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Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Alright, welcome ladies and gentlemen. Let me first go around to the
campuses and make sure everyone can hear us and so that people can just introduce
themselves, acknowledge themselves. Let me start with Kokomo. I can see Stuart. [I’m
here] East? [Yes we’re here. Yes.] Southeast? [Yes we’re here.] Okay. IUPUI? [We’re
here. We are here, yes.] Okay. South Bend. [We’re all here.] Oh, you’re all here. Right.
Northwest? I can see Chuck [I’m here.] and is Fort Wayne the vacant tables? We’ll take
them as having agreed to this. Okay well let’s get started. The first item is the approval
of the minutes from the last meeting. Are there any comments? Any issues with the
minutes from the last meeting from any member? Being none, can I have a motion to
approve those please? [So moved] And a seconder? [Yeah.] Any discussion on that
motion? There being none, I’ll put the motion. All those in favor please signify by
AGENDA ITEM 2: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

I just wanted to comment on the matter which tends to dominate a lot of my time which is the economic situation in the state obviously. I was at a meeting just yesterday with the other public university presidents and the governor. It’s still not clear where we’ll be for the next budget session obviously which will be starting to ramp up at the end of this calendar year. I think you all know that the state revenue figures for the first time in about two years, the actual collections, exceeded the estimates for March which was the first piece of good financial news we’ve had in the state for nearly two years. I’ve heard informally that there’s some reason to be optimistic about April, but that is informal and it’s just really at the level of anecdote and rumor at this stage. I’m not certain we can credit anything to that but remember also that we all need to be watching the April figure because it is about the most important figure because that’s when taxes get paid. So I commend those figures when they come out for close inspection. But I think as everybody knows there is at least some evidence that things are improving nationally. The historical situation is that Indiana is always slow to come out of a recession and first to go in. I do know also that the governor did share with us that the expectation is that the state’s reserves will be considerably reduced by the end of this budget session and that I think there’s a – again I think this is really informal – but there’s an expectation that the budget for the next biennium is probably going to be at best about a flat line budget. I think there’s no suggestion of any increases. And remember, that flat line will be from where we will be at the end of this biennium which is over 6% below where we were at the beginning of the last biennium and if we can get away with something like a flat line budget we may well be doing well. I think there’s been a lot of speculation that in fact there may be further cuts so it is not a particularly rosy situation, but there is, I think, at least some evidence that we are maybe starting to bottom out which at least is – relatively speaking – good news.

I also want to comment that a constant theme of some of the governor’s recent comments about higher education have been focused very much on the regional campuses – Steve, we’ve got some—if you’re listening Steve we’ve got some feedback problems – as have the comments of Senator Lubbers, the Commissioner for Higher Education. Two things they keep stressing and again this should be of no surprise to anybody. One is affordability which in part is linked to student aid. That is, they’re concerned that the cost of a four year degree is getting beyond the ability of the middle class to afford. They know that people from low income backgrounds are able to attract at least a significant amount of financial aid if they’re appropriately qualified but the concern is really the people in the middle and this continues to be a concern and the second is graduation rates. They have really zeroed in and I have stressed this over the years that it’s something we do need to be concerned about. I think there’s some signs of significant signs of improvement, but graduation rates across many of the institutions in the state have been heavily criticized by the governor and the commissioner. We need to – I think all campuses, all chancellors, all faculty really – we need to be redoubling our efforts to do what we can to improve those graduation rates because it
is becoming a target for the government and I think the legislature will probably almost certainly pick that up at the next budget session. So that’s just a very broad overview/snapshot of my perception of where we are in the state at the moment.

Let me move to agenda item three which is the business of the Agenda Committee to Erika and Simon.

**AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**ATKINSON:** So there’s really one major item of Agenda Committee business that we wanted to discuss with the UFC. We’ve talked at a number of Agenda Committee meetings and I think we’ve talked about this some at the UFC meeting also, and though the president addressed this in his State of the University Address which is the effectiveness of the UFC as an institution of faculty governance and a partner in shared governance for Indiana University. I think we have a feeling that the UFC has not worked well in that respect for the last couple of years. So the Agenda Committee would like to suggest the appointment of a very small committee to take a hard look at the – I guess I’m a biologist so – the structure and function of the UFC as an institution. And we’ve drafted a preliminary charge to the committee which I will read to you and I hope that’s been circulated by email.

So the University Faculty Council charges the committee to examine the mission, offices, structures, and processes of faculty governance at the university level with the goals of:

1. Increasing faculty engagement in shared governance, and
2. Improving the effectiveness and flexibility of the UFC as a partner with the trustees, president, and central administration in shared governance of the university.

The committee will review the scope of faculty authority at the university level, examine the relationship between the university and campus faculty governance and based on this understanding will make recommendations if needed on the reorganization of the UFC.

The suggested composition of this committee is what will be two former UFC co-Secretaries, that’s myself and Herb Terry, and Markus Pomper from Indiana University East. So this committee will work over the summer and will come back with recommendations to the Agenda Committee and to the UFC. The general mind of thinking is that the UFC should continue to exist with wide representation from all campuses so that there is a voice for the faculty on all the campuses at the university level. But that in order to make the policy making, decision making and particularly the ability to be reactive to emergent situations that the president needs to consult the faculty about, particularly budgetary situations, that the one way to do this would be to empower the UFC Agenda Committee to be able to take more actions in between UFC meetings. So that that’s one possibility as we look at this. I think part of the work of this group will be to look at other models amongst our peer institutions. So many, for
example, the Big Ten institutions have a system wide or university wide system of faculty governance and in many cases they have mechanisms for a smaller group representing that faculty governance that interacts directly with the university president or chancellor and the central administration. So that is a proposal then from the Agenda Committee to establish this committee and go forward with that. I don’t know where Craig is. Whether we’d need that as a resolution to appoint this committee with the charge or if the general sense of the UFC membership is that we can go ahead and do this.

