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1. Approval of Minutes
   October 24, 2006
   http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/minutes/10.24.06.htm

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

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
   (Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
   (President Herbert and Professors Miller and Ng)

5. Policy on Intellectual Property [SECOND READING/ACTION ITEM] (45 minutes)
   (Professor Simon Atkinson, co-chair, UFC Research Affairs Committee)

6. Review of IUs Core Campus and System School Operations [DISCUSSION] (45 minutes)
   (Professor Maynard Thompson)
7. Review Procedures for Chancellors [DISCUSSION] (10 minutes)  
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)  
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/chancellor.htm

8. Transferability and General Education at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)  
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

9. Standing Committee Reports  
10. Old Business  
11. New Business

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Let me call the meeting to order. I just want to make one announcement today. We have these microphones around the room, they are very sensitive and they are recording. They are sensitive enough that if you’re having sidebar conversations they could be picked up. I just want to warn everybody, in this room, I’m not sure about the acoustics. Can everybody hear me? These are not necessarily for amplification purposes, they are more for recording. So again, I just want to give everyone a little warning upfront.

Let me begin by asking for approval of the minutes. Kelly has advised me that there was one observation made relative made to the attendance portion of the agenda. That has been corrected and is now posted on the website. Is there a motion with that correction that the minutes be approved?

FISHER: So moved.

HERBERT: Moved. Is there second?

FINKBINE: Second.

HERBERT: Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor please say “aye”. Minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

HERBERT: With regards to my report, let me just mention a few things. First, this morning and afternoon, we started at eleven o’clock and ended around one o’clock, we had a meeting between the governor and the university presidents discussing a number of issues as we get ready for the upcoming legislative session. I thought that the meeting went very well and the bottom line is that I can tell you that this governor is very supportive of higher education. He understands its importance for the state and I think that as he begins to release his recommendations to the legislature that will be evident. All of us expressed our appreciation to him today for listening and for his responsiveness to some of the views that we have articulated.
Let me also tell you that I just returned from a trip to Asia. The US Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings asked twelve higher education presidents to join her and assistant secretary of state for a trip to Japan, Korea and China. We ended it in Beijing. The purpose of that trip was to focus or to articulate the commitment of America to attracting more students from abroad as well as enhancing opportunities for our students to have experiences in countries around the world. We were very well received in all the countries, particularly China. One of the things that was especially interesting there was that there was a memorandum of understand signed between the Minister of Education and the Secretary and in what folks over there regarded as an unprecedented action, the Head of State met with the Secretary and the Ambassador and Assistant Secretaries that were with us. The meeting ran fifteen minutes longer than it was supposed to, which was unusual, and then he walked them out to their car. Some of the Chinese officials said that they had never seen him do that. We’re now looking at a possible follow-up trip to China in particular over the course of the next—maybe around the March period we’ll tell you more about that.

I think overall we were very well received. I was sitting, having lunch with one of the senior officials from the Chinese government and he proceeded to tell me that he has a niece studying at Indiana University. So again, our reach is very broad and I felt very good about the fact that we had the reception at the ambassador’s home in Japan and one of our recent graduates came up to me and started talking and then we had two or three others, so our alumni are really all over the world.

The next, I know all of you are aware, but I’m just very proud of the fact that we received two major gifts this past week, for a total of $90 million and we’re grateful to Bren and Mel Simon for their support of the School of Medicine and also a $40 million gift for the Center on Philanthropy from the Lilly Endowment. Some of you may have seen the article in the full page thank you note in the star a few days ago to the Simons and we’re doing something else for the Lilly Endowment. They don’t want that kind of recognition. So we’re doing something else for them just to let them how grateful we are.

Again, I think that those gifts, especially the $50 million in support of cancer that the School of Medicine is very important as part of our statements to the legislature, relative to the life sciences. Speaking of that, I did make a presentation to the State Budget Committee on October 17th, in which articulated university priorities with this budget session. I will speak again on December 13th before the Budget Committee. What we have done is to ask that our proposal for our life sciences initiative be treated as an economic development issue and not as a proposal coming under the higher education budget. What that does essentially is makes it possible for us to ask for additional resources for a priority initiative that we think because of the magnitude of it, if we lump those together it would potentially have a negative impact with regard to our request for basic operating fund. The good news is that coming out of the Higher Education Commission there is a proposal from that group for a 2 percent increase for this year. We’re obviously asking for more. But I think that’s a good first step as we go into the legislative session. So the proposal for the Life Sciences initiative is $80 million and we’ll make that presentation on the December 13th.
Let me just end with two final items, one is outsourcing. I know all of you are aware that this has issue that the Board of Trustees has emphasized. I’m asked about constantly. There’s one element of this that has implications potentially for all of our campuses and that is the proposal that we have—the RFP that has been released relative to the bookstores on all of our campuses. Essentially what the RFP provides is an opportunity for companies to make a proposal for Bloomington only, for IUPUI only, for both of those together and for all of our campuses together. What I can tell you right now is that we now have had all of the vendors who expressed an interest they have now had a chance to walk through to all of our campus bookstores. Each campus was asked to develop responses to a series of questions that would give a comprehensive sense as to the financials and all of the other related matters that they need in order to make a decision. The responses to the RFP are due on the 22nd of December. What I can tell you is that we now have five parties that are definitely interested in pursuing this and all of them have asked for an extension due to the complex nature of our structure with the number of bookstores that we have in place. Our intention is to provide an extension. We haven’t decided on the exact date as of today but we will provide an extension because of the complexity of this RFP. Once we receive that my guess is that because this is complex, we may hire an outside consultant to help us sought through everything to make sure that we’re getting an optimal deal for all the campuses.

The last announcement I’d like to make is that as part of the IU Lead Program, I have appointed John Applegate as the university’s first presidential fellow. He will officially assume those responsibilities on the 1st of January. He was one of the members of the first class of IU Lead and I’m looking forward to his working with me. His term as a presidential fellow will run at least through my tenure as president and he has agreed, as has his dean, that assuming that we have a new president on board in July, that he is willing to continue to serve if the president would like through this calendar year. We will then proceed, hopefully on an annual basis, to select another presidential fellow from the faculty ranks.

That concludes my report.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me now ask Ted or Bart if you have any that you would like to make in terms of reports.

MILLER: I’ll start, Bart.

NG: Sure. I don’t have anything to particularly say.

MILLER: Alright, I have a couple things that I could mention here. Number one has to do with today’s agenda. You will note that our agenda contains a Policy on Intellectual Property. This, as many of you know, has been a policy that this council and various other councils around the university have been discussing for a long period of time. You’ll note that today’s agenda contemplates the idea that we may take action on this item today. I think that I could speak for the Agenda Committee in saying that we all hope sincerely that it is possible to do that. We would like to move this item off of our agenda.
The second thing that I will say just a bit about here, we have some discussion down below on the agenda regarding general education. I’ll just report that the trustees remain very interested in the topic of general education. At the last Trustees meeting, both Bart and I were grilled, I would say might be the way to put it, over just how this was going and so forth and so on. I just encourage you to keep in mind that we are going toward this February date, February 1st or 2nd, early February right?

HERBERT: I think it’s around the 3rd or somewhere around that time.

MILLER: Early February where the Trustees are expecting the President to make a report regarding progress that we have made in this area. I’m not sure if it’s just going to be focused on Bloomington and Indianapolis at this time or it’s going to be a broader discussion?

HERBERT: It will be broader. They want to know about what all the campuses have done.

MILLER: So we’ll have a little of talk here today. I doubt if we’ll spend 30 minutes today actually but there’ll be a little talk here today just to keep us mindful of the fact that this is a topic of interest. On our various campuses, I think we need to do as much as we can to facilitate the end game here in terms of this general education topic.

The final thing, I’ll just say a few words about the presidential search. As you all know, Indiana University is searching for a president who will replace President Herbert at some point over the next year and a half, I guess, I’m not quite clear when that would happen. But there is a search underway. You also know that the structure of this search is somewhat different from previous presidential searches in that there are two committees that have been appointed that are involved in the search. One of them is called the Search Committee and the other is called the Faculty Advisory Committee. The idea of the Faculty Advisory Committee is of course to bring the views of the faculty into the discussion surrounding this search.

As I said, this is an approach that has not been tried before and I think there no doubt are people who are wondering whether this structure is going to be effective in bringing the faculty view into the search. I am a member of the Search Committee. There are very very few faculty, what you might think of as pure faculty members, there are very few pure faculty members…

HERBERT: There’s a question here, are you pure?

MILLER: …that are members of the search committee. There are 12 or 13, I forget the exact number, who are members of the Faculty Advisory Committee. So the search is now sort of launched. There are candidates that are being reviewed. The Search Committee has had a meeting and the Faculty Advisory Committee has had a meeting. They have basically been reviewing the same set of candidates.

What I would like to say today, just for your information, is that the views of the Faculty Advisory Committee and the views of the Search Committee regarding the candidates that have thus far been reviewed at any rate, are really very very similar. I think that this is something that
I think is important for the faculty of the university to know. I’m quite sure that there are concerns about what this all means, how effective the role of the faculty is going to be in this. I can say that up to this point the faculty views have been taken very seriously by the Search Committee and the Search Committee view has ended up being extremely similar to that effect. I’m very hopeful that that pattern will continue as we go forward.

One of things that I would encourage you all to do to the extent that you have a chance—the IUPUI faculty had a chance last week Tuesday to hear Trustee Reilly talk about the presidential search. Trustee Reilly is one of the trustee members of the Search Committee. He made quite a presentation last week to the Indianapolis Faculty Council. It was quite a lengthy presentation, the contents of which ranged over quite a number of topics and frankly I think that some what he said regarding particularly the relationship between the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses was somewhat exaggerated. But what I want say to you today about Trustee Reilly is that when you listen to what he says about the presidential search, it’s clear he is going to be a very influential person in this search. What he says about the presidential search is that from his point of view, the President of Indiana University must be a person who can drive the academic agenda of the university forward. It must be a person who can drive the academic agenda of the university forward. He has said that repeatedly in different forums where I’ve heard him and it’s very clear, I think, that that is a view that is in sympathy with the views of many faculty. So what I’m trying to say here today is that from my point of view now, the search is proceeding and thus far I do not have any serious concerns about the way this is going. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Any questions of Ted, Bart and me?

SPECHLER: First, Ted, I’m not particularly surprised that the Advisory Committee and the Search Committee are roughly congruent in their appraisal of candidate’s dossiers. But the question that I have is what kind of information this congruency is based on? I think, as I’ve said at the meeting here with Trustee Reilly, that the problem is that the search firm provides too little information about the style, habits of work, and so on. Also, it doesn’t tell us very much about the shortcomings—we all have shortcomings—of candidates. I wonder Ted, can you tell us whether the committee is reaching out beyond what the search firm and letters have brought you.

MILLER: Well I’m certain that that is going to happen. What has happened thus far has been a pretty preliminary set of considerations in terms of trying to think about the candidates that have applied. Whether we think that there are people that should be considered further or not, is been pretty general at this point. We’re not at a point where there is a final list that has been selected, but certainly at that point there will be an effort to go beyond.

SPECHLER: Well if that is so, as I suspected, I think it’s really very important that you as representative of “pure faculty” I assume, urge the committee to do its own investigation and in particular to open the search in the final stage to the faculty as a whole. We have many channels of information that Trustees don’t have. Trustee Reilly quite openly admitted as much, and he seemed to favor opening the search for the last stage. Our experience at other top universities
MILLER: Well, you of course made that point very effectively at the meeting last Tuesday, the IFC meeting here on the campus and if you recall I was very supportive of the point that you’re making. The one thing that I would encourage you to do as you think more about that to the extent that you want to lobby various people to adopt your view, I think it would be useful to view the search, when we use this term “the search”, what are we talking when we talk about the search? I think it’s useful to think about the search as something that terminates with the Search Committee putting forward to the Board of Trustees a set of finalists, however many that might be. I think it is useful to conceive of the search being over at that point. So it’s one thing for the trustees to take the position that the search is going to be confidential. That does not necessarily conflict with the point that you’re trying to make, that once the finalists go to the trustees that the names could be made up, that could be some events that the faculty could participate in and we would have a broader base of information developed about these candidates. So it seems to me that we can have both a confidential search, which is really what the trustees I think have said that they would like. But that doesn’t necessarily preclude the sort of end-game that you’re talking about. So I’m encouraging you, if you continue to talk about this, which I presume you are going to, and I would encourage you to, I would phrase it in that way. I would make that distinction between what is the search and what follows the search. I’m not sure that the Trustees have made up their mind about what follows the search. But I think they have made up their mind about how they want the search to be conducted.

SPECHLER: Oh, yes. I have a question for President Herbert as well.

HERBERT: Yes, sir?

SPECHLER: You spent a number of days with Secretary of Education Spellings and as you certainly know, the Secretary has made some broad based criticisms of American higher education, not particularly Indiana University, if I’m not mistaken, with some emphasis on the affordability question. So I’m not aware that she’s been in favor of raising the Pell Grants in order to deal with that issue. But anyway, we have a new situation in Washington—could you say what you learned from the experience of meeting her? What’s really on her mind because to have negative criticism by the Secretary of Education is not good for us but we should learn from that kind of criticism if at all possible?

HERBERT: We didn’t spend a great deal of time talking about that but what I can tell you is that she has invited me to come to Washington to talk with her about my views on some of these matters and I am going to do that. But we focused most of our attention on the mission and if you would take a look at the agenda, it was just so tight, we just went from one meeting to another until 10:30 or so at night. So, just the conversations about that were not at sufficient depth to be able to add much to what you already read about in The Chronicle and elsewhere relative to some of her thoughts. She’s meeting with the accrediting bodies this week. But from my advantage point, at least the opportunity to go up to Washington and talk with her about it
relative to views from here, I think it’s something that is very helpful, at least in terms of being able to articulate our views.

SPECHLER: I for one would be very eager to hear what it is that is bothering this administration about higher education and whether you can persuade her that at least sort of criticism are ill-informed.

HERBERT: I’ll let you know what happens as a follow-up to that. There’s one over here and then...

COFFIN: I want to go back of the bookstores briefly. It sounded, from what you said, almost as if the decision has been made to outsource bookstore operations.

HERBERT: A decision has not been made. What I can tell you is that the trustees have asked us to take a look at that and there are mixed views on the board about some of these issues. What we’re trying to do is to be very thorough and I will tell you for example that in the case of Bloomington, the Bloomington bookstores are making a bid, are submitting a bid. When Terry Clapacs visited the campuses, actually he had a meeting here and had the bookstore folks come in and one of the points that he made was that this is an opportunity, potentially, for all of our bookstores to submit their own proposals. So at least from an administrative perspective, our intention is to be very objective about this and if in fact there’s a proposal that is so overwhelming, that also deals with the issues of staff and impact on them as well as on resources, quality of service, cost, if a proposal comes in that is so significant that we have to consider it, we will. But our intent is to be totally objective about it and do what is best for the campuses.

COFFIN: Well my question goes on to ask for the individual campuses, assuming that proposal, will the decision be made at the university-level or at the campus-level seeing about how the campus bookstores will be affected by this?

HERBERT: It will be made at the university-level with input from the campuses, and I would just note there that this has now risen to a trustee issue. My view is that the administration has to make a decision and we’ll advise the board. But I think what we’ve got to be in a position to do is to demonstrate that this has been a sound judgment and is in the best interest of all the campuses. So as we go through negotiations with the vendors assuming that we find one that looks…[End of Tape 1, Side A…. some comments may be lost]

BODMER: …have done or been working on or contributes to the Presidents report to the Trustees in terms of general education. I mean February is coming up and I am just not clear what we need to be doing. I mean we have been working on this but I am not clear what we need.

HERBERT: Well frankly I’m relying upon Ted and Bart to help me pull together whatever it is we are going to submit and what we are trying to do is to utilize the processes that they have put into place so that this is something that is coming from the faculty and me. So let me ask…
MILLER: Well let’s defer this until-- this is an item on our agenda. We are going to review the information that we now have and we are going to talk about what it is that we would like to have from various campuses that we now do not have.

SCHNEIDER: Ted, can I ask you a question about the presidential search procedures and particularly what specifically this Faculty Advisory Committee will do. You said for example now it has access to the dossiers as they come in and they are making some sort of rating or ranking of them. Will they then, presumably from that there will be a short list developed or shorter list developed, will they then participate in the fuller vetting and meeting to interview. I assume they won’t have a final vote.

MILLER: I do not believe that there is currently envisioned the members of the Advisory Committee interviewing candidates. I don’t think that is part of what the trustees have in mind.

SCHNEIDER: So this will be it reviewing the initial dossiers and provide some ranking.

MILLER: Well the first stage of it is kind of a crude sort of separation of candidates into those that are interesting versus those that perhaps are not so interesting from our points of view. That is kind of where we are now. That is kind of ongoing right now. Ultimately, there will be a question about which of these seemingly interesting candidates we want to pursue further. I am certain that the Advisory Committee will make its views known on which of those are of most interest to them. Beyond that I am not sure at this point.

HERBERT: Are there other questions?

TERRY: Two very quick comments. One relates to outsourcing and something I thought about more as a result of the story in the IDS this morning and that I would hope that we would keep in mind when evaluating what is recommended. I also direct an undergraduate student residence in Bloomington and what impresses me is how much our students work but not in the classroom alone but how many of them have outside jobs and actually how important that is to them and that in many cases these are the people that we are worried about in terms of access and affordability and on-campus jobs at places like the bookstore help with that. These are typically not minimum wage jobs, often they have benefits of free food if they work in the residence halls or this sort of thing. I would hope that in the review one of the things that matters is to look at outsourcing and its impact on access and affordability and the effects on students. There probably aren’t many students who work for the motor pool, I don’t know about that but certainly for some of the units there are student staff.

The second comment that I have has to do with the presidential search. I would hope that the trustees go down the path of announcing the names of the finalists. We did that recently on the Bloomington campus with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. And I think that the meetings, for most people who attended would agree, gave faculty a chance to meet the dean candidates and the candidates a chance to meet some faculty. It gave them a sense of what they were getting into for the position. I would urge us to use caution as we go through that search which to me is self-evident but apparently isn’t happening so far. If the trustees decide to make
these finalists public be sure to notify candidates in advance of that so they are not blindsided by it. I think the candidates should know in advance because this is a high-profile search.

HERBERT: Herb, I can tell you that with regard with the issue that you raised that is something that we are looking at as part of our ultimate assessment and they are aware of our practices in that regard. That concludes the Q&A session.

AGENDA ITEM #5: POLICY ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

HERBERT: Let’s now turn to Item #5, the Policy on Intellectual Property, Ted.

MILLER: We have Simon Atkinson with us today, who is going to make another brief presentation of this material.

ATKINSON: I really will try to keep this brief because everybody has heard about this policy too many times. The draft of the policy that comes to you today has been voted on and unanimously approved by the Indianapolis Faculty Council and the Bloomington Faculty Council. I don’t whether that reflects support for the policy or just fatigue. This draft is somewhat different from the previous version that we saw at the last UFC meeting at Kokomo. Not significantly different in its content but there has been some rearranging and removal of duplications and its actually shortened from the draft that we saw at Kokomo, which almost never happens with policies which is a remarkable achievement. There are changes that are highlighted in the blue document U5-2007. Those are changes that were made as a result of the action of the Bloomington Faculty Council at the last BFC meeting discussed this policy. For those of you who are from Indianapolis those changes with the exception of one small change were incorporated in the document that was approved by the IFC. The one thing that was not in the version that was approved by the IFC is on page 9 and it is in section G2 at the paragraph on the top of the page, the deletion of “utilize” all. That was a change that should have been in the version that was approved at Indianapolis. This change was made to take account of the situation where the faculty used programs like TurnItIn to screen student works for plagiarism and was decided that the previous version precluded the use of those kinds of resources for plagiarism.

I will just remind you of what’s different from this policy and the policy that is currently in force. The main changes are in the revenue distribution scheme, which is found in the table on page 13. At present there is a step distribution scheme so intellectual property revenues up to $100,000 are distributed in one way and as revenues increase above $100,000 the relative distribution between the creator and the university changes as more revenue comes in it becomes more generous to the university and less generous to the creator. This is essentially a flat rate. The new distribution scheme is that there is a distribution to the creator’s lab or program/activity that stays with the creator as long as the creator stays at the university. It sort of a handcuffs provision and then there is a direct distribution of 25 percent of the IT revenue to the Technology Transfer Office which is intended to support there activities get there stomping levels up to those equivalent to those of peer institutions tech transfer activity and translating Intellectual Property into revenue producing activities for the university. The other main change is that there is now is more specific treatment of copyright issues as separate from patentable intellectual property and explicit treatment of software which is now treated as copyrightable intellectual property and is
usually a traditional work of scholarship unless there was extraordinary university support that’s defined. And there is also explicit treatment of handling intellectual property issues that are related to online instructional materials which were not treated in the previous policy. So I think in my personal opinion is that with these changes this is something that we should be able to approve. There is a provision just in case anyone is worried about not being able to see this again, I am sure the Trustees will be interested in this policy. That is one potential opportunity for us to discuss this again and there is also the idea of a revision provision that the policy will be reviewed by the Intellectual Property Council and if changes are recommended proceed with bringing the policy back to this body. So I can answer questions or we can debate it or whatever we want to do.

HERBERT: Are there any questions?

VERMETTE: Simon, just one question, what do you think the controversial parts of the document that will flag themselves for the Board of Trustees?

ATKINSON: I think they could potentially be concerned that the revenue distribution here is more generous to the creator and there is a small allocation to the central university. And obviously that is something that they are trying to reverse so that the resources are available to the president. This distribution really is a way to provide incentives to the creation of intellectual property and to attract faculty who are likely to be producers of intellectual property to this university and to make sure that when intellectual property is created there is proper support from the technology transfer office to make sure that IP can be translated both for the benefit of the university and the creator. I can see that the trustees might be concerned about the small fraction of revenue that’s targeted towards the central administration.

MILLER: Simon, is it your sense that this aspect of the policy is consistent with practices elsewhere or is it inconsistent with practices elsewhere?

ATKINSON: Practices elsewhere are all varied. This is a model that has been used at several institutions that are fairly similar to our standard policy and the way that this works. So it’s a model that has been adopted at other places.

MILLER: I think if we anticipate questions along these lines it would be very useful to have some documents.

ATKINSON: There is a lot of material that was accumulated by the original IP review committee that went into producing the original draft which has evolved into this. There are really many approaches that have been used and I would say more institutions are now moving toward this approach and trying to incentivize the creation of IP. I know that Craig Brater has commented in the past that some faculty candidates have not been pleased with the current policy because individuals were concerned about the revenue to them and to their research program and it was not comparable to other institutions.
HERBERT: Just following up on Ted’s observation I would urge you when this does come before the Board you might want to at least have a table that shows how the other Big Ten institutions are distributing revenues because it will come up.

LAHIRI: My question relates to lab and it’s a term that is confusing. Some research is done collaboratively with other labs, not within the campus, but in other states. So this money would be divided along these labs?

ATKINSON: If there are multiple creators, it will be split between the creators and each of their ongoing labs or research programs. And obviously there are some situations where that may be complicated and there may have to be some negotiation that is involved in that. I don’t think it is possible to specify exactly how that works in every different case because there is a lot of differences in an ongoing program in Fine Arts, for example, or an ongoing program in a lab in the Medical School.

LAHIRI: So would it be split accordingly university-wide as well if there are three universities involved. So which university policy would be used?

ATKINSON: You mean institutions outside of Indiana University that are involved? Then this distribution scheme only applies to the IU share of that intellectual property. So presumably there would have to be an agreement between the institutions of how the IP revenues would be broken up between institutions.

HERBERT: Are there additional questions?

MEISS: If a person or a creator is currently receiving revenues under old scheme, will they be grandfathered into this or would they keep their original agreements?

ATKINSON: The policy as its drafted states in the implementation clause that IP that is created before this policy is brought into force will be distributed according to the old scheme unless the creator agrees with the university otherwise.

HERBERT: Yes?

TERRY: I’m not sure I follow how you believe or why you believe that page 5 addresses the TurnItIn.com question, if I understand that question. My understanding of the concern was that students were concerned about the coursework they created in the course of a class. The concern was that if they submit these to TurnItIn.com, other universities or somebody else, including TurnItIn.com, might appropriate the works for a vendor database. The specific language that you have here troubles me in two ways. I am not sure that a student essay written for a traditional class and suddenly submitted to TurnItIn.com online, given the definition of online instructional materials in here, is on its face not an online instructional material. That would be my point of view.

ATKINSON: That would have been my point of view too.
TERRY: Okay so can you explain why our point of view is not in here?

ATKINSON: No I was not at the BFC meeting so maybe somebody else can comment.

KISH: I will try to articulate this. Brad Wheeler brought this up. The issue is that the sentence read that—your issue is the definition of whether student work is online instructional material. The committee’s concern was to take the broadest possible interpretation. Brad Wheeler is the acting CIO in lieu of Michael McRobbie in the IT Office. Brad’s concern was that the phrase “utilize or distribute” would prevent the faculty member from using TurnItIn.com because they would be utilizing the material. So his suggestion was to just remove the word utilize and then it is satisfactory in terms of that contract and that was the only reason why it was brought up. If we say that faculty can’t use these materials that would really mean that we would need to get rid of our TurnItIn contract. This was brought up by Brad I believe at the October BFC meeting.

TERRY: I’m not sure I was at that meeting, that may have been when I was in Syracuse, but the question I guess would be, based on your understanding of that discussion, would there be a problem if the sentence said something “like in the case of students copyrighted or copyrights materials created by students and submitted for course requirement including online instructional materials are owned by the student author”.

KISH: The only issue is that this is in the section called online instructional material.

TERRY: I guess I would say it is under other instructional material.

KISH: Under page 8 called “Online Instructional Materials” under G, you have a definition and ownership and this falls under ownership so this all falls within the context of students submitting work in an online instructional capacity. This whole section has been problematic for the past three years. This was the final agreed upon language.

TERRY: I guess I would say that I hope that on the basis of this discussion should we ever get to an interpretation of this it is clear that the intent of this council was that a students work, even if not part of an online course, simply submitted electronically comes under that. My second concern is the use of material by TurnItIn.com.

KISH: Our contract with TurnItIn, they do not have access to materials submitted by Indiana University.

TERRY: Right our current contract. We may not stay with TurnItIn.com forever and I am wondering why this says only that the University. Maybe it should say that neither the instructor nor the university nor others should release the materials. I’m not sure we should leave this undefined and at the discretion of some interpretation down the road.

ATKINSON: I think this will appear in the minutes of this meeting.

HERBERT: Okay, we will make sure that those are in the minutes. Are there other questions?
CARINI: So one thing that seems to have disappeared here is what happens to potentially patentable discoveries that the university decides not to pursue.

ATKINSON: Right, those are essentially dead. The creators can elect to take those discoveries and pursue a patent but that will be without university support. One thing that is added in this draft is that there is a more extensive appeals process against those decisions so there is an initial appeal to the Intellectual Property Council and if the creator is not satisfied with the ruling of the council then the creator can turn it over to the President who has the final decision.

CARINI: The previous version said well you can pursue licensing at that stage and that’s it before sending it to the outside.

HERBERT: Other questions?

ATKINSON: The clause I was trying to find relative to the revenue distribution is on page 13, paragraph 5. “Revenue distributions determined prior to the implementation of this policy shall not be affected by this schedule, except as agreed by all parties.”

HERBERT: May I ask one?

ATKINSON: Yes.

HERBERT: On page 13, item D, the last phrase “in coordination with the Office of the President”, what does that mean? If it is in coordination with, where is the money going?

ATKINSON: My understanding is that the money is going to your office.

HERBERT: The part that just confused me was “in coordination with”.

ATKINSON: Right.

HERBERT: I couldn’t tell if it was to be allocated by the Office of the President, then it is not in coordination with, but I won’t quibble about it. I just didn’t understand who it was…

ATKINSON: I think that means it goes to you directly.

HERBERT: Are there other questions, if not is there a motion relative to the policy? It has been moved and seconded. Are we ready to vote? All those in favor please say aye [aye]. Is there anyone opposed? It is unanimously adopted. [Applause] And the minutes will reflect the observations that have been made. Next item 6, Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #6: REVIEW OF IU’s CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL OPERATIONS

MILLER: The next item is a discussion item focused on a report pertaining to the future of the
Core Campus and System Schools. The report that has been distributed to you is a report to the President. The President is currently considering what recommendations he will make regarding these matters, what decisions he will make regarding these matters. And this is an opportunity for the faculty of the university to make its views known. I would welcome your comments although to begin this we have with us Maynard Thompson who was a member of the committee who prepared this report. You will see that by the cover page that Charles Bonser was the chair of this committee. He was not available today and Maynard was asked to make some remarks about the report and he has graciously agreed to do so.

THOMPSON: Thank you, Ted. I’d like to begin by calling your attention to the composition of the committee that the President tasked to undertake this review. Charles Bosner was a long-time dean of a multi-campus school, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Angela McBride a long time dean of the School of Nursing, a multi-campus school; Jack Wentworth long-time dean of the School of Business, a core campus school. In addition Gerald Bepko who was a long-time chancellor of this campus (IUPUI) and F.C. Richardson a long-time chancellor of the Southeast campus represented the chancellor’s point of view in this conversation. The President asked us to undertake this review in late spring. We got started in June. We had a report ready to draft in late July. It went through various revisions and Ted and Bart received their first externally circulated copy early in the fall semester. I would like to call your attention to only two or three of what I view as the major conclusions of the review. And it certainly is possibly that individuals in this audience and individuals in other audiences would take issue with the conclusions that review committee proposed. The conclusions are based primarily on a rather elaborate questionnaire that was circulated [End of Tape 1 Side B … some comments might be lost] … individual faculty members who played roles on various kinds advisory committees and so forth to the school deans.

As, I’ve said, a couple of the dominant conclusions were that for many of the core campuses, the dean of the school coordinates programs, faculty, and activities between the Indianapolis and the Bloomington campus. In the committee’s view many of those schools are working extremely well and we cite in particular the Kelley School of Business, the School of Library and Information Sciences, Informatics. That’s not to say that there’s not individual issues that arise in these schools that are less than optimal. But they are the sort of issues that typically arise within a single school on a single campus and so don’t represent necessarily symptomatic characteristics of a core campus. I think in the words of the report, at some point the committee concluded that the university gained more by having the organization along core campus lines than they would if these operations functioned completely independently, that there was in fact a synergy that had positive value added to the university.

The second recommendation or set of recommendations is that the multi-campus schools, with the exception of Social Work which is a special case, the environment in which they function has evolved significantly since their creation—a number of these multi-campus schools were created in the mid-1970s and the environments, by that I mean the regional campuses, the characteristics of the regional campuses, the degree programs, faculty composition and so forth, was obviously very very different in the mid-1970s then it is today. And the environment has evolved to a place that it may well be that different organizational structures are more appropriate now than they were in the past. The committee’s belief is that those individual structures should be determined
by the campuses and by the school deans. If the current arrangement is productive perhaps it should be continued. If the current arrangement is not productive and there are alternative arrangements between individual schools and campuses there ought to be an option for those to be worked out and agreements be reached. There is an underlying theme that occurs in several places in the report is that the committee would encourage that the arrangements be more formal than they have been in the past. Not to say they be uniform but they be formal so that the deans, the faculty members, the chancellors, the vice chancellors of academic affairs have a clearer understanding of what the expectations of each part are through this common arrangement.

I’m sure there’s going to be many questions on individual issues but perhaps with those two major thematic recommendations we could open it up for more general questions.

**HERBERT:** Are there questions or comments? Suggestions? As Ted indicated this will be especially helpful for me as I sort through all of this before making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

**VERMETTE:** Can I ask just a general question because maybe I should know this but I don’t…what prompted this review? Why was this being done and is there a reason for looking closely at the relationships across the campuses?

**HERBERT:** The Board of Trustees asked me to take a look at the organizational structure of the university. This is one part of that and my view was that it was important that we go ahead and deal with all of these issues at this point in time before the new president comes in.

**BALDWIN:** To what extent are current rearrangements of units happening as a result of this or have just happened? I’m referring to what’s happening on this campus with Journalism moving over to Liberal Arts, is that completely independent of this?

**HERBERT:** No, a decision has not been made on that. Essentially what has to happen is that if we decide not to maintain a core campus presence then one of the things that has to happen is that the academic units on this campus have to agree to accept the faculty from that unit. So that for example if we make the decision to separate Journalism or to not maintain a core campus presence in Journalism then this campus, as I understand it, has agreed on a location for those faculty. If we make a decision with regard to music the same thing will have to occur. The faculty here will have to make a decision about, at least the faculty in the unit here that would accept those faculty for appointments, would have to agree on that. So that’s a separate action that has to occur in the context of each campus. The first action that has to be taken is a decision that we are going to move away from a core school concept in the various disciplines or we’re going to maintain it, in which case those approvals aren’t necessary.

**SCHNEIDER:** When do you expect the Trustees to decide?

**HERBERT:** Well I’m going to make some decisions and then what we’ll probably do is to share with the Board the recommendations coming from this committee just so that they are aware of what has been discussed and I’ll make a recommendation to the Board finally, probably their first meeting of the year in February. Yes?
COFFIN: Two questions, I guess. Perhaps this is something that I should have picked up on at some point in the past and it’s clear that Bloomington and IUPUI are being designated as the core campuses but what does that mean that those are the core campuses? What does that mean that they can do that the other campuses can’t do or that the other campuses can do that they can’t do? As I said, maybe I missed this somewhere, but I don’t quite understand that and then I have one more question that I’ll ask as well.

HERBERT: That’s historical, let me ask Ted if he wants to respond and Maynard has been here forever so he can also respond.

THOMPSON: Well the core campus is a term that goes back to the 1970s when the current structure of the university was created there was something called the core campus and that was the combination of IUPUI and IU Bloomington. In this report it’s used primarily in conjunction with schools—core campus schools being schools that operate on both the Indianapolis and the Bloomington campus.

COFFIN: The second thing I wanted to ask about is that I note that there are at least two programs that are university-wide, at least to my understanding, that are not mentioned in here and that’s the School of Continuing Studies on the one-hand and the Labor Studies program on the other hand, which as I understand are university-wide programs. And I’m not sure how either one of those fits into this discussion.

THOMPSON: Continuing Studies is mentioned in there explicitly.

HERBERT: With regard to Labor Studies that is an issue that is currently being explored on the IUPUI campus and so that is not ready to come yet to the university-level for discussion since that’s currently an issue that is being evaluated.

MILLER: Could I just make a comment, Don? I think it’s interesting that you would raise the question about what the core campus stuff is all about because as Maynard says this is a term that has been in use for a very long period of time but, at least my observation is, that the only people that really were talking about the university in these terms were the trustees. There was very little talk at the faculty level regarding these ideas and I’m sure there are many faculty who really are unaware that this term is something that has a meaning somewhere. I’ll have to say that my own, we had quite a lengthy discussion today in the Agenda Committee about this report, and I’m trying to process what it is I heard there but I have to say I think one of the problems with this report really does revolve around this terminology, this overlay of terminology, that really may be confusing the issues way beyond what they need to be. We have a history in this university of using terms that really are confusing. Some of you know that I have been for a number of years sort of talking about the so-called one university. This is a term that has been in use for a number of years. The trustees have been talking about the structure of the university and one of the questions that they come back to on a regular basis and try to clarify amongst themselves whether they are all on the same page regarding is whether in fact Indiana University should be viewed as one university or whether it should be viewed as a university system. And the typical ending of those discussions amongst the trustees is a re-affirmation on their part that Indiana
University is one university. Now to me Indiana University is not one university. I don’t think it’s necessarily a system either although to me it seems more like a system than one university. But the interesting part of these discussions is that when the trustees start talking about why they think it is one university they end up talking about things that I never even conceived of as being related to the idea of one university. When they talk about Indiana University being one university what they mean is that there is a single person who is the chief executive officer. That is their idea of the one university. As long as the president has that role they view the university as one university. When I think about one university I think about efforts to somehow homogenize us into the same stuff everywhere, you know? And so when the president introduced his mission differentiation project I thought this was just fantastic stuff because it was really going to do-in the one university and as far as I’m concerned it has. But the trustees don’t see it that way. When they think about the one university they have something else in mind and I think this terminology with the core campus and system schools and the multi-campus schools and all this terminology is really just confusing. If we could strip that stuff out of this report and have a term that could make sense to ordinary people—and to me the term that would make sense would be multi-campus unit, it’s an academic unit that operates on multiple campuses whether it’s two campuses or five campuses or whatever it is. So if we could strip all this confusing terminology out of here I think we could get down to something maybe that we could understand and maybe it wouldn’t raise the kinds of questions that it raises.

HERBERT: Could I just make one comment first? I had not heard Ted articulate this before and I don’t want to speak for the Board but let me tell you what I think I hear them saying. That this is one university that has multiple delivery components. It is one university because all of our delivery alternatives offer a degree that says Indiana University but we’re doing that in different ways. In Bloomington we have an AAU research university, in Indianapolis we have urban research university, and then we have regional campuses and so what we are trying to do, as Ted has correctly articulated, is that through mission differentiation is to provide greater flexibility for the regional campuses to be more responsive to the realities and the needs of the regions that they serve. But all of them are still offering a degree that says Indiana University it’s just that there are different types of approaches. And so when you come to a discussion of how those are going to be delivered one approach is to deliver a degree in Social Work on all of our campuses and because of accreditation issues we have to have a unified structure for doing that and so we offer that Indiana University degree under the auspices of a single unit that has a presence on all the campuses. But there are a whole host of ways to deliver those degrees. So it seems to me that that’s what they focus on and they do want to have a president who has overarching responsibility for ensuring that the integrity, working with the faculty with regard to degree integrity, but pushing forward the academic agenda as it relates to how the Indiana University brand name is going to be utilized in the context of those multiple delivery sites. I don’t know if that differs from what Ted says but I think that’s the way they look at it.

VERMETTE: Just one comment and a question. The comment is that if they think this is one university they should look at funding it as one university rather than putting all the money in one slot and then letting the others fail.

HERBERT: Well that’s a legislative issue. What the legislature does is fund each individual campus.
VERMETTE: Right but there is some discretion there and are the discretionary funds for the president that are coming from the different campuses going to be spent on the different campuses or on one? But that’s just one remark. My question is how come I don’t see anything in here about the School of Medicine—that’s a multi-campus enterprise.

THOMPSON: The School of Medicine we thought was completely outside of this structure. That operates across the entire university and across the entire state and we did not include that in this report.

BALDWIN: One of the major problems about Indiana University and Ted brought this up earlier when he spoke about ambiguous terms. Probably the ambiguous term we have around is Indiana University itself. We ourselves cannot come to a common understanding of what that means and it reflects on the one university question. Sometimes you read a sentence and Indiana University refers to the campus in Bloomington and two paragraphs down Indiana University refers to the whole shebang throughout the state. And until we learn ourselves to use the term correctly that Indiana University is one university operating around the state, instead of using that with Bloomington. We discussed this in the Integrated Image Project last year and I don’t know what has happened with that and I thought we worked it out in reasonable fashion with all the campuses but it still bothers me that we can’t agree on a definition of the term Indiana University in our daily ordinary life conversation. And the state follows us and the Indianapolis Star follows us and they can’t understand it either.

HERBERT: Well there are two dimensions of that. One is that within the context of university documents we do refer to IU Bloomington.

BALDWIN: Not always. Read the IU Alumni Magazine sometimes.

HERBERT: Well in terms of official university documents that’s what we are attempting to do. Now the other reality is that by law the campus in Bloomington was created and called Indiana University. Originally that was the only campus of Indiana University and so when it was created that’s what it was called so the law has not been changed, it still is referred to by law as Indiana University. So what we are trying to do now is to provide the clarification by using the location to clarify which campus of Indiana University are you talking about. But again, if you are looking at it from strictly a technical perspective by law that is the name of the campus in Bloomington.

BALDWIN: There are a lot of other laws written in the 19th century that have been superseded by practice.

HERBERT: Well that one has not been.

VERMETTE: Well why not? That’s what you should ask when you talk about one university. Martin?
SPECHLER: Maynard, we haven’t had a chance to examine this report in detail although certainly very distinguished panel of authors including yourself and I already see that it has this great advantage of removing barriers to voluntary cooperation between the two parts of the core campus. I understand that the core campus means IUPUI and IUB whether or not they are also a system school. Now, Maynard you certainly know as an experienced person, that there are many voluntary relationships between departments and faculty members on the two core campuses and to the extent that the report removes hindrances and obstacles to such voluntary cooperation I think it’s very much to the good and I’ll tell Chuck Bonser when I see him. But as far as I can see, I think you didn’t face a very critical question and that is whether as a core campus we go beyond voluntary cooperation between departments and faculty to the point where the dean or some other authority can say well we need an econometrician in Bloomington and you have one at IUPUI, well of course economics is not a part of this but the Business School is. So the dean of the School of Business may say we have given our econometrician a year off sabbatical and now we don’t have somebody to cover that course. So the question then becomes whether the dean can say to somebody on the Indianapolis campus for example you are now going to the Bloomington campus to teach that course. Now you can see that there are advantages to this that you would not have to cover every field on each campus and so on but what you haven’t dealt with as far as I can tell is whether faculty and students are going to be required to move between the two core campuses where there is some kind of academic case for doing so. Could you comment on that?

THOMPSON: I think this report did not address that directly. Certainly it is the case, I know of colleagues on the Bloomington campus who have been asked by their deans and most of them interpreted the request as a little bit more than a request, to teach a course in Indianapolis. I think that to some extent that’s analogous to faculty being asked to teach a service course. If you are a member of a department and your dean believes that this activity is important for the department and the dean asks you to do it most people will do it.

SPECHLER: But you are not commenting at all in the report about whether such requests are legitimate and something to be expected throughout your career?

THOMPSON: I believe that’s correct we did not comment on that.

BOBAY: Related to that issue beyond the requirement or the request to teach on another campus it seems to me that at the core of this if this were a faculty-centric view of this there would be a lot of discussion in here about campus-specific tenure decisions. And for the core schools if the tenure itself is campus specific but the decision for tenure is on another campus, which I believe is the current situation in some schools, that seems to me a real issue beyond the sort of let’s encourage collaboration and one that I have heard talked about, the School of Education has an issue there, but not a fundamental issue to really face.

HERBERT: Maynard do you have any comments on that?

THOMPSON: That was a question that was asked of all the deans and there are schools where it seems to work very well and there are schools where from time to time there are situations that are complicated.
FRANTZ: What is the impact of the report? I guess my question is that if you accept the report at face value as is, what is this designed to set in motion? Is it designed to set in motion more a clarification of roles in the case of the system schools or is there a particular end that it is driven towards?

THOMPSON: I think one of the goals is to provide a wider range of options for schools and for campus chancellors to develop relationships that make particular sense for their faculty and their campus that may not make sense at all for another faculty on another campus. Today that really happens only on the fringes and that would be a perfectly acceptable way for these relationships to develop. I think also another goal of it is to, and if the administration and the Board of Trustees were to endorse it, would be to say that the core campus relationships have real value to the institution and individuals have the opportunity to make contributions, whether academic or administrative, who actively facilitate those relationships should be recognized.

HERBERT: If I could just make a comment in the context of what I perceive in all of this. From a regional campus perspective what this is saying is that there is a belief that each of the regional campuses is now mature enough and the mission statements have been defined in such a way that each of those campuses now has the capability of offering most of the degree programs that are currently offered under the auspices of a system-wide school. The exception, one of those clearly is Social Work for the reason I articulated earlier. But that with regard to SPEA, Education—education is already federated—so I think the notion here is that there would be more of a federated model where the various campus leaders would come together to talk about issues and the like, especially since we’re offering one degree, but that the campuses would now be empowered to take over responsibility for those programs. That’s one assumption that I make in looking at it that is tied back to mission differentiation. And the second is that there is a belief that the core school model continues to offer a great deal in terms of fostering continued collaboration in the context of several of the academic units of the university and that the overall institution is strengthened by having the benefit of faculty on the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses collaborating to a much more significant degree or at least making clear that that is something that is highly valued. That’s what I’ve gotten out of it as I’ve read it in terms of big picture issues.

COFFIN: I obviously, like Marty, have not had a chance to read this with a great deal of attention to the details. It does seem to me that it increases the integration between some of the professional schools in Bloomington and Indianapolis but it also seems to me that it does a better job, I don’t know a better job, it does a more definitive job of separating the professional schools on the regional campuses from the professional schools on any other campus. And whether that’s good or bad there is a need to recognize that this is moving in two directions at once: greater integration between Bloomington and Indianapolis and reduced integration between not just the core campuses and the regional campuses but decreased integration between the regional campuses as well. [End of Tape 2, Side A]

HERBERT: Well I think people can look at this from a whole host of perspectives. Again, as I talked to the committee, and this I think is a very fundamental question that we have to address...how committed are we to fostering the continuing development of the regional
campuses? To what extent have they had the time to become mature enough that they can, to a much greater extent, control their own destiny from an academic perspective? If implicit in that observation is a feeling that we should not move in that direction, that the regional campuses are not really prepared to assume those responsibilities, if the only way that we’re going to have collaboration is by having centralized control over academic programs than it’s another issue. But what I was told was that the School of Education offers a good example of collaboration; the leaders meet at least one or two times a year, they are discussing issues, and that that achieves some of the continued collaboration that you’re talking about. But if we don’t move in this direction I think we are making some very clear statements about where we want to go long term with regard to greater empowerment on the part of the regional campuses. And I must confess that one of my objectives, and I don’t back away from this, is I’ve been trying through the mission differentiation process to give each regional campus—in particular since we’re talking about them—an opportunity to step up and define themselves. In the case of Northwest they are talking about a totally new organizational structure that will enable the campus to pursue I think a very exciting kind of destiny. And I think what they have proposed is yet another step in that direction, with regard to the regional campuses.

**MILLER:** Could I just say that I have been a member of a system school faculty for thirty years. And when I came to Indiana University my school which is SPEA was very definitely an integrated faculty between Indianapolis and Bloomington in particular but even beyond that there were regular meetings of the system-wide faculty of SPEA. Two or three times a year we would be together and we’d be debating our common curriculum and all kinds of other issues. Now when the RCM, at least this would be my interpretation of what happened, when the RCM system was introduced the integration of the system school clearly started to diminish. And if it’s fair to say that today the School of Education between Bloomington and Indianapolis is kind of a federation I think it would be very hard, for me at least, to think of SPEA between Bloomington and Indianapolis or across the other campuses as being anything other than a federation. The amount of contact across the campuses in SPEA is dramatically reduced over what it was at the beginning. That’s just a fact as far as I’m concerned. There may be people who see it in a different way but it’s very hard for me to see it in any other way. So if the intent of this report is to alter that to sort of turn us around and go backwards or go back the way we came, that’s one thing. I’m not sure if that’s the intent of this report. On the other hand, perhaps the intent is to say well alright we’ve come to a new place over these many years now and we want to make sure that we have a situation where the multi-campus schools can in fact work together to the extent that it is deemed useful to do so and make more out of it than perhaps we can make out of just the separate entities. It seems to me that there are kind of two possibilities here that come through to me. And I am frankly very skeptical about the idea to somehow recreate this kind of togetherness across the campuses, I’m very skeptical about that.

**HERBERT:** If I implied that in my comments it was not my intent. Again as I read the document what it was saying was that we ought to indeed take that step of each of the regional campuses being in a position to assume complete responsibility for the programs on those campuses, tenure and promotion decisions would be made on those campuses—would not come to Bloomington for example where the dean is housed in Bloomington. There’s an opportunity for a campus, in fact a classic example is Kokomo which proposed a masters degree in management and SPEA has agreed to offer some courses through distance learning to help that
campus deliver the program. So if those kinds of possibilities are there then the federated model refers essentially to the opportunity for, and that can happen in a whole host of ways, but at least the heads of those units would get together regularly to talk about issues and where there’s a desire for collaboration that would occur. But this is at least as I interpret the document this is a recommendation to move in more of that second direction that you were articulating where each campus begins to deal with all of its programs separately but with the opportunity and encouragement of continued discussion and collaboration because we’re offering one degree.

MILLER: Well I think the intent of this with regard to the regional campuses I think is clearer. I think I understand where this report is headed from that point of view. With regard to Bloomington and Indianapolis it is less clear to me where this is going or whether the report is expressing a preference about where it should go. It’s fuzzier to me and I think we should try to clarify it to the extent that it’s possible.

HERBERT: Are there other questions? If there’s a desire for further clarification…Marty?

SPECHLER: Well, Ted, you surely wouldn’t quarrel with the idea of removing artificial incentives to voluntary cooperation among research teams on the two campuses. Surely we wouldn’t do that. But I think the issue is whether a single dean, your dean for example, has some authority, real authority, in Indianapolis or whether the Social Work dean, if it were a core campus school, has authority over the few faculty members in Bloomington. And I assume that’s really the issue is whether a single dean in a core campus has some authority over the campus on which she or he doesn’t sit.

MILLER: Well, I mean I think the tension here, Marty, is clearly between the authority of the dean over operations on multiple campuses and the authority of the chancellors on those campuses. That has been a tension that has been in this idea of multi-campus schools and core schools or whatever they are called, that has been the tension that’s been at the heart of this since the beginning. And I’m not in favor of creating more tension. I would be in favor of reducing those tensions if we possibly could somehow, I don’t know. But I think that’s really been the tension that has been here all along. And as I say in my school we started off in a situation where the school dean had a lot of authority over operations across all the campuses but in the face of the RCM that diminished, diminished, diminished and the campus chancellors became relatively influential and that’s kind of where we are today. From my point of view one of the key questions here is whether this report is seeking particularly between Bloomington and Indianapolis to restore the school deans to authority or to kind of just be done with it and let the campuses do what campuses are supposed to do.

HERBERT: That’s very helpful in terms of my examination of this. Are there other comments? Herb?

TERRY: My comment builds on Ted’s. I honestly expect that…mission differentiation….[background noise drowns out speaker]…
HERBERT: I’m not sure that they can’t undo but I think it will be more difficult especially if it’s very clear what the rationale is and the board buys into that. Bart do you want to add anything?

NG: No, I actually am very sensitive to this, I agree with Ted’s comment. I think from the point of view of Indianapolis there is always this tension of reporting lines. This has come up over and over again. I think most recently rumor has it some dean down in Bloomington decided to appoint an associate dean here without ever telling our chancellor about the appointment. That clearly cannot be and I think one has to be very…the report is supposed to encourage collaboration but it is very short on details. At least I don’t see there’s a real understanding of how faculty collaborate and the question that Professor Bobay brought up about this report, she wished the report were more faculty-centric, I think that’s a very good point. From a faculty point of view if that person has tenure on this campus and has to somehow negotiate this kind of obstacle course of promotion then it is not a good thing no matter how you look at it. So I think there are many, the issues and the report I think is well intended but I’m not so sure it will achieve its purpose of greater collaboration if some of the structural issues are not really addressed. And I think the report is actually schizophrenic about the regional campuses versus the relationship between Indianapolis and Bloomington. You know the term core campus is used but I’ve heard since the restructuring of Indiana University we’re not quite a core campus so I’m not so sure where we stand. Having you being appointed as the chief executive in Bloomington, if it’s a one university, there should be one for the entire university but now with your title in Bloomington how does that all play out? And I think those are the issues that confuse us because we do not know what lens we should use the view the recommendations. And the nature of the recommendations seems to be somewhat self-conflicting but that is not to say the report has not raised important issues and I think these issues should be addressed. Hopefully this is a way for the trustees to really come to grips with the real fundamental structural problems that we have not faced up to in Indiana University for years. So that’s my view on it.

HERBERT: Any final comments, Maynard? Jan?

FROEHLICH: It’s just so rare that I have the opportunity to tell Ted Miller that I agree with him 100% I can’t pass up this opportunity. I do think what he’s pointing to is exactly what Bart is saying that we have some structural problems that we haven’t addressed yet and haven’t come to resolution on. I worked on the mission differentiation piece also and I agree with Ted. I thought it was going in the right direction and giving every campus an opportunity to build on its strengths and define itself and somehow I see that being lost in this effort toward homogeneity just as Ted has noted. So I hope that you’ll take his comments to heart and take them elsewhere also.

HERBERT: Thank you very much, this was extremely helpful to me. Next issue please, Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #7: REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR CHANCELLORS

MILLER: Well I don’t know, I’m going to have to regain my equilibrium after Jan’s comments. I appreciate those comments, Jan. Well, this item is framed here as a discussion item, I guess
there is something to discuss perhaps. But in part it’s an information item. This document you’ll note that it appears here on a white paper. That’s almost always a sign that this is a document that we at the UFC do not embrace. This is the final version of the Review Procedures for Chancellors and you’ll see at the top of the page it says “approved by the Trustees of Indiana University November 3, 2006”. It gives no attribution whatsoever to the various faculty councils that worked on this and approved various versions of a policy and so forth. This is a trustee policy.

Now some of the language that’s in here is drawn from the drafts that were written in our faculty affairs committees or whatever the committees were that were dealing with this. But at the end of the day the trustees really crafted a policy of their own. And so this is a I think probably a significant event in the life of Indiana University. It’s not that the trustees have never before taken action that the faculty was somewhat out of sync with but this is I think probably an event that’s worth noting.

From my point of view I think the question that this raises is one that I think the faculty councils in their various locations and this council should probably spend some time thinking about. I don’t think we want to do anything about this this particular year; Bart I know is looking forward to next year and perhaps would enjoy engaging the council in a discussion really having to do with the faculty authority. What is the authority of the faculty? We all know that the Indiana University Faculty has a Constitution; the University Faculty has a Constitution, the faculties on the various campuses have their respective constitutions. In those constitutions we have made some statements about the kinds of things that we feel the faculty should have authority over on the one hand and the kinds of things that the university administration should consult with the faculty over on the other. This policy I think represents a situation where the faculty had one view about how this should be dealt with and the trustees, I’ll talk about the trustees, had a different view about how this should be dealt with. They in effect I think came to the view that this is a policy over which they should consult with the faculty, and of course they did over an extended period of time there was consultation with the faculty over how this should be done. The faculty, I think, approached this with the view that it should be able to write a policy on chancellor review. The reason for that is that in our constitution the faculty says that review of officials, I’m paraphrasing now I’m really not quite sure what the exact language is but, review of university officials that have authority over the academic mission of the university or the academic programs of the university that that review process is under the control of the faculty. That’s the way we set it out. And basically I think what’s happened here is that the faculty continue to view the chancellors as people who fall into that category—that have authority over the academic programs of the university. But the trustees, I think, came ultimately, I’m not exactly certain why, but they came ultimately I think to view the chancellors as not being in that category.

Now one of the things that has happened more recently in the university, perhaps has contributed to this I don’t know, but we now are commonly referring to a particular officer on each campus as the chief academic officer. We have a chief academic officer and it’s not the chancellor, it’s a different officer. So from one point of view you could look at the structure of our campuses now and say well alright if the faculty want to review the people who have authority over the academic programs well that means they want to review the chief academic officer. But beyond
that maybe we’re talking about the kind of person who really falls into the consultative end of our scheme of things rather than the legislative end of things. Well I don’t know exactly what’s going on but it does seem to me that what’s happened here does raise some questions about where the faculty wants to focus its effort and its authority and what kind of arguments do we want to have. I think it’s a fairly basic question and I’m not sure that we’ve really visited that question recently. But it may be useful for the faculty to kind of take up some of these really basic questions. What is the role of the faculty? I think that’s perhaps enough.

SCHNEIDER: Ted, in keeping with Jan’s comment I would agree with you but perhaps if you’re thinking about the overall I have a slight disagreement that I will add to your observations. It’s true the way you describe the constitution and the responsibilities of the trustees and the faculty that there are cases where decisions are seen as to be within the purview of the trustees and some things within the purview of the faculty but there is also an area where there are shared responsibility. That’s really the way I see this policy. What’s dismaying is that the trustees didn’t even see this as something to be shared. So in some ways it’s actually more pessimistic than you suggest.

MILLER: I don’t think there’s anything formal in our constitution about shared responsibilities. We make a fairly clean distinction—well I don’t know if it’s clean or not—but we make a distinction between the areas where the faculty has legislative authority and the areas where we want to be consulted. We do not identify areas where there is some kind of shared authority.

SCHNEIDER: I think there is.

MILLER: There’s nothing like that in there.

SCHNEIDER: There are questions of consultation. There are various ways of communicating that we mean shared…

MILLER: Well the consultation is one side of it. And I think from the trustees point of view they may well feel that they’ve consulted endlessly with the faculty over this particular policy.

HERBERT: Marty?

SPECHLER: Well Ted you seem to feel very strongly about this and I hate to send your blood pressure back up but I disagree with you and I’ll tell you why. I think of the chancellors as the principle lieutenants of the university president …that’s increasingly the role of the university president, certainly at Indiana University, will be to raise money from private as well as public sources. I’m sure Adam will tell you that a huge amount of his time is spent doing that. We have essentially nine campuses although one is yet to be recognized all over this fairly substantial state. Now I think that if the president is going to be effective now and into the future he or she has to have chancellors that are responsive to the president’s priorities. In actual fact the president can take or reject faculty criticism and has done so in the recent past as a matter of fact. I think we should recognize that. The chief academic officer which is apparently the provost in Bloomington, I’m not aware that we have one on the other campuses, but it seems to me that the chancellor on each campus is responsible for far more than the content and quality of academic
programs, important as those are. There are also facilities questions, technology questions, political questions, and all kinds of things of that nature. I think if we try to attract another fine president of Indiana University we have to give that president the confidence and the tools to carry out his or her priorities. The tools, to my view, are the chancellors. They are on the spot. They are the ones who articulate and take the orders and preferences of the president and put them into motion. So I realize that the big issue here is what the constitution of this review committee is and I don’t regard that as an issue for lethal combat because the president can take it or leave it anyway. But I do think that given the complexity and size of Indiana University the president needs not only a staff but also lieutenants and line people and line commanders in the field in South Bend and in Gary and in Southeast, places that he visits only occasionally. So I’m afraid I have to disagree with you on this point. I think we want an effective president and not just a fundraiser. We have to see that the chancellors are his or her men.

MILLER: Let me just say I’m not sure what you’re disagreeing with me over, Marty. I don’t see what you said as necessarily being in conflict with what I think. What I was trying to do here was to reflect on what happened here and why it happened. And the point I’m trying to make is that the faculty, for over a fairly long period of time, and perhaps this idea was developed primarily from the Bloomington context where we had for many years a chancellor who was not only the chief executive officer of the campus but the chief academic officer of the campus, they were one and the same for many years. So I think the faculty in Bloomington has viewed the chancellor from a particular point of view and possibly that was the basis of this idea that we had as we went into writing this chancellor review policy that this was somehow the purview of the faculty to do this. We went through various versions of this in the UFC and we all thought this was our business. Now at the end of the day the trustees are telling us that this really isn’t our business and you’re giving…[End of Tape 2 Side B]… if we describe this in a reasonable way? Are we happy with the way it now reads? Do we want to have some shared activities and write down what they are? These are questions that I think that the faculty really should re-engage.

FISHER: Ted, I am entirely in agreement with you. I think furthermore, it’s the issue of jerking us around for a period of four years that we’ve been dealing with this policy. If they didn’t want us to be involved with it they could have told us four years ago and saved us all our time. And it is disrespectful to let us go along like we are children and then go ahead and do their thing without coming to talk to us.

MILLER: Mary it is a very different board this year from what it was last year.

FISHER: I understand that.

MILLER: It is not a four year thing.

FISHER: Well, for us it has been.

BALDWIN: Did the Board go on record when they passed this about whether this applies to the IUPUI chancellor who is also a vice president? Which review procedures will apply, vice president? The procedure whenever they are written down or the chancellor’s procedures? Does Chancellor Bantz know?
HERBERT: We’re going to have to sort that out. The bottom is that he does wear the chancellor role and so the question is will we treat his particular case as one where he’s wearing both hats. If we’re looking at it in that context then we will have to have someone on the committee who is from a regional campus, at least one person. That does not necessarily have to be a faculty member but we will have to deal with that. But it is clear that a significant part of his responsibility is here on this campus.

BALDWIN: The question is do we need a separate policy document for IUPUI vice president and chancellor?

HERBERT: I don’t think so.

MILLER: Well it does seem to me that if there is going to be a policy that pertains to Vice President Bantz, it in all likelihood will not be a policy developed by the faculty because the vice presidents are certainly farther removed from the academic mission than the chancellors are.

NG: But he is the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. So it comes back to …

MILLER: That’s not my understanding of his exact title.

HERBERT: His title is Executive Vice President. I think we have a question and comment here and then over here.

COFFIN: Getting away from the broader philosophical issues for a moment, I find myself having some really serious problems with the language of this as the board has adopted it. If you look, for example, at Principles for Chancellor’s Reviews, they all say this evaluation “should” not that it “shall” or that it “must.” My mother was an English teacher I can’t help myself. “Should” is an option and one of the things that’s in here as an option is results for the faculty review process outlined in this document. The only thing I can find outlining the faculty review process comes in Section 8: Survey, “the review committee may utilize a survey”. It seems to me that if the committee chose to do so, they can do this review with exactly this much faculty input, according to the plain language of this document.

HERBERT: I think it was here and then we’ll come over here.

VERMETTE: If this policy will not apply, the Board of Trustees policy, will not apply to the IUPUI chancellor, and since Bloomington doesn’t have a chancellor any longer, this is a policy strictly for the regional campuses, right? Wouldn’t the Trustees know that, that this is a policy that will only review people on the regional campuses, that the two core campuses are excluded?

HERBERT: No, it does not exclude IUPUI.

VERMETTE: But we don’t have a chancellor. If he is going to be reviewed as a vice president and not as a chancellor, then there’s no review of the chancellor.
**HERBERT:** He is chancellor and executive vice president.

**VERMETTE:** So will we get two reviews in that case, one as vice president and one as a chancellor? And what happens on the Bloomington campus; they get no review at all? That’s what is very confusing about this document. I’m not sure they realize this. You too right?

**HERBERT:** Well ultimately I will have to interpret it, or my successor will, in the case of IUPUI.

**VERMETTE:** Well what about Bloomington? I’m interested in the Bloomington question also, not just IUPUI. Who gets reviewed in Bloomington and by whom?

**MILLER:** Well, the situation in Bloomington now is that the chief executive officer is the president and there is a policy on presidential review.

**VERMETTE:** But we don’t participate in that.

**MILLER:** There is also, in Bloomington, a provost and the provost is a Bloomington campus official, largely anyway. I recognize that there are some responsibilities that are not strictly contained in Bloomington. But because the provost is a Bloomington campus official, the provost would be reviewed under Bloomington campus procedures.

**TERRY:** I too am not so pessimistic about this language, I agree with Marty that the chancellors are direct-reports to the president and the trustees probably set the policy, provided the Trustees want to do this, I actually see a silver lining to the adoption of this policy and that will come when the job descriptions are actually revised or examined. If these job descriptions say that this person is the principle academic officer of the campus, then I think it’s a violation of the constitution for us not to be conducting the review. But I would disagree with Ted that Bloomington had for a long time a chancellor who was also the chief academic officer of the campus. I would argue that for a long time we didn’t have anybody who was the chief academic officer. The advantage of the reorganization is that now we do. And there are procedures providing that the provost review will be undertaken using faculty policy. So the silver lining that I see in this maybe in the non-core campuses will end up of a clearer person who really is the principle academic officer of that campus and then the constitution of that campus faculty would be involved in the review of that officer.

**CORDELL:** As one of the campuses for whom this is not theoretical at all what is passing now. I was hoping for the impression to get an understanding of where UFC would be going or thinking about going from here, rather than a statement that if the faculty needs to discuss at UFC discussion level, campus level discussion? At this point I don’t know what we should be doing other than I am going to be monitoring what is going on in our chancellors review and I’m going to see whether the faculty voice is heard in that review. But I would really like a clear understanding of what we’re doing and I think that if there is concern about what the Trustees understanding of what the faculty role is, then perhaps we should make a decision now that we will respond to that, as a resolution. Maybe we need to setup a task force or working with
something to develop some of these ideas. But, I’m left not knowing what to do basically and what I should be doing.

Frankly, the chancellor on our campus has a huge daily impact on the academic program because she has taken control of the budget to such an extent that she sweeps up money, she does not respond quickly enough to requests for funding for additional section at the primary registration. There are all kinds of things that she does that impact the academic program enormously in ways that it was not done before. So to say that she is removed from the academic program is false.

HERBERT: Well, let me just tell you that as one who has to implement the policy, my intent would be to implement it beginning this year for the reviews. There is faculty participation in the process and there is definitely an opportunity to raise those kinds of issues that the president ultimately will then sit down with the chancellor and discuss. Again, a lot depends upon the overall feedback that’s received from it. So it would be my intent. We have two chancellors that will come up for review this year and I’ll be working with the executive vice president. He’s already began the process of thinking about that and will be asking for nominations and begin that process so that during the spring term we’ll be implementing it on those two campuses. Again I think that the way it reads, it does provide an opportunity for feedback. If there is specific issues that merge, those can be brought to the attention of the committee. The broader questions that you raise are really ones that co-chairs have got to deal with and not me. So I don’t know whether you want to comment on that?

MILLER: Well I think my sense was that when the Trustees approved this policy, they made it quite clear that they viewed this as what some of them are fond of referring to as a governance issue. What that translates into in practice is that they see it as something that really sort of flows from the president. They feel that it’s very important for the president to have the authority to review chancellors. Of course the faculty never argued that the president shouldn’t be the person who ultimately is making these decisions. But the Trustees I think made it very clear with some of this language that Marty was talking about earlier, that they did not feel that the faculty should be the dominant sort of force in the review of a chancellor. They view the faculty from this point of view as one of the constituent groups; there are the alumni, the staff, and so forth. It’s one of the constituent groups. We’ve got our role to play in this, other people have got their role to play in this and the end result will be that the President will basically make some decision about these reviews. That’s kind of where we are and I’m not sure that there’s anything for us to do at this particular point.

HERBERT: Let me ask…

BANTZ: If I, because the president has asked me as executive vice president to initiate this support of Maynard Thompson. Let me tell you how we are proceeding so that it’s clear. Effectively what we’ve done is take the procedure that parallels what’s been done in the past. I asked the campuses in question; South Bend and South East, for ten faculty names from which we will identify five faculty, we asked for two students from student groups, from which we will pick one, alumni; two names to pick one, community members, we asked for as well. We’ve identified a committee chair, in each case somebody who is senior individual and Maynard was fortunate for securing F.C. Richardson to do the one in South Bend and Norm Lefstein former
Dean of the Law School here for more than 15 years if I’m remembering correctly, agreed to do the one in Southeast and he’s done similar things in governance as well. So we’ve got those underway. The committees are intentionally small committees. There will be 11 people counting the chair. In the case of certainly Southeast, the chair is a faculty member currently in our law school. So there is 6 faculties involved.

We are going to make those selections from the names before the break and put the committees to work. Our expectation is that they will gather information in the format here. It is critical as we always know that individuals provide information to the reviews and that the Board was exceedingly interested in input from the faculty and the community in the reviews. One of the matters that was of an issue is, in the state of Indiana, there was a significant concern about how one can—that under state law in Indiana it is not possible to keep confidential the names of individuals who provide input and council believes very strongly that there’s virtually no way to guarantee that. So you’ll notice here that the survey that will be done in such a way that there never is an identifier attached to it. So it will in fact be anonymous and that’s the only way under the law that appears that we can do that. There were several things like that that made this very complicated, much more so frankly than it would be in some other context. That’s the basic from me, Maynard I don’t know if there’s anything else to add to that. We’ve tried to follow the basic principle that has been used in the past and it does look like this is important that it comes to the president. But the board and the president have indicated to me that they expect us to conduct a process that provides a full review of each of the chancellors in question.

HERBERT: Bart.

NG: I just wanted to respond to Professor Cordell about what we need to do. Bear in mind that before this policy was actually approved by the board, we actually made an attempt, and especially Ted, has been rewritten because based on prior discussion, the concern seems to be one of confidentiality. There is a confusion, as far as I’m concerned, in their mind, between anonymity, anonymous comment, versus confidential comments. But I’ll come to that in a minute. But Ted actually made a valued effort of trying to actually address that issue. We actually wrote part of the document, and we gave it to the Trustees and they claim they never got it until the day the meeting took place. They intern gave us this document which literally was at the meeting. So what can we do? I think that in some sense they are determined to get their way, let me put it bluntly. So for this year there’s not much we can do.

Now as far as, I think the passage I find most troubling, and I beg to differ from Charles’ interpretation that they want comments. I want to point your attention to page three, at the bottom of page three, about the survey. You will see that the last line said that “the survey shall not”, now here is an order, “contain written comments”. Now, I can never understand in my mind, in fact, one of the premises that we tried to convey to the Trustees is that alright, they are surveys and at the end there will be open questions; is there anything that you want to tell us about this person. I think anybody that has taken a survey like that will realize that at the end of the survey, the people who handle the survey will check that you, your signature says that you are who you are. Then that means that it is not anonymous but it is in fact confidential. You know who it is; it is not somebody coming off the street who just wants to diss somebody and make some nasty remarks. So that was the way that we thought was a way to protect
confidentiality. I think what we have really here is a blind fate on survey “professionals” who can actually do push pollings, excuse the language, of asking questions that yes/no, choose one—that is the kind of input of data, the quality that we are being presented with. As I said, I am not happy with it and I think I raised that point with them, I think Ted did the same, we put up a fight, but we were literally told that this is the way we want it. I cannot put a better more positive spin on it.

FISHER: The other thing that’s on my mind is that it seems to me that this whole discussion is reflective of our current relationship with the board and it seems to me our current relationship with the board is not good and maybe that’s what we need to express to them; our concerns that in fact they are injecting themselves into many things that are in academic purview and they are doing it in a way that doesn’t seem reasonable. The other example of that is currently right on our agenda is the general education piece and time table being set up that is not even remotely realistic in coming up with a quality product in a system as large as IU. So it’s a naïve attain that seems to be represented, of not understanding the university and then making it impossible with an underlying attitude that they hold with value. I think that’s what we’ve got to work on and I don’t know how we do that if they won’t engage us. May be the two of you who are co-secretaries can transmit back to them our concerns and that we feel it’s bigger than this particular policy. I think they need to know that we’re displeased.

COFFIN: I agree.

TERRY: I agree with Mary in that sense. What I wonder about though is, can we wait until next year? I don’t think so. I think as Ted pointed out, this is a different Board of Trustees and we have ourselves in part, to blame for its methods. It wants to be engaged. Ted, at the last meeting, did stand up to them very forcefully on what things we need to take basically under our control in terms of general education. I’m not sure they accepted that but I assume that that must have come across to them clearly. One thing I would suggest that might be possible and ought to be considered, is that when you are invited at Trustees meetings to make a statement representing the faculty, and I doubt that the faculty would object to you making a summary of what the constitution says is under the faculty power and what is not. I think a number of things are on the table and it is time for us to educate this set of Trustees as to the role of the faculty in the governance of this institution and we can't wait for next year’s board.

G. HOYT: I would agree and I think it’s necessary to do that prior to the new president coming in otherwise certain things ____ it will be very difficult to change and may not be advantageous for the president’s interaction with faculty.

HERBERT: Could I just make one observation? The faculty has asked the trustees to be more engaged. They took that serious last fall and so they are now following through and being more engaged. The second thing is, before Ted, you have that conversation, before you make your statement to the Trustees, they have looked at the law and you need to also with regard to the powers of the board. I think you will be shocked, and they know what those powers are.

MALE SPEAKER: Excuse, this seems very important, we can't hear you.
HERBERT: I’m sorry. What I said earlier was that the faculty asked the board this past fall to become more engaged in university activities, especially as it related to personnel matters, and they heard the faculty say that the faculty did not feel that the board was engaged enough. So they heard that and are now engaged.

The second thing is that before Ted does convey the message, whatever that message that Herb articulated, it is very important for him to also read the law as it relates to the powers of the Board of Trustees. The board members have read the law and they know what their powers are. If you haven’t seen what the law says, it might be very instructive and I think, again, it may be a surprise, including issues related to terms of what the law gives to the Board of Trustees, powers related to curriculum matters.

TERRY: That’s another one of these older laws that guided practice at the time. I haven’t reviewed it in some time but I don’t think it mandates the Trustees. The only way it could clear this up would be to listen to the tape.

HERBERT: And the board has delegated a number of powers.

TERRY: Yes to other parties including the faculty. My concern would be that, like I said, educate them. Help the Trustees understand what faculty contributes on academic matters. Make sure that they see that we’re not just a constituent to be satisfied, but that we have a specific level of expertise and knowledge, and on some matters our input is both necessary and sufficient.

HERBERT: I will just make one final observation; you will have to go through that education process, whatever form it takes in July as well because you could have as many as five new board members, as potential.

TERRY: Right.

HERBERT: We have exceeded the 10 minutes, but let’s go on.

SCHNEIDER: I’ll be quick. The one point I wanted to make was to support what you said and it was in response to Ted’ question about faculty authority and what was shared. What Ted I think was calling faculty authority is in fact shared. We may propose a new degree program but the Trustees have to also approve it. Even hires and tenure are all in fact shared. I don’t think, I don’t know, may be I have to reread it. I think the Trustees-- they can't approve, for instance, honorary degrees by themselves, that’s shared as well. The faculty have to approve that as well as the Trustees. So most of what you were saying Ted, was faculty approved, I think it was actually shared and I think this is one that falls in that category and may be that might be avoided.

MILLER: I disagree with you completely about that Bill.

SCHNEIDER: The other point I want to make was a suggestion to the current reviews underway. My suggestion is this; pay very close attention to how seriously the faculty input is being taken and how much faculty are being consulted and if there is a problem, bring it back to the UFC. In many case, at the end a report might be useful for how it worked. An approximate
majority report. Anyway, faculty, I think it would be very useful to see that and that might be a way of sort of going with what we’ve got for now and taking it for consideration for next year.

VERMETTE: Just a comment also about the faculty asked the Board of Trustees to become more active and take control. I’d like you to know that that was less than half of the faculty from Indiana University. That was one campus’ faculty and the rest of the faculty was not consulted about whether or not we wanted the Board of Trustees to take more active control. I think that was always forgotten; that Bloomington is by no means even half of the faculty at IU. I think that should go on record also and that should probably be told to the Board of Trustees, that one campus is not the university like ours made.

FRANTZ: My ___ is that I do think that it is important to educate the board in some respects but I think from my perspective, our best strategy is to do it around ____ issues because I think as much as we have a board that prefers to be activists as it, that we ask that the … But I think my own perspective is that we can talk about governance, the balance if you will, in the abstract or in a theoretical way, but I think our most important way to demonstrate to the Board that we are a key player in the process is by demonstrating that we have something substantive to say of particular issue. I just think that’s the most effective way, that we take issues of substance that we have disagreements and that goes to the point to which we engaged before as opposed to saying we want more engagement.

Baldwin: Just one comment, a number of years, and I think what stimulated this policy was the fact that we had a chancellor on one of the regional campuses who was reviewed quite well and had to be dismissed a few years later for gross negligence. I don’t see anything tempting. I don’t see anything in this document though that will address that problem about the review and not picking up could be the result of this missile a few years later. [End of Tape 3, Side A. Some comments may be lost]…

CORDELL: May I please comment, that’s my campus? … I was on campus when that review came out. It is the assumption that there were no problems before the sexual harassment complaint and that’s the wrong answer. There were many governance issues, there were personnel issues that were made, engagement issues, and the review simply did not reflect what some of us—me in particular, felt was accurate review. An accurate view of what was going on.

Baldwin: Do you see anything in this policy that would change it.

CORDELL: No. If the review is written up in a way that it does not reflect comments submitted then, no, what can you do? A minority report, yes, a response for the faculty, yes; you could do those things. _____.

HERBERT: Let me just point out that we have 15 minutes before we must adjourn. If you would rather continue this and not talk about general education, we can continue. But I think that we have 15 minutes left.

MILLER: I vote for that option.
**HERBERT**: Marty can you say this in 30 seconds.

**SPECHLER**: Yes. Very briefly, I think number 7 and 8 reflect the Trustees’ believe that when the faculty wants to enter their comments, they have to be by identifiable individuals and not anonymous comments. Personally I think that that’s unreasonable. If you have comments about the chancellor, and you’re a tenured member, you should be willing to write a letter and sign your name. If you can't, then I think you should re-examine your criticism.

**AGENDA ITEM #8: TRANSFERABILITY AND GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

**HERBERT**: Ted, Item #8?

**MILLER**: Well, Item #8 was here as kind of an update item I guess. We want to keep you informed regarding the kind of information that we are hoping will be developed and the extent to which that information is now available. So essentially, we’ve got two things going in here, just to review. We are trying to focus on the idea of general education at the campus level; general education program at the campus level. Some of our campuses have general education programs that have been developed, they are implemented, they are in process. Others are making progress towards such a thing. Bloomington has made a step forward, the East campus, if I understand correctly, has recently made a step forward. South Bend and South East have their programs in place. Indianapolis has a program in place but my sense is that there is an effort on the campus there to sort of ….

**NG**: Reinterpret

**MILLER**: Reinterpret the program in a way that kind of constructs some connections between what’s going on in Indianapolis and what’s going on at the other campuses, to try to make it clear that there’s something similar underneath it all. So I think, from my point of view, there has been an effort by the faculty, there has been some movement towards developing this kind of program at the campus level. The faculty has been resisting having a common general education program for Indiana University. We have been trying to suggest that that would not be in the best interest of the university, to have us all doing the same gen. ed. None the less, the Trustees view the commonality of the gen. ed. They have sort of a positive disposition toward common general education. I still am not quite sure precisely what underlies it all but certainly a part of it has got to do with the transfer and articulation issues that we confront. We all know that the state legislature passed a law about… when was it; 6 months or 8 months ago, mandating various transfer and articulation arrangements across all the state campuses. Not just within Indiana University. So the approach that we have taken with regard to this kind of common program has been to try to focus on that legislatively mandated set of courses. It’s called the core-transfer library. We are trying to develop information from each campus as to how those core transfer library courses will be dealt with by the campus. How we are going to respond to this state law that requires that we do certain things with regard to these courses. We are trying to develop that
set of information. Kelly can give you the latest word on what information along those lines that we have.

**KISH:** Last month you saw the spreadsheet with Bloomington and South East included. We have since received information from South Bend. Some of you who are familiar with the South Bend gen. ed. program and their course offerings in their program, they offer specific interdisciplinary courses. So their interpretation of the usefulness of the core transfer courses for their general education program look a little different than South East and Bloomington’s assessment because the Bloomington and South East campus use the traditional discipline specific courses to deliver the general education. So South Bend has a very unique approach to gen. ed. and their response reflects that.

The East campus, they just approved a new gen. ed. program, may be three weeks ago, and so in the last two weeks, they’ve been doing the assessment. We’ve received a preliminary draft but they’re still talking about it. So we now have four campuses with at least something evaluated in terms of the transfer library.

The Indianapolis campus has been discussing it. Betty Jones and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, is that right, the UCC?

**NG:** Yes.

**KISH:** … has been discussing this.,

**NG:** Actually we do have a list but it has not been integrated to this list.

**KISH:** So that’s 5 of the 7 that we have. There is at least some movement on. We haven’t heard from the Kokomo campus yet or the Northwest campus. I know the Kokomo campus-- they are in the process, just as East is finished, of developing a new gen. ed. program, or really updating their gen. ed. program. So we’re waiting on that and I don’t have an actual assessment form Northwest but they already have a gen. ed. program. So they should be difficult to plug in. So we’re moving ahead in terms of developing that matrix a little bit further. The other part of this that we’ve asked the campuses to contribute is what their current gen. ed. programs are. So we will have a compilation of each of the seven programs plus the gen. ed. matrix at the end of this. So those materials will all be available online in one cohesive report. At present that’s where we stand in terms of the materials we’ve collected.

**MILLER:** So I think we just encourage those of you on your various campuses to ensure that these matters are under consideration and take into account that at the beginning of February the President will want to be saying something to the trustees and hopefully we’ll be able to make good use of this material that we’re trying to put together. So there is a time frame that we need to be mindful of as we go forward here.

**HERBERT:** Marty?

**SPECHLER:** Well, much as I would like to have a common general education philosophy or
program for all the campuses of Indiana University I have come to the conclusion that it’s out of
reach simply because we don’t have enough faculty on any of the campuses who would teach
any common program that might be invented. I think it’s out of our reach but I do want to
compliment the people involved; Ted, Kelly and others. I think we have made an important step
forward. What we’ve done essentially is to say that if you’re thinking of studying on one
campus, let’s say IUPUI, we’re willing to accept courses from other state universities for our
general education program and we’re specifying those. And as for other courses we’re willing to
say we’ll give you undistributed credit or possibly concentration credit for that. So at the very
least we’ve got something I think very good and that is to inform students who wish to move
from one campus to another just how much they have ahead of them in the general education and
other parts of their degree. I would hope that the trustees would accept that as a good faith effort
given the time constraint that they’ve put us on. By the way, we have dithered and dallied for
years on general education. I don’t blame the trustees for their impatience in this area but I do
think that we have made about the only practical step at the all-university level. Now the most
important thing, in my view, for us to do is to work at the campus-level now and to justify the
choices that are made as the best practical choices for a general education program, either for
students who began at that campus or who may wish to transfer into that campus and I accept
that those choices will be somewhat different based on the missions and capabilities of each
campus.

HERBERT: Other comments or questions? Are there any committee reports? Is there any old
business? Is there any new business? Hearing none is there a motion for adjournment? [So
moved] All those in favor please say aye, those opposed, the meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.