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UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
University Place Conference Center
Indianapolis
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4:00 P.M. - 5:30 P.M. (EST)

Please Note:

Due to the short agenda, the time of this meeting has been pushed back. The Agenda Committee will meet from 2:00 – 4:00PM in Room 138. The plenary session will take place in Room 132. UFC members are cordially invited to attend the President’s reception and dinner in Lilly House starting at 6:00PM.

1. Honorary Degrees: Executive Session [ACTION ITEM] (15 minutes)
(Attendance limited to UFC members and officers only).

2. Approval of Minutes.
3. Presiding Officer's Business (20 minutes)  
(President Michael McRobbie)

4. Agenda Committee Business (20 minutes)  
(Professors Lisa Pratt and Rosalie Vermette)

5. Question/Comment Period* (15 minutes)  
(President McRobbie and Professors Pratt and Vermette)

6. Proposed Changes to the Indiana University “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.”  
[ACTION ITEM] (20 minutes)  
(Diane Dallis, Head, Information Commons/Undergraduate Library Services, Wells Library and Prof. Nuria Morral, Medical and Molecular Genetics)  
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/U7-2008_Full.pdf

7. Old Business
8. New Business

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie, Professor Pratt and Professor Vermette should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc.

AGENDA ITEM #1: HONORARY DEGREES: EXECUTIVE SESSION

AGENDA ITEM #2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Anybody else joining us or is that it, Craig? Okay, ladies and gentlemen, if we could move to Agenda Item two, the approval of minutes. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting, please.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: So moved.

MCROBBIE: And a seconder? All those in favor? Or, any discussion on the matter? Any issues or concerns? Can I have, sorry, let me put the question. All those in favor of adopting the minutes of the last meeting, please signify by saying aye. [Aye] Against? That’s carried.

AGENDA ITEM #3 PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Presiding officer’s business, I just want to comment on about six different things. Firstly, there’s been a development in the last week of some interest more broadly to the university. There’s not much information yet, but its impact could be substantial. And that of course is the announcement that Governor Daniels made last week where he announced, actually
in this very building, where he announced a plan to provide funding to Indiana students to cover their costs of attending the first two years of any college in the state. And he did not go into much detail, but clearly the implications of this could be substantial. They obviously have implications for the university in that certainly I think all campuses have put a considerable amount of effort into providing just this kind of financial aid, so how that affects us is something that we’re in the process of considering. Of course, how this will be funded, the governor didn’t really indicate in much detail, didn’t indicate in any detail, how this would be funded. And obviously there’s been speculation about what the mechanism for this may be. But I think, certainly in principle, we should applaud the fact that the governor is prepared to give college attendance and the attainment by Indiana residents of post-secondary education and degrees we should give that, we should commend him for that. And obviously, we need to await the rest of the details as to how this is going to be done. Clearly how these things are funded is really a matter for the governor and the legislature to debate and decide. But as an educational institution, I think we can applaud his intentions in doing this. That’s the first thing I wanted to comment on.

The second is, there’s been, as I think many of you know, quite a bit of discussion about our policies with respect to Affirmative Action. I had actually a question on this at the last, I believe it was the last UFC meeting and I’ve had some discussions with Bart and Lisa in our regular bi-monthly meeting about this as well. I think there may be some reason to want to have a closer look at our policies across the university on all campuses and in particular, what we are obliged to do legally and what parts are our prerogative to establish on a university wide basis or on a campus by campus basis. I have had a preliminary but brief discussion with University General Counsel about this, and I want to discuss it with the chancellors at our next meeting which is next week, and some others as well. But at the moment, I’m moving towards wanting to put in place some kind of a group here, some relatively small committee, to have a closer look at our policies and procedures in this matter. But exactly how to do this [feedback] and what its treatment would be and so on is far from settled in my mind. But I really haven’t had very substantial discussions on this yet. But there are clearly some issues here that I think bear closer analysis and attention. So that’s something that I will hope to get to over the next six weeks, four to six weeks or so.

Thirdly, the Family Leave Policy; we, as I said, at the moment how I expect that to develop is that unless there are any major issues raised by either the deans or the chancellors that will be discussed with the Trustees at their Academic Affairs Committee. But as the Trustees’ policy lapses at the end of June, I intend to put in place a policy that, of course, is the one that you’re familiar with, as an administration policy in the university but with some more discussion. It was discussed with the deans the other day and our newest member of the deans here was present at the discussion. I think it was very, it’s fair to say it was very favorably received by the deans. Not all of them were there, but most of them were there. They were all circulated with the policy and my views on it, and I think it was favorably received. The next discussion is at the chancellors’ meeting next Thursday, Thursday morning, and then to Academic Affairs of the Trustees. So unless anything unexpected turns up, I would hope to be able to finally deal with that the week after next.
IPP policy I will be taking, I think you know that thanks to the work of Simon and his colleagues we have I think an agreed consensus version that I intend to take to the Trustees. I’ve already distributed it to the Trustees for discussion at the forthcoming meeting as well. I’m not quite certain what the outcome of that will be either. The Trustees will adopt it as their given that the present policy is a Trustee policy, they will either adopt it as a continuing Trustee policy. They may want to modify it and so on. I will certainly be recommending the consensus version to them. And it may be that they’re prepared to allow that policy to also become an administrative policy. That one will be, I think, a little more complicated. But that’s how that one will be dealt with.

The Core Schools Operation Committee report, both I think Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson tell me that that’s close to completion I believe. I asked for that by the end of the semester. I guess it’s not quite clear how one defines the end of the semester, but let’s assume the next couple of weeks, but I understand that’s close to completion.

So those are the five items I wanted to report on. I do want to take, I, hopefully will speak a little more fulsomely on this later tonight at the Lilly house where I hope you’ll all be able to join us, but I do want to say given that this is the last meeting for Bart and Lisa, to thank them very much for the role that they have played in their respective faculty councils and at the UFC. They have been wonderful colleagues and collaborators. Of course, I’ve known them both a long, long time and I’ve seen the impact that they’ve had on their respective campuses and the contributions they’ve made. I have to say that I’m personally delighted to see Bart become a dean. I think his talents will be well applied in his new role, and I enjoyed welcoming him to the Dean’s Committee. And I must say though I’m sure Lisa will be a loss to this group, her full time return to science I’m sure will be applauded by many of her scientific colleagues and by her colleagues at NASA as well. And this council’s lost will be exobiology’s gain I think as well. And to the others, I know there’s quite a few people who are retiring or finishing up their terms and will not be standing or have not stood again. My thanks to all of you as well. And we can say that a little more fulsomely with something in our hands to celebrate with later tonight.

So those are the six points I wanted to make. There may be questions on some of those, but let me leave that to Agenda Item five, and move straight on to Agenda Item four. Bart and Lisa?

AGENDA ITEM #4 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

PRATT: Well I think Bart’s going to allow me to make one presentation this year as co-secretary and unfortunately the president has preempted every one of the topics that I thought I would have a chance to touch on.

MCROBBIE: I’m sorry I thought I was meant to.

PRATT: No you were, indeed you were. But I think we have successfully really pushed through many difficult agenda items this year and even though we don’t have absolute closure on them, I feel some real confidence that Intellectual Property Policy, which has dogged us for season after season without coming to completion, that it might actually, it might actually happen this spring. And let me just remind you that we did something quite unusual with that policy this year.
When we found that the document passed by the UFC was a cumbersome document whose language reflected the turnover of many people along the way and that as we moved towards bringing that forward to the president and the Trustees, it was not clear from the language we had voted how it would be implemented, we then worked in a collaborative way with a representative from the president, people from legal counsel, and we asked a number of knowledgeable faculty both within faculty governance and outside to partner, sort of in a good faith effort, to hammer out what we’ve called a joint document. At the very end of that process as many of you will know, that we actually came up against something, the actual distribution proportionalities, where we did not believe that we could come up with something that would not require bringing that document back to the faculty for a vote. So at that point we agreed that the consensus document for implementation would stand as a specific contribution, that the voted document was a specific contribution, and the recommendation from the president’s office, if it was modified with regard to distribution, would then on its own be a third contribution toward a package of recommendations brought to the Trustees. And I think that turns out to be a good plan for action in the future when it’s clear that it’s in the best interest of everyone to move these matters forward and to not get hopelessly caught in an iterative process of one step forward and two steps backwards. We’ve taken this forward and Michael assures me that he feels some confidence that that package presented to the Trustees…

MCROBBIE: But no promises.

PRATT: …well, I didn’t say promises. Only that there is a sense to me of optimism that we’ve done this well. We’ve done it in an appropriate way, and I simply hope that the trustees recognize that enormous intellectual capital has been put into those documents. A great deal of thinking, and I hope they respond likewise with some sort of a rapid decision. I don’t doubt that they will put their mark on it, but I’m very pleased with the way we did this. In many ways it signals a new way of doing business in which we identify the need for collaborative, collective effort with the administration and move it forward in a way that we don’t pass documents or make resolutions that then lead us into a period of sort of combat over who has ownership when in many cases, it’s quite clear that the faculty and the administration has joint ownership of both responsibility and implementation.

Likewise, Family Leave which many of us have worried about for the last couple of years as the president has mentioned, it is looking good. It’s not a completed policy yet. The current one will expire on, at the end of June, and it is our expectation that the president will be able to bring forward a recommendation from his office and that that will be I guess just accepted by the Trustees without any additional…

MCROBBIE: Well, it’s within the delegation of powers to the president, yeah.

PRATT: Core School Operations, you’ve already heard just a few words about that. We expect there may be follow up from the UFC, the BFC, and the IFC once we see reports from the Core School Operations. But we look forward to that, we look forward to seeing that document shortly, whatever ‘end of the semester’ means and for people to have a chance to really read through it and digest it over the summer and then if there are follow up issues for the faculty councils those will give us something to look forward to in the fall early on.
That I think is the end of the items that Bart and I have been, oh! Thank you, there was one other one and I actually had it on my list and I looked right over it and that was the joint committee. Again, a committee in which we partnered with the president to identify individuals who could look at promotion and tenure across the university with the idea that there should be a baseline for policy and decision making that could then be modified by individual campus as needed for the mission of those campuses and for the particular environment in which they reside. The large committee has not yet held a meeting, but we spoke to the chair of the committee…

MCROBBIE: Co-Chair.

PRATT: …Joe Wert, co-Chair, excuse me, earlier and we’re going to move out the administrative person who is…

MCROBBIE: At IU South Bend, Alfred Guillaume.

PRATT: Alright, they have not yet met, and they will keep us informed as they move through the fall semester. So they expect to have a summary document or findings by the end of the semester, and again, we’ll just update you as we go through the fall and hear from them. So again, that committee is another example of trying to find ways to work collectively and to increase our efficiency.

I will close by thanking the president on behalf of Bart and myself for a wonderful series of face to face meetings that I think have been open and frank with discussions on a wide range of issues that touched on both individual campuses and on the needs of the university as a whole. I can only describe our relationship with Michael over this past year as genuinely collegial. And I think it bodes well for the future of faculty governance both on the campus level and across the university as a whole, and I thank Michael for moving us in that direction with a sense of shared vision and shared mission.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Lisa. Thank you very much, I appreciate that.

NG: I’m actually sitting here on behalf of Rosalie because she’s supposed to be sitting here, but she’s going to leave for a student’s appointment. I just want to join Lisa in thanking the president for a wonderful working relationship in this past year; and as Lisa said, I think that we are on a very, very productive course in the coming year and I’m sure that the UFC will live up to its charge to represent the faculty throughout the entire university. And I think that the new ways of collaboration between the faculty governance and the university will be very productive. So, thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Bart.

NG: And I also want to take this opportunity to thank everybody that served on the Council and thank you for your support. My time on this council has been a wonderful pleasant experience that I have in my 33 years at Indiana University and so I look forward to a new job, and I told
some people that yes, I’m not completely over to the dark side. I hope that I’m still (inaudible), so….Okay, thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #5 QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Thanks Bart, thank you much. Let me move on to Agenda Item five, the Q and A period for myself and Bart and Lisa. I have a question that was submitted formally in writing. Let me read it to you and then respond to it. The question reads: “Chancellor Bergland has discussed with the IUN faculty governance leadership his intention to retire in the near future, initially indicating a date of June 30, 2009. He also indicated that he had begun to discuss this transition with you. What plans are underway to create a search committee and when do you plan to have that committee in place?” Chancellor Bergland, Bruce Bergland at IU-Northwest, Chancellor Bergland and I have had one discussion on this topic, one brief discussion on this topic. He was not quite so specific with a date, although it would be within that general timeframe, but that would probably be the earliest. I think as a courtesy I obviously need to discuss this further with Chancellor Bergland. That, when we discussed the matter, that was not the key focus of what we were discussing anyway. So, I will be having further discussions with him as to his more precise intentions over the next few weeks and I’d say that we’ll know where things stand by the time the Council meets, whenever August or September. Other questions? Yes, Martin.

SPECHLER: Well I hate to interrupt this ___ of affection, but there are some issues that fellow faculty have asked me to talk about including faculty salaries at Indiana University. Recently it’s been announced by the AAUP that the true value of faculty salaries across the country have increased the last several years, three, four years. And although this year the average increase was 4% that’s barely above what was projected to be the cost of living increase in, clearly, an inflationary world. And I know that listening to your radio broadcast on (W)FIU at least twice, I know that you’re very sensitive to priorities and I really wonder if your priority with respect to faculty salaries now I was talking to Chancellor Paydar before the meeting and I was absolutely delighted to hear that IU East one of our smaller campuses is succeeding in slimming down the administration of that campus and has gone a very long way to solving the financial problems that that campus has had over the last few years. On the other hand, a number of new appointments have been made and announced in the last few days even of positions that I never heard of before. Now of course they could be a change in the climate and I don’t know all the details, but…

MCROBBIE: Which positions Martin are you referring to?

SPECHLER: You know about the associate deans at the College of Arts and Sciences, for example? But I don’t want to be too specific, because after all we do need administrators, good administrators, I understand that point. But my question to you, and this a question I’ve raised with the previous president, is whether you’re attracting the amount of the total budget of Indiana University which is going for administration both at the center and on the various campuses – it could be just a casual impression and it’s not my business, I have a lot of other things to do – but it just strikes me as if Indiana University instead of hiring very good people who were successful at research and teaching and put them into administrative positions where, I hope they’ll do well,
but certainly at the financial cost. I was recently asked by our administration at IUPUI to investigate an important matter of giving fringe benefits to part-time faculty and it turned out that people thought this would be a marvelous idea for retention of very good people, particularly young women who need to be part-time in order to make it to tenure in difficult high tech fields, for example. And at least half the deans that we asked said ‘We’d like to do this, but we can’t afford it. We can’t afford it.’ And we’ve also had some bad news about funding in one of our wonderful schools here at IUPUI. I won’t go into the details. So, you know, it does raise the question; faculty salaries, equipping new scientists, part-time benefits. These are rather important matters for the health of our faculty and for existing programs. So, you know, I want to raise this question about where are the priorities. Why do we need or do we need more administration at Indiana University?

MCROBBIE: Well Martin, that’s a huge series of questions there and the decision as to what administrators individual deans appoint is up to the individual deans, but let me comment on, let me try to extract two points from your question and comment on those. Firstly, and I’d be happy to have Vice President Theobold maybe give a, sort of a detailed presentation at the first meeting of the council next year on some of these matters, but I believe that one of the biggest areas of expense for us, or increasing expense that’s increasing very rapidly, and probably, although I’m not certain of this, probably is increasing faster than certain kinds of administrative costs is healthcare costs. Now, we are joint partners in Clarion with the Methodist Hospital, but I think it’s probably fair to say that we have not yet worked as closely with Clarion as we maybe could have to try to reduce our healthcare costs. I have a series of issues that I want to try and tackle next year after having dealt with certain other issues I didn’t expect to be dealing with this year. But, one of them is going to be healthcare costs. And I’m still thinking through how I want to do that, again, discussing with various people. But I want to see if we can mount a fairly serious assault on the increasing healthcare costs, use our full range of assets one of which I think would be Clarion, another one, obviously are the health sciences schools principally on this campus to see if we can stem in a major way this increase. Because what we can stem in that area obviously gives us more flexibility when it comes to faculty salaries and related matters, start up packages and so on and so on. That’s the first item. Second item: I am sensitive to the issue about what we spend in administration versus the rest of the mission of the university. I don’t think we have as good a handle on that as we to, to be blunt. It is the case under RCM that the philosophy behind RCM is that the schools are cost centers and income centers. They are the parts of the university that generate the revenue and that administration provides services to them for which they are the customers. And they are the people who can, if you like, exercise a certain sort of market discipline over those services. That we don’t really have very good mechanisms for enabling that to happen. So, another thing I’m looking to tackle next year is a more sustained effort in cost containment. I made an initial start on that this year, this academic year, with the redistribution that was carried out from the administrative budgets on a number of campuses in particular to focus down on what is one of our priorities, which should be one of our priorities which is degree completion. But that was still relatively modest. It was called The Degrees of Excellence Initiative, too, I think that’s, that I talked about in my inauguration and since in a number of places. But that was a start, and what it at least was able to prove was that we were able to reallocate funding internally in support of a key priority and, if you like, an area that needed attention. But I would agree, we need to do more. I don’t think we have a comprehensive understanding of how much we spend on administration and I think we need to
have mechanisms to allow us to look at what we're spending it on and enable the deans in particular to make some decisions or at least give some advice on how important those particular services are to them. So those are two things I’m going to try to pick up next year. Other questions? Yes?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: You mentioned that the governor had ...(inaudible)...tuition...(inaudible).

MCROBBIE: Right, that would be, the figure he’s talking about would be enough to cover cost of attendance at Ivy Tech.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MCROBBIE: I haven’t heard that rumor. I think this is extremely early days. I know that he will be looking for comment from us and input and so on and so on. I think he was basically putting forward a broad concept and now the detail has to be fleshed out and discussed. I haven’t heard that rumor at all. Other questions? Yes, Bill?

SCHNEIDER: I just have a brief one question. First for Lisa: do you think that the composition of the committee taking on the promotion and tenure procedures has that been set yet?

PRATT: If it’s not, it will be as soon as they have their first meeting. My understanding is that everybody’s been named, everybody has agreed to serve, but you know what, I don’t know if it’s…

MCROBBIE: We’ll send you an autographed copy from the three of us if you’d like Bill.

SCHNEIDER: The second question is the Family Leave Policy, I mean that group of deans are they ready to talk about faculty currently, who have recently or are in the process of applying for a leave and not really what policies will affect them?

MCROBBIE: No I don’t think they show that level of penetration about the matter actually Bill, but to be frank it was a, Bart was there, it was a fairly brief discussion. I asked for their views about this policy: did they think this was a good thing, did they support this? And there was vigorous nodding around the table of about seventeen or eighteen deans who were present. The only issue of concern was whether this might prove so popular that the additional expense that Vice President Theobald estimated it would involve, or could involve, which would be up to $100,000, might be exceeded and my view there is that well maybe if it’s exceeded by another $100,000 in the scheme of things that’s relatively modest. If it’s exceeded by $1,000,000 then one may need to review the policy. And that was the end of the discussion. Would you agree with that Bart?

NG: Yeah, I quite agree. And there was a very strong sentiment of several deans that this would be a very good tool for recruitment and retention of faculty.

MCROBBIE: I was very impressed with the strength of their sentiment actually.
AGENDA ITEM #6 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY “CODE OF STUDENT RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND CONDUCT.”

MCROBBIE: Alright, let’s move on to agenda item 6, the proposed changes to the code of rights. Who’s presenting this one, Bart or Lisa?

PRATT: Diane is.

MCROBBIE: Oh, Diane.

DALLIS: So the Bloomington Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee along with the Dean McKaig and Pam Freeman proposed changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct and they proposed those changes to the UFC Student Affairs Committee and BFC Student Affairs Committee which is the format of this memo and they approved these changes unanimously. And what I’ll do is I would like to go through the changes point by point, give a brief explanation of those changes and then I will, along with my co-chair Nuria, will field questions as best we can. And I believe that Dean McKaig and Pam Freeman are also joining by phone if you have any, if we need any help with clarification on that.

The changes that you have before you are, there are four of them, and first that I’ve noted in the memo, and just some fairly simple changes to the preamble in part one. The change to the preamble is the addition of a bullet point that emphasizes the importance of learning as a student responsibility. And the second change in that area is in part 1, and information from the Code of Academic Ethics has been reviewed two years ago when significant changes were made to the code. We’re simply reinstating those with some modified, updated revisions to the anti-discrimination, discriminatory clause. So that’s what those are. You’ll find those in the packet that you have on pages 3 through 5.
And then we’ll move on to the second area which is part one of the student rights. The wording ‘gender identity’ has been added to any area that lists categories of protected groups against discrimination. And that simply is putting our code in line with policies at other universities, businesses, government agencies and all Big 10 Universities use ‘gender identity’ as a description to identify this group being protected from discrimination except Indiana, Purdue, and Northwestern. So we’re hoping to make that change in all of the areas that we need to get our code up to date.

Part three of the procedures for implementation of the code; I guess you’ll have to go to page 8 of your packet first of all. And it proposes a revision that would enable campuses to more actively involve advisors at both the formal hearing and the final appeal level of the judicial process. That is the third, and the fourth change broadens the definition of student to anyone who is enrolled with IU programs. This would include students enrolled specifically in Hoosier Link program. So they’re held to the same code of responsibilities, conduct that IU students are.

So, that was a brief description of the changes. And I know that there were some friendly amendments proposed…

SPECHLER: Point of order, is this an action item or a first reading?

DALLIS: This is an action item and the idea is that it should be voted on so it can be implemented in August.

SPECHLER: Could I ask the Parliamentarian (inaudible)? Other than that, there is one controversial item here (inaudible) I personally would be relieved if we could discuss this with a fuller membership first meeting in the Fall. But let me tell you why. Is it Diane?

DALLIS: Yes.

SPECHLER: Diane obviously hasn’t been around as long as I have, but the whole idea of having an advisor at disciplinary hearings has been considered several times and usually rejected. I participated in such a thing and the difficulty there is that the advisor is not really defined to be the student’s choice. And in some particularly difficult cases, that will be an attorney. Such a thing that will complicate and delay the hearing making far more that it has been in the past. Now I’m not absolutely against it in some cases, but I’m telling you that this will make disciplinary hearings potentially far more complicated, not the sort of things that we’ve wanted in the past. In other words this… (tape cuts out, comments lost, end of tape) …more complicated not the sort of thing that we’ve wanted in the past. In other words this proposal to have an advisor available to make statements on the behalf of the student has been rejected in the past. Exclusively considered and rejected in the past. Other members can correct me if I’m wrong about that. So, in view of that, I’d like to have a broader discussion by people who have participated in such disciplinary hearings and to see whether the balance of benefits and cost is a positive one.

NG: Well, first of all, I do not believe that your description about the allowance for an advisor is entirely accurate because you read the passage as it stands now it says, “A person charged, a
victim or anyone providing testimony is entitled at his or her expense to be accompanied by an
advisor or support person of his or her choice.” Of his or her choice. “An advisor or support
person is limited to the role of advising. The advisor or support person may not participate in the
proceeding, may not question witnesses, and may not make any statements during the
proceedings. The campus may, however, make procedures to allow a student to have an advisor
or support person to speak on the student’s behalf at a final appeal hearing.” And then it went on
to say, the change here said “Campuses may also allow advisors to make statements before
decisions of responsibility and sanctioning are determined at any personal misconduct
conference or hearing.” So the last sentence leads the further role of speaking at the last moment
up to each campus. But the paragraph before that is already adopted. So we allow advisors, they
just simply have a very prescribed role, that’s all.

PRATT: I think it also is respectful of the fact that conversations about the role of advisors and
whether or not there should be any limitation on who that advisor is, those conversations are
proceeding on individual campuses at very different rates. And this simply allows individual
faculty governance groups to make the decision because this doesn’t mandate it, it only permits it
on a campus by campus basis. And I believe we have Dick McKaig on the phone…

McROBBIE: Dick are you there?

MCKAIG: Yes I am.

MCROBBIE: Do you want to comment?

MCKAIG: I agree entirely with the comments that most recently have been made. This is a
position that allows an individual campus to choose to involve advisors more directly than had
been done in the past. And on the Bloomington campus that’s been an area of interest. That’s
why students came forward requesting it. And yet it does not mandate any change for other
campuses.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

FISHER: I have a question on pages four and five. From line 77 to 110. Does that basically
then involve a reiteration of what’s in the University Code of Academic Ethics?

DALLIS: Yes.

FISHER: Some of that wording seems to be kind of old from the standpoint of it’s very
classroom-oriented. And many of us don’t even teach in classrooms, and so my concern is
about what you’ve then just updated both in its original place and then also here.

POMPER: Okay, in order to partially address I would like to offer a friendly amendment on the
wording of lines 77 to 80. If you will notice on page 34 and the previous page, “Students will
have the right to (inaudible) ” I’d like to suggest that line 77-80 be replaced with the following
“expect that faculty abide by the (inaudible) in University Code of Academic Ethics in
parentheses and then the citation of those items A. 2. 1-7. And then continues for (inaudible) the end of the next page.

PRATT: Markus, would you read that one more time, starting with “A student has the right to expect…” and can you just read that again?

POMPER: “A student has the right to,” that’s from the previous page, and then where it begins on line 77 has been replaced with “expect that faculty abide by the IU (inaudible) policy and the University Code of Academic Ethics” in parentheses, paragraphs A2. 1-7” And the remaining parts of it on lines 8.1 remain as they are. That would address the fact that all of those are just (inaudible).

FISHER: So those (inaudible) no longer in the document?

POMPER: No (inaudible) my suggestion (inaudible) would not change that. My suggestion would only change 77 through 80. That’s my motion, so…

MCROBBIE: Well I guess we’ve don’t formal…well I know it’s come as an action item but I guess we don’t formally have a motion in front of us.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: It comes from a committee.

MCROBBIE: Does that mean that we don’t…okay, so this effectively is a motion in front of us. Although I guess we need a formal mover.

FISHER: (inaudible)

MCROBBIE: I confess I don’t know, Mary, without a Parliamentarian to adjudicate on that, but…

SCHNEIDER: (next few comments inaudible)

FISHER:

BALDWIN:

SCHNEIDER:

VOLLRATH: (By teleconference) This is David Vollrath at South Bend, I am here, and…

MCROBBIE: I’m sorry who is that?

VOLLRATH: This is Dave Vollrath at South Bend. In response to Marty’s earlier question, it is proper for a member of the UFC to (inaudible) to postpone a future meeting. That motion is debatable and requires a majority to pass. Martin Spechler I believe asked about the (inaudible)
of handling an action item. And in the circumstance (inaudible) anybody may make a motion to postpone to a future meeting. That motion is debatable and requires a majority to be approved.

PRATT: Let me see if I understand what you said, and I’ll just say it from the front here so we can all hear it. My understanding is that if Marty wishes to pursue the idea that he wants to defer this until the first meeting in the Fall, he would put that out as a motion, it would be debatable and it would require a majority vote to be approved.

VOLLRATH: That’s right.

PRATT: Thank you.

FISHER: Point of order?

MCROBBIE: Yes, Mary?

FISHER: Yeah, my question is more fundamental and our past practice in my opinion unless I’m getting senile has been that we always have a first reading of policies for this body; have we not been doing that? It just seems to me that that’s always been what we’ve done.

MCROBBIE: Can I, let me ask…

FISHER: So we can discuss, you know, so this would be a good discussion time. But I (inaudible)

MCROBBIE: Right. Diane, what is the urgency about having this approved? Is there some urgency about this or what?

DALLIS: Well, I think that there are some points that would be helpful, especially that gender identity concept, to have that included unless there are concerns about that to have that, the code updated with that.

MCROBBIE: I think the concern is probably least with that. I think that the concern is probably with the implications of the point at 77 on page, well my page 4, and I think if I’m, without putting words in Mary’s or Martin’s mouth, a suggestion that what’s been - even though that comes from the University Code of Academic Ethics - that what’s being described there is not really representative of the full gamut of how faculty interact with students. And even though that is there as a policy, Mary is even saying, I think Mary might be suggesting well maybe we need to go back and look at those policies in turn. Let me suggest, I think that rather than get into a torturous procedural debate here, since it seems to me having read this, and I’m sorry you’ve had to come all the way here and I’m sorry, Dick that you’re on the phone, but could we treat this as a first reading along the lines of what Mary said and bring this back to the first meeting in the new academic year. I confess I don’t see anything here that is so critical that it is going to bring the academic life of the university to its knees. So, although I am, I don’t want to at all disparage the importance of these points, but I think it is something we can probably take a little longer on to sort this out. I’d hope it would not take as long to sort out as
the Intellectual Property Policy, but maybe if we can do a little bit better than that would be helpful. Bill?

**SCHNEIDER:** Just a point of information, this is brought here from the UFC Student Affairs Committee and not Dean McKaig?

**DALLIS:** Well it was brought to the UFC-SAC and the SAC approved it and is bringing it forward to the UFC.

**SCHNEIDER:** What was the name of the first one?

**DALLIS:** I’m sorry the Bloomington Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee brought it to the UFC-SAC and now we’re bringing it forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Right. Yes, Mary?

**FISHER:** Just a quick suggestion, it’s always better because the fact that we know that this one area is somewhat out of date, if we could both refer to it as Markus had suggested, saying that expect that academic body have items and then name them and not actually read them in the policy then when those items get updated we wouldn’t have to re-update this policy...

**MCROBBIE:** That’s a good point.

**FISHER:** …you know, and so we can have a reference there. That would kind of satisfy my concerns about that, because clearly that policy’s out of date (inaudible)

**MCROBBIE:** Jim?

**BALDWIN:** (inaudible)

**FISHER:** (inaudible)… a copy of… (inaudible)

**NG:** That’s in the Academic Handbook, that’s pretty (Electronic noise in room).

**MCROBBIE:** George?

**BODMER:** As Markus (inaudible)

**FISHER:** (inaudible)

**NG:** Is he making a formal motion…?

**MCROBBIE:** If we want to treat this as a first reading, it’s not a matter of amending it; it’s a matter of that being taken as feedback. Now, do you want to, I mean, what I was going to suggest is that we take this as a first reading and bring this back to the first meeting of the UFC rather than get into this lengthy discussion now. Yes, George?
**BODMER**: Well I mean if we’re going to have an amendment it still can’t be voted on, unless the original mover accepts it.

**DALLIS**: Well, I accept it.

**MCROBBIE**: But can you formally be the person who’s moving this? I said, can Diane be the person moving this? I mean, who is the mover on this?

**VOLLRATH**: I would consider a chair or cochair of the committee to be able to make a decision about and (inaudible). So I think she’s within (inaudible).

**MCROBBIE**: You’re saying she can be the mover?

**VOLLRATH**: Yes, I believe so.

**MCROBBIE**: Then it’s being accepted, so...

**DALLIS**: You also provide the feedback as well, you provided an amendment as well, which I have and I accepted that. It was discussed in the Agenda Committee and then shared with me before the meeting. Would you want to read it now?

**BODMER**: Yes, as we discussed in the Agenda Committee this is the part three under advisors which we have been discussing and in the bold face in part three, the bold face of the part three the advisors makes formal what in the two previous statement in this paragraph, so we just did in offering the friendly amendment (audible) They also allow the advisor or support person to make a statement before a decision on responsibility, sanction is determined as any personal misconduct conference or hearing. So we just changed advisors to advisor or support person and then we made the rest of it (inaudible). And I’ve already….

**DALLIS**: Yes, thank you.

**MCROBBIE**: Martin?

**SPECHLER**: I would urge that we put this off to the first meeting in the new year. First of all the first meeting we often don’t have very much business so it will be better heads and secondly as far as I understand from Diane to the other campuses for their consideration as if…is that correct?

**DALLIS**: No, it’s only gone to the UFC-SAC.

**SPECHLER**: Well, you’re empowering a number of campuses to do something, it would be nice, courteous to show them and allow them to make their wishes known.

**MCROBBIE**: Martin, are you moving for a deferral? That this be deferred. Are you moving a motion to that effect?
SPECHLER: I don’t think we even need a motion. I accept the chair’s ruling that this be a
discussion and that we will put it on the agenda the first thing in the Fall.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

SPECHLER: Do you think we need a motion?

PRATT: I think it does need a motion.

MCROBBIE: Okay, it’s been moved. We have a motion to defer. So second from Mary?
Someone seconded, who was seconder? For the record…Okay, motion to defer does that have
discussion?

VOLLRATH: Yes, it’s debatable, then it is passed with a majority.

MCROBBIE: Okay, any discussion? Yeah?

POMPER: How about the gender identity issue? You said it might be important to have that in
there?

DALLIS: If the Council feels that it’s not urgent and if Dean McKaig doesn’t feel that this is
something that we absolutely have to have voted on now I think that…

MCKAIG: I concur, it can wait until the fall.

MCROBBIE: Okay, we have a motion in front of us. Any further discussion? All those in
favor of the motion to defer, please say “aye.” [Aye] Against? Okay, that’s carried. Agenda
item 7. Agenda item 7, any old business? Agenda item 8, any new business? Being no new
business we are adjourned. I will see you all, or whoever’s going to stay, at the Lilly House at
6pm for drinks and dinner. Thank you all very much.