**DOWELL:** I think if we get a general sense today, then we’ll take it that the Agenda Committee will do a final approval of the charge and appoint the committee from there if that’s okay.

**ATKINSON:** Is there any objection or endorsement?

**MCROBBIE:** Are people happy with that?

[East is in favor of that.]

[Northwest is in favor as well.]

[IUPUI is in favor.]

[Agree]

[Kokomo_____Southeast agrees.]

[Bloomington agrees.]

**MCROBBIE:** And South Bend? [Agrees] That’s right you’re all here.

**ATKINSON:** Alright, any other...?

**DOWELL:** No, not too much other business. A number of us here today attended a meeting of the Indiana Commission of Higher Education, a meeting for faculty leaders on Friday which was interesting although we talked about it just in the Agenda Committee. In some ways it was most interesting for the way Ivy Tech has come to dominate the group and the different sort of character of their faculty representatives which were mostly, at least the three that I met, were deans as opposed to the kinds of representatives that came from the four year institutions.

**MCROBBIE:** Nothing else, Simon and Erika?
ATKINSON: Not unless anyone else on the Agenda Committee has anything that we’ve forgotten?

DOWELL: Everything else I think will be coming up later on the agenda anyway.

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Alright, questions and comment period. Either for me or for the co-secretaries. Any questions or comments on any matters of people here?

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne from East. I have a question of when the president will be addressing external review. Is that going to come up during the discussion of the P and T principles during this meeting?

MCROBBIE: That comes under… What is it? Agenda item 7.

NISHIHARA: Thank you. Thanks.

TERRY: Herb Terry from Bloomington. I hope you can hear me. I’m losing my voice. I’ll simply add that one of the issues at the meeting with the commission for higher education was what the president mentioned about an emphasis on keying the budget more directly to output measures including graduation. If I were to react to what they’re saying, I would hope they end up with a more refined measurement of that, that reflects the differences among the institutions in the state better than the preliminary measures they’re employing now. But clearly it’s the case that the higher education commission will advise the general assembly that it should switch more funding to those kinds of measures, but I think we have a self interest but also a responsibility to respond to that.

MCROBBIE: We should remember that the commissioner is a well respected former member of that assembly. It’s...yeah, that’s exactly right, Herb.

WALKER: This is Leslie Walker from IU South Bend. I’m just wondering about the graduation rates. If we are doing everything we can – I mean, obviously we’re going to do everything we can to improve them – but also to educate folks who are our overseers in terms of national averages. Because in terms of national averages, IU South Bend is not so bad [some laughter] in the sense, well...I mean you know in terms of the national average, we are ahead of the national average in terms of those four year graduation rates and I’m sure that that’s the case for other institutions other IU’s. So I just think that that’s an important point as we go forward.

MCROBBIE: It might be.

WALKER: Just so they have a sense of context.
**MCROBBIE:** That might be useful, but I would comment that it doesn’t really cut much, you know, ice with them. They tend to take the view, ‘well, that doesn’t say much for the rest of the country in that case.’ That’ll be their response.

**WALKER:** Right, but it’s still part of education funding...

**MCROBBIE:** But what I’m saying is that that’s not enough for you to refer to that. I mean I take your point that they need to understand it in that context but it doesn’t necessarily change their views all that much about these matters. Yeah?

**ATKINSON:** Another factor is the graduation rates affect the input into the higher education system too. It reflects the K-12 preparation of a lot of the students that arrive on our campuses so that’s – it’s not just an issue...

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER FROM IUPUI:** We have a conflict here at IUPUI –

**ATKINSON:** – it’s not just an issue –

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER FROM IUPUI:** – Do you have time? There is a tendency to blame K-12 for the students that come to us and that’s been a long historical journey. We’ve always referred to what K-12 was doing when they came. The high schools say the junior high schools and the junior high schools say the elementary. I’d like to ask us to think about what are the kinds of steps we are going to take to actually address some of the concerns about retention and graduation and to do it in a very proactive way that says Indiana University is going to stand out as a university. That doesn’t say we meet national standards or national quotas. We have set the tone for the state to move forward. And I’d like to see us address it with a plan of action. So I’m asking what will our plan look like and how will we make that actual step toward changing what we have come to accept?

**MCROBBIE:** Well, there was an initiative I took a couple of years ago called Degrees of Excellence which required every campus to divert 1% of their administrative budget into programs to improve and increase graduation rates and that’s been the main response so far. I think it’s going to take more than that, but there’s some evidence that the way in which that’s been implemented on the various campuses has had an impact. But we are going to probably need to do more than that because I don’t think the rate of increase is substantial enough yet. But I think the individual chancellors can probably comment on that if they wish. What they’ve done in particular to implement that initiative.

**GREEN:** Let me just make an observation in response to the individual from South Bend first and that is, I certainly agree with you Mr. President, that when you have a state overall that lags behind in baccalaureate production in terms of its overall population,
saying that we’re no worse off than the other guys is not going to be an adequate answer. At the same time, I do think we have the resources here, in Vic Borden’s shop and elsewhere to take a look at segmenting our populations, looking at our profiles, using things like Alexander Astin’s measures of success in retention to point out how we are doing not with respect to any kind of general overall outcome, but with the outcomes that should be expected for our kinds of institutions with our kinds of student profiles and I think that’s very different than when you look at the regional campuses and even particular regional campuses versus larger Research 1 universities/residential institutions, etc... So I think there are some ways that we can do some things to educate the population that’s making these judgments about us. At the same time, I agree that there’s going to have to be a lot more focus – partly through Degrees of Excellence – in terms of analyzing what has in fact worked? What has in fact worked? What are best practices that are working not only at our sister institutions within Indiana University but at other institutions that are having significant impact on improving student retention rates. I also think that this goes to the kind of work that Nasser has been doing at East in terms of his relationships that he’s been building with getting a very effective pipeline with Ivy Tech so that the students that are coming to us through this pipeline are going to be more successful when they get to us. We recently underwent a study of our graduating students last year. And the kinds of questions we asked about why they were the ones that made it to graduation are beginning to inform the kinds of practices that we’ll be engaging with as an institution in the future. Including, what is the profile that is most likely to succeed? What are the kinds of curricular and co-curricular engagements that help students to persist? What are the relationships on campus that help them to persist? So, I think rather than saying, ‘here’s a plan,’ I think we need to start looking at the data we have available and gather the data that we don’t have to help inform the development of our plans both across Indiana University and on each of our particular campuses.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Other quick things, Stuart? Other questions or comments from anybody?

PLUCKER: Michael?

MCROBBIE: Yes?

PLUCKER: I think it’s important to note that this isn’t a partisan issue for the most part. The previous commissioner, this was one of his really big issues, too. He’s in D.C. now working on this big issue. And in some ways it’s kind of become a hot topic here a couple years later than other parts of the country. This isn’t something that’s going to come and go. This is a long term trend for us to need to focus on and you know it’s always much, much better to be ahead of the wave as opposed to having the wave crashing down on you. So...
MCROBBIE: Thanks, John. Alright, other questions or comments? I think we’re timing out on this, but other questions or comments maybe one more if anybody’s got anything? Okay, there being none, let’s move on to agenda item five which is, is Dan? Oh Dan’s over there, right. Dan Rives the Associate Vice President from HR is going to talk about the phased retirement plan and the health engagement rollout. Dan?

AGENDA ITEM 5: 18/20 PHASED RETIREMENTS AND THE HEALTH ENGAGEMENT ROLLOUT AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

RIVES: Good afternoon. Erika and Simon gave me a little heads-up of some of the areas of interest. 18/20 is an early retirement plan that the university put in place back in the late 50’s. We discontinued new faculty of becoming eligible in 1988 and have replaced it with some interim plans and then in ‘99 even those plans were discontinued. So I think one item of interest I’ve heard of has to do with the difference between the 18/20 plan and what we’ve called the replacement plan. So certainly we can engage in that. The phased retirement plan which we put in two years ago, how is that going? What kind of participation, and then I actually have a question for you as I had a look at numbers and maybe retention incentive is another. It wasn’t a part of your agenda but it’s a type of something we do for retirement plans which has changed a lot, so... A little background and you’ll have to guide me as to which direction you want to go. The university for many years had a 15% contribution rate to faculty for their base retirement plan. And that 15% rate was discontinued at the end of 1988 and replaced in ‘89 with a 12% contribution rate and then in 1999 – July, specifically – that rate was changed to 10% where it is today. So new faculty coming in today have a 10% contribution to their base retirement plan as opposed to 15. Well that 15% cohort group also has an early retirement plan and we call it 18/20. It essentially has two components. It has a deferred compensation component which we call interim benefits and it has a component that pays into the base plan for an equivalent period of time. It’s a complex plan. I even start off smiling thinking well we call it a hypothetical annuity so that interim benefit we’ve taken, the stream of contributions from one’s career and we hypothetically split those contributions to CREF stock. So CREF Stock is a big factor at the end accumulation and then 50% to the TIAA fixed annuity. So that’s another factor in the equation. And then the accumulated value, the hypothetical value, we buy, we act like we’re buying annuity. A straight life annuity and then that’s a value that gets paid to the plan’s participant when they’re eligible like age 64 until 70...sixty months, 70 or death, whichever occurs first. But there’s a cap on the benefit and the cap is no more than the terminal base salary which is defined as the average of the last 60 months or the average of the last five years. So prior to 2008, the value generated a higher income replacement and of course the equity market took a very big hit, profound hit, about 30% of the equity market went away CREF stock reduced in value. Now it is back by the way, a lot, so just looking at to date stock values and CREF stock it has come way back. But after CREF stock came back, you had the fixed income market getting the big hit. So it lagged the economic phase which it’s gone through and it’s still lagging. So that calculation which was looking at CREF stock and a fixed annuity value even though CREF
stock has come back the annuity factor has not, and like anybody else buying an
annuity, converting a lump sum to a stream of lifetime benefits, that other factor, that is
the annuitization factor has also dropped. So bottom line here is that in 2009, faculty
who thought they were going to get a certain benefit under 18/20 that calculation that I
just described and I apologize it’s a little more complex than that, did not generate to
what they were expecting. To the point that around fifteen to twenty faculty who were
planning on retiring did not retire. We had around thirty faculty retire from that cohort
group and we were expecting maybe forty-five to fifty faculty. We are seeing the
numbers up this year so CREF stock values were up, plus individuals may have deferred
their retirement from 64 to 65. If you only have 60 months worth of benefits, once you
go beyond 65, the value of the benefit begins to dissipate so we are seeing greater
numbers of the faculty retiring this May and June so I think that was one thing on your
mind.

Another item on your mind is I believe from a couple of you. The trustees of the
university saw easily that it could not sustain the cost of 18/20. It was never funded. It
was never required to be funded. So every year we budget the anticipated expenditure
for that year we never put money away and in all the earlier years for the future liability.
And between numbers and the salaries, the cost rose significantly. And I wasn’t here at
the time, but in the late 80’s the university commissioned what was I believe called the
Long-Lindeman Report looked at some alternatives and recommendations, and their
recommendation was to suspend the program. The university just could not sustain the
costs that were forecasted. We’re not talking about millions, we’re talking about
billions of dollars in unfunded liability. And so the university suspended new
participation in the plan effective December 31, 1988. So you roll that forward by a
couple of years, a variety of IRS regulations quickly pointed out this plan which was like
a deferred comp plan if that means anything to you, wasn’t really very well—wasn’t
solid with IRS regulations. The IRS regulations probably didn’t really support it very well.
So in 1990-91, the university sought some private letter rulings from the IRS to get
exceptions to the regs and we achieved it. And I came onboard in 1991 and those years
there was a great deal of consternation that maybe the administration was trying to find
a way of getting out of this liability. That wasn’t the case at all. The university was
doing everything it could to make it a very solid arrangement, but what happened the
IRS came back and said this interim benefit, meet benefit that no one else had,
grandfathered the university – excuse the term, but that’s the term that’s used – for
those members who were in the plan prior to July 14th, 1988. And that was just a date
from Tax Reform Act that became effective that particular year. So you had this class of
faculty hired in the fall of 1988 who thought they were going to get 18/20 and the IRS
said, ‘Wait a minute, you can’t give them 18/20.’ So we built a new plan to make up the
difference or to replace that interim benefit which we now call the IU Replacement Plan.
And it took us a few years with prior members of this committee and administration we
worked for some months. And in 2002 we took to the trustees a resolution to create
the IU Replacement Plan. But it only replaces the interim benefit. It doesn’t replace the
continued contributions which the IRS has no problems with. And we couldn’t create a
defined deferred compensation plan. We had to create a 401A defined benefit plan. We couldn’t ignore the ADEA, the Age Discrimination Employment Act. We had to comply with the Age Discrimination Employment Act. You couldn’t have a benefit that just stopped at 70. So we create a very, very different plan that around ninety-nine faculty that were hired in that fall semester became eligible for. And its calculations are very, very different than 18/20. It’s a defined benefit plan. And all this is online. If you look at the documentation it’s the normal benefits, 36% of final average salary, paid for life. The option, though, is to take final average salary for 60 months. And so the complaint today is, under 18/20, you may not get your final average salary because of the formula but under the replacement plan for those faculty hired in the fall, their benefit is a different benefit and it is generating 100% of final average salary, but they’re very different plans. I think I should stop and see what discussion items there may be.

MCROBBIE: Questions or comments for Dan? I think people asked for this for you to come and talk Dan, so…this is a good opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: I have a question about the early retirement, phased in retirement and how that’s moving forward.

RIVES: Very good. Two years ago, so excuse me, the base retirement plan, you can’t withdraw your money unless you’re separated from the university. The IRS gives the ability though to create under in a very limited circumstances a phased retirement plan so an individual in a bona fide way can enter retirement early or partially enter retirement and be eligible to draw down their base plan. So we created what we call a base retirement plan. So at age 65 with ten years continuous service a tenured faculty member can basically take partial leave and if they need draw down their base retirement plan and then phase into retirement from a 12 month or 36 month period. So it’s a very good question. Keep in mind we have a lot of faculty who are still 18/20 eligible. They’re not eligible for phased retirement, but we have a few faculty now—well, a lot of faculty now—who are not 18/20 eligible but a few that are retirement age and not 18/20 eligible and they’re beginning to take phased retirement. Maybe not in big numbers. We have three individuals university wide who have entered 18/20 and interestingly enough –

DOWELL and ATKINSON: – Entered phased retirement.

RIVES: What did I say? 18/20? phased retirement, yes! Thank you. And interesting age 65, 67, and 70. So you think of when do individuals phase into retirement. You shouldn’t just be automatically thinking 65. It may actually be later. And we have three other individuals who are going to enter that phased retirement but they start that leave without pay period in a couple months, maybe with the upcoming Fall semester. So, if you will, between the individuals who accepted and those who are implied – around 6 individuals university wide. Not a big number. I’m anticipating the number will grow.
**ATKINSON:** Do you know what the pool of eligible individuals for the phased retirement is?

**RIVES:** Yeah, good question.

**ATKINSON:** That are in the right age range...

**RIVES:** Yeah. So it would be, it’s not a large pool because it would be the non-18/20 eligible group who are 65 with at least 10 years of service. I think you have a large cohort group marching toward that point, but not quite there yet. We sent out in 2002 a letter to all tenured faculty. As I began to prepare a little bit for today, I’m thinking I need to do something again. So fast forward, and not 2002, two years ago, and today I think I should go out again to faculty and remind them of the plan. I was suggesting to Simon and Erika that if you were to at least give me a nod, it’s not the head of HR suggesting someone should retire. It’s the HR with Faculty Council wanting to make sure they’re informed of the benefit. So I think I should do that if that’s something you’d like for me to do.

**ATKINSON:** I’m not sure how widely known this benefit is and so I think getting the information out there is good.

**DOWELL:** I agree.

**TERRY:** You have lots of nods...

**RIVES:** I got my nod, didn’t I?

**MCROBBIE:** I think you probably got the *imprimatur.* Unless anybody objects, I’d probably go ahead and do that.

**RIVES:** Very good. And by the way, all of the information I’m describing is on websites and in the documents and so forth. I mentioned the retention incentive. So some years ago we began to look at other costs, containment measures for retirement plans. We put a program together called retention incentive. So an individual who could otherwise go in 18/20, if their department wished, the dean with the chancellor’s concurrence could retain them and we would give them a 20% supplemental pay. And they were giving up 18/20 so it’s post-65 and later and you’re giving up something. 100% of something and getting 20% supplemental pay. In the earlier years, we had very few enrollees in retention incentive. I’m happy to report that we have 32. It doesn’t sound like many, but for many years we had 10, 14, 12 in that neighborhood, so it’s more than doubled in recent years and that may be some of the dynamics of the economics and individuals not really wanting to enter retirement for various economic reasons and their departments wishing to retain them. So I think that’s a good number.
MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments for Dan for anybody?

ATKINSON: Any questions in general about the retirement? We were also hoping that you’d talk a bit about where things are going with the healthcare incentives?

RIVES: I get to talk about healthcare. I never knew my career would be so much about healthcare, and with healthcare reform it’s not going to –

MCROBBIE: – You’ve barely started, too…

RIVES: I know. I was with a group of graduate assistants this morning and healthcare reform is going to fix everything, right? Well, let’s hold on. Thirty-two million people are going to get healthcare coverage, but I’m not sure about cost. So, we do have an issue. The cost of healthcare is one of the single most visible items where the university’s allocating money to. And the deans in this room and chancellors and others, you know very well there’s no longer any elasticity. You used to be able to reallocate money in your departments to cover healthcare costs. Well that elasticity’s gone. So there’s a great deal of tension on how are we going to afford health care. The current fiscal year we’re going to spend $154 million. Next year it’ll jump to $160 something million and it just compounds itself and doesn’t seem to have any end in sight in terms of the slope of the increase. And several years ago, President McRobbie commissioned a group, he called a Blue Ribbon Committee, Tom Inui, CEO of Regenstrief, chaired it and we looked at what are some initiatives that the university could take on to begin to at least control the rate of increase, and there are four or five initiatives. They’re out there on the web.

One of the initiatives was to look at how can we take individual responsibility for health and move it from more of a passive to more of an active environment and what many institutions are doing—large institutions—Ohio State, Michigan, ones that we would be familiar with, are moving to more incentive programs for personal health. So we put together a program, and we’re still in the development phase. And it’s called a Health Engagement Program. And in concept it has three different phases to it. The first phase would be deployed this coming fall and has an active period of January 1, 2011. And the first phase is really about getting to know your health status. Taking an online risk assessment, which you already have today for the high deductible plan, but we’ll be deploying it for all employees and their spouses. Also a biometrics screening – a simple screen, not a full panel – but it’s your BMI, blood pressure, LDLs and glucose and getting that information. So there’s nothing the individual has to do with it, the individual just has to become aware of their health status. And that then determines the credits. So also, let’s not forget non-use of tobacco. It’s something we do today, we’ll just fold it in the program a different way. So the first year is about getting to know your health status. And contributions would go up for the employee and of course if you can cover your spouse or domestic partner it would go up and then there’s incentives for each to
offset that increase. That’s the first year though. The second year is about outcomes. So you’ve got four outcomes. The LDL levels, glucose, body mass index, and blood pressure, and then having a program like meeting targets and they would be generous targets. One of the complexities here as I see it is physicians may actually want individuals to have lower targets than we’re going to suggest because these are targets for healthy individuals. I’ll give you an example. The body mass index around 25-27, I think, is what’s recommended. We’ll probably go with around 30, less than 30. That index is on that threshold of getting obese. So we’ll have to work on some communication pieces here, but that’s year two. And year three is less defined – we have a lot of infrastructure to build – it’s about compliance with physician or provider recommendations. An example as a layperson would be compliance with physician prescribed medication and so when physicians prescribe medication, does the employee actually take it? And compliance then generates the credits and so forth. So that’s just a real quick overview of a program that we’re calling the Health Engagement Program, engagement for your personal health. When we first began to put the pieces together, it was a little exciting that we were doing something cutting edge, come to find out that we’re not. This is the trend across large institutions. I want to say corporate, but I don’t mean literally corporate America, but large higher ed AAU institutions, as well. And incentives tend to be the economic driver for these pieces. I also thought it was going to be unique of not just looking at the employee but the spouse and again I found that many other institutions are doing it as well. So, again, just a real basic overview of what the program consists of.

**ATKINSON:** So this will be implemented with the first premium increases offset by the self-assessment piece?

**RIVES:** Yeah, for January 2011 the incentive is based on getting to know your health status. It’s not based on achieving certain outcomes. That’s year two.

**ATKINSON:** I think you’ve been discussing with at least our Fringe Benefit Committee that there may be differential premiums or differential offset of the premiums based on...

**RIVES:** Sure! We actually have a small advisory group and went to Erika and Simon to get representatives on the group and Jim and Dominic are our members. And so when you think of incentives at $30,000 annual compensation, the incentives could be one amount but as compensation grows, if you kept that same incentive, if you kept $20 a month as the same incentive, it probably means a lot less to someone making $100,000. So the concept would be to have it tiered, though a suggestion’s been thrown out as percentages but the current thinking is to tier it. And this is different thinking for us than we’ve ever done before. We currently have our employee contributions based on membership and there’s no salary component, and what we’re looking at is a salary component so that the higher compensation, the higher the potential for paying higher contributions. And we’re thinking of tiering under 30 which sort of represents what we
do today for the under $28,000 and then 30, 60, 120, and above 120. A suggestion from the benefits committee was to do it by percentages and we’re exploring that possibility. That’s going to be very complex, but we’re going to explore that.

**ATKINSON:** I think the concern about tiering is that if somebody’s earning $29,999 dollars and they get a dollar a year pay increase –

**RIVES:** – Sure –

**ATKINSON:** – that moves them up and then they take more money away from their paycheck in health premiums and...

**RIVES:** – Unless they meet the outcomes which is really our goal is to have a healthier population.

**ATKINSON:** Right.

**RIVES:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments or questions for Dan?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** So how are you going to collect the information? Is it going to be just our word or how...? [laughter]

**RIVES:** Good question. The question is, how are we going to collect the information? Well, the health risk assessment’s an online tool and I don’t recall the department out of Michigan which developed the tool and it’s currently being deployed by Clarian Health. So we’re going to use Clarian Health as a very strong partner to collect both the risk assessment and the biometric segments. So even today we have onsite biometrics. We’ll also do that on a larger scale for the employee and spouse. The data will go to Clarian Health. It will be aggregated. So one question I frequently get is, what about confidentiality and security of the data? The university won’t get the data. We’re not interested in the actual LDL levels. We’re interested in whether or not the credits were achieved, but not the actual amounts in the biometrics. So we would use web-based applications which are, you know, scalable university wide for the risk assessment. The biometrics will be done either onsite, promptcares, physician offices, there will even be a toolkit so your physicians could obviously provide the data. It’s not actually done by the person putting it in. It’s done by some mechanism like physicians or a provider collecting it. I would also say that the non-use of tobacco will be taken to a slightly different level. Today it’s just completely an affidavit but in the future it will be the affidavit plus a cotinine test, if I’m pronouncing that right, which is testing the enzyme in the blood – see what I’m learning about? – checking the enzyme in the blood for the use of tobacco so you’ve got the two pieces to get that credit. But all kept by Clarian Health and this is not Clarian the hospital this is a division of Clarian Health that does EAP.
programs and these kinds of programs for other employers and it will never be comingled with Tom’s office or my office. You know, there’s laws that protect employees from medical information being used for employment decisions.

**BLACKWELL:** Dan?

**RIVES:** Yes, ma’am?

**BLACKWELL:** This is Jacqui Blackwell in Indianapolis. About the tobacco test, will this be a part of the blood panel to test for this?

**RIVES:** It may very well be. The cotinine test is either, as I understand it, a part of the blood draw or a swab and so we’re getting some prices together from Clarian Health but it could either be part of the blood or a swab inside the mouth, the gums.

**BLACKWELL:** I have a question, so if we choose not to participate in any of this, should we expect an increase in premiums as the employees?

**RIVES:** Yes, ma’am.

**BLACKWELL:** Significant?

**RIVES:** The first year, so we want to put it in a way that it’s reasonable the first year, but the second year it would go up even more and so what is significant? I guess it all depends on levels of pay. I gave you an approximate level at less than $30,000 then $20 additional per month unless you’re married then that’s doubled, it’s $40, if you cover the spouse. That can be meaningful but that number would even increase the following year. This is a really significant matter fiscally for the university. I have to tell you between the CEO of the university and the trustees and the CFO there’s no matter that is more important in terms of containing costs than healthcare and so there is a possibility employees would pay more for health care.

**BLACKWELL:** I understand. So that means if we’re working with our doctor, then our doctor would not be trumped by all of this in terms of what would be in our best interest?

**RIVES:** Oh, very good question. So when you think of – this is year two – when you look at the biometric outcomes, there are lots of alternatives; that I’m pregnant, treating for cancer, bone marrow, there’s a whole host of treatment plans that doctors would say ‘I’m treating someone for XYZ’ and that would then satisfy the credit. And also if someone is under a smoking cessation program or nutrition program, blood pressure programs, really look to physicians to identify what those programs are. So there will be lots of alternatives of that nature, and the idea is to have a healthier population and for
someone working to get a healthier outcome that’s in the right direction from an incentive perspective.

BLACKWELL: Thank you.

WERT: This is Joe Wert from the Southeast campus. Would this program apply to everyone on all the campuses no matter what their insurance was, even if we’re not associated with Clarian?

RIVES: So, good question. We have three healthcare plan options today. Think of this as an umbrella that sits above all three plans regardless of what you enroll in. Now if you don’t sign up for the university’s plans, obviously it does not apply. We have around 900 employees who don’t sign up for IU healthcare. So obviously it does not apply to them. They’re not paying anything. But if you pay a contribution for one of the three healthcare plans, it would apply and if you cover a spouse and domestic partner or a domestic partner it would apply at all campuses university wide.

PAYDAR: This is Nasser from East. Have we done any studies to see how the healthcare reform is going to affect the university years from now and how premiums may be affected and how we should budget for that?

RIVES: Yes, sir. In fact I’ve got a presentation to the trustees next week on healthcare reform. I think it’s a very good topic. Could I suggest that it probably is going to need more time than I could do justice to here at the moment. Is it something that we could spend some time on at another meeting? Because I think it’s very informative and goes out for years...

MCROBBIE: And there are some issues that are still unclear at this point in time that by the first meeting of the UFC in the fall should probably be clarified. So, you know, maybe a presentation on the agenda for the fall meeting.

RIVES: Yes, sir. I would very much look forward to that.

MCROBBIE: I think people would find that valuable.

RIVES: It’s one of the most important pieces of legislation since maybe social security, but also it’s huge in terms of its volume pages. But it’s going to require a lot of administrative regulations to sort it out and make the definitions. And every time I peel through it I come upon something and say, “What is this?” There’s an example. There’s a description of grandfathered retirement, of grandfathered healthcare plans. Does IU have grandfathered healthcare plans? I think so, but I really need more to quantify that. So, could I come back at a later point and do that?
**ATKINSON:** Should point out that there’s also another committee that’s looking at whether it’s possible to implement some of the other recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

**MCROBBIE:** Will you speak to that since you’re on the ...

**RIVES:** President McRobbie also commissioned another committee. It’s chaired by Neil Theobald, the Chief Financial Officer, and I’m on the committee and several others are on the committee. We’re looking at taking the other recommendations from the Inui report, Tom Inui chairing that blue ribbon committee, and seeing what other items we could promote and engage to contain healthcare cost increases. No savings; just contain the rate of increase. And we’ve got two potential directions we’re moving in but they haven’t been confirmed nor presented yet. I don’t know if they’ve been presented to Michael, to the president, but we’ve got two. One is how can we encourage greater enrollment in high deductible plan and the medical savings plan. So that high deductible plan which is fairly new has lower premiums but it has a very unique feature that can be valuable to our faculty members. It – unlike a tax benefit from a flexible spending account – the monies in that account don’t go away. It actually belongs to the member. It’s sitting outside the university and it rolls over year to year even into retirement. And upon death it goes to a beneficiary. So it’s the employee money. And it has huge preferential tax treatment. There’s no taxes going in. The university puts money into it and the employee puts money into it. Nor when it comes out. So unlike retirement plans where it’s only tax deferred, this plan is non-taxable. There’s nothing like it. We think it’s just a significant benefit for our employees. It’s complicated, the way it works, but we want to get more employees to enroll in it. And then the other direction we’re looking at is, can we construct a fourth healthcare plan option using healthcare, using Clarian and Clarian Quality Partners? So Clarian hospitals, the clinic, and various physician groups and it would be like an HMO plan using Clarian. And we are putting those pieces together to see if that’s really a viable option. So those are the two things we’re working on.

**MCROBBIE:** It is worth commenting, Dan, maybe by way of wrapping this up because we’ve got other things to get through, just to reiterate what Dan said, I think we did some calculations that show that within a couple of years total health care costs would be in the vicinity of about $200 million. We’d be getting up close to that. To put that in perspective, the Kelley School of Business which is the third largest academic unit of the university, its general fund budget is just a bit under $100 million. So it’s two Kelley Schools of Business – that’s just annually – in terms of money. In terms of buildings it’s three buildings the size of the research three building in Indianapolis or four Simon Halls – and that’s per year – on this campus. So it puts in perspective just how much is going into healthcare costs, and those increases are taking money away from the core missions of the institutions. Everything we can do to rein those costs in and slow the rate of increase improves the funds that go to the academic units of the institution.
Okay, alright. Thank you, Dan. Let’s move on to agenda item 6 and let me just say just a couple of words by way of introduction.

I think members of the UFC will remember the background to the public health. I took the decision upon – what was it about a year and a half ago? – something like that, to basically initiate the process on both campuses in Indianapolis and in Bloomington to establish two new schools of public health. The reason, as I think people will know, why it was two rather than one was that I believe both schools, both campuses, had excellent cases for the School of Public Health on this campus it would be based on HPER and then in Indianapolis it would be a completely new school that would grow out of the Department of Public Health in the School of Medicine. And this was forced on us in a sense by the requirement of the accrediting body in public health which really requires a school to be very much a campus specific institution and not to be what we think of as a core school here which may have been a more logical solution. So I wrote a lengthy piece that started the process going and in order to ensure that the two schools will be coordinated as much as possible and to ensure that we don’t have any destructive competition between them, I put in place a coordinating council that reports to me and that Ed Marshall chairs and he is somewhere...Oh, Ed’s over there. That Ed Marshall chairs that has a number of faculty and deans and others on it that I think has been working assiduously to help oversee the planning for both schools on the two campuses. Now Bob Goodman as the HPER dean has spoken to the Council before, a couple of meetings ago I believe it was, and then today we have Dr. Marie Swanson from the School of Medicine from the Department of Public Health in the School of Medicine who is going to present about the creation of the school at IUPUI in Indianapolis. So, Marie do you want to…?

AGENDA ITEM 6: DISCUSSION ON THE CREATION OF TWO NEW SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH AT IUB AND IUPUI

SWANSON: Yes, you have a PowerPoint for me that’s started and President McRobbie I thank you. You’ve pretty much gone through my first slide here. And contrary to what it says here on the agenda, I’m only going to talk about public health on the IUPUI campus. And, you know, I can’t control so I just have to ask you for the next slide. Okay, Steve, thanks. If you could go to the next slide that would be great. Next slide. Basically there were a series of institutional decisions. The first was an IUPUI Faculty Council resolution. Greg Wilson and I were asked to prepare this and it was unanimously approved by our Faculty Council in May of 2008 initially to begin the process to make a request to you, President McRobbie, about developing our school. The next one please, next slide, there we go. The IUPUI Deans’ Council also unanimously approved it and then in May of 2009, President McRobbie made his announcement that he would establish two schools and then the next one…and as you just said, Vice President Marshall is chairing our Public Health Coordinating Committee and we in fact just had a meeting last week and I’m sure we all feel that this is going to be extremely helpful to making sure that we have a lot of complementarity in the two
schools. If we could go to the next slide...Chancellor Bantz then appointed a public health task force on our campus and he made sure that that was representative of many of the schools including medicine. I won’t go through the whole list, but it’s all of the other health profession schools as well as the School of Science and School of Law. It’s hard to tell who has the major programs on health on our campus because health is kind of integrated in many of the things that we do. But at any rate, this group worked with me and we developed a preliminary plan with a timetable and basically what I’m going to show you is the results of that plan and I’m just going to walk you through the steps that we’re taking. One of the things since this is a faculty council that I want to show you and assure you of is that we do have faculty decision making and input throughout this entire process. The difference, of course, on our campus is you have a school here that will be transformed into public health. We are establishing a new school. So the process is, I was going to say a bit different, but it’s considerably different actually. The next slide shows the administrative infrastructure and in November of last year I was appointed the department chair and I have been the department chair for a year and was appointed Vice Chancellor for Public Health. We don’t have a school so we don’t need a dean and so this was the interim appointment. In the next slide, you can see that in spring semester of this year, we appointed division directors and those are division directors for health policy and management. The next slide; social and behavioral sciences and epidemiology and environmental health. So those division directors have been appointed and they include people who were in the department and also people who are moving into the department through transitions from other schools. And as you might imagine as we expand the number of academic programs and the number of faculty and the number of students, we need a very different business office and that expansion is ongoing. The next slide is a proposed organization chart and I’m going to apologize for the quality. We just didn’t have good software for developing it. Essentially it shows that either I or someone will become the dean of this school and we will have associate deans in the areas of community and global health, in bioethics, and in academic programs and we planned — well our proposal was to have four departments. Our strengths are going to be in the areas of health policy and management, biostatistics and epidemiology and environmental health and social and behavioral sciences. Environmental health is going to be a smaller footprint in our school and so we are planning to combine that with epidemiology and that was a faculty decision that could have either gone with health policy because that’s where the environmental health faculty are now in SPEA but we felt it was a better fit with epidemiology, so. So this is a plan as you know, anything can change as things are implemented. We’ll also have two research centers that move on board, the center for bioethics and the center for health policy, and the rest is just the administrative infrastructure. So we have done a slightly different approach in each of those departments or divisions because I’m the chair of the department now. And in biostatistics as the next slide shows, we have a very large group of biostatistics on our campus; about twenty faculty at this time. They’re extremely outstanding. I wouldn’t even want to think about trying to compete with them. We haven’t decided exactly how we’re going to form this, but faculty, those faculty, are making a decision about
whether some of them want to move to public health, whether it’ll be a shared department between the two schools or whether everyone wants to move to public health with an assurance to the School of Medicine of course that we’ll continue with the research support that we have. Since both – if we could have the next slide here as well – since both my department and the biostatistics division which is under the Department of Internal Medicine are both within the School of Medicine, it makes absolutely no sense to transform them from one department to another, so as you’ll see in the rest of the timing here, we hope to be formed as a school in about a year from September and at that time then biostatistics would become part of the School of Public Health. So that’s that will be established. I mean, biostatistics right now with funding that we have for our school is beginning to hire people. They are pretty much 100% funded by research, and so they need to have faculty who have extra time clearly for teaching and that’s being done. The next slide, please. For epidemiology and environmental health we’re doing a little bit of each. The epidemiology faculty we now have six people on board and all of those people have been recruited through national searches and we brought the last hiree on board just a few weeks ago in the middle of March. So we’re extremely pleased with that. One of our strong collaborators is the IU Simon Cancer Center and they’re looking to sort of take the cancer center to the next step to become a comprehensive center in the National Cancer Institute’s terminology and they need more faculty in public health areas. So they may actually be helping us fund yet another position in epidemiology. That’s a possibility. If we could have the next slide please? Environmental health faculty, we have two people who will transfer from SPEA in July 2010 and I want to tell you that the discussion with the SPEA faculty has been ongoing for about a year and those faculty were given the choice very clearly from Chancellor Bantz and from Executive Vice Chancellor Sukhatme and myself that it was entirely up to each faculty member to decide whether they wanted to transfer in or not. And we started with a memorandum of understanding that was developed by the SPEA faculty that might be moving in and then reviewed by us and after a couple of exchanges we had one that everybody agreed to and all the faculty and staff that said they wanted to transfer in had signed it and about a month ago I sent out letters of offer that solidified that for each individual faculty member. They have all signed it. So essentially, the entire health faculty, both in health policy and management and environmental health, while currently housed in SPEA will move in to our department on July 1st. And we also will be recruiting additional faculty here in environmental health through national searches. We, in order to meet the accreditation criteria, have one faculty in the department, we’re adding two. We need to have five. So we’ll do additional searches for those two faculty. In the next slide, and the next one, too, as well please, we have health policy and management. This is a majority as – if you’re familiar with SPEA – you know the majority of the health faculty are in the health policy and management area and they will be joining the department of public health on July 1st. And again we’re going to start two searches for additional faculty on July 1st of this year so I have four faculty currently in the department, I think six or seven faculty are moving in from SPEA. So this is going to be one of the strengths of our faculty in the new school of public health. The next slide please? We now have a division of social and
behavioral sciences which will become a department under the school and essentially we have four faculty members now in that department, that division, and we’re recruiting two additional individuals through national searches. And when those two are finished that will be the complement that we will have to start the school.

One of the things that I want to be sure we’re doing which is why we’re here today and I really thank you for inviting me to talk to you about this is to make sure that the IU community is informed every step of the way. And the next slide shows that I made a presentation to the IUPUI Faculty Council earlier in this semester. The next slide indicates the presentation I’m making here today. The next line on this slide shows that we have ongoing discussions. The main ones on our campus that are involved of course it’s the school of medicine, the school of science, and SPEA so those are discussions that I essentially think will be going on not only until we establish a school but probably after that as well. And then the last line here, we have continuing discussions with many other entities on campus because as we develop doctoral programs in particular there are faculty in dentistry or nursing for example that are teaching courses that are very appropriate for these and we’re trying to make sure that we don’t duplicate efforts. So this is something that I see as not only a continuing obligation but something that I want to be sure happens that we do keep people informed as we move along. The Masters of Public Health as you know I’m sure from Dean Goodman’s presentation here has five core areas. Every accredited school of public health in the country must meet these five core areas. You can have one, none or a hundred others if you want, but you must have these five. The ones we currently have as you can see are epidemiology, health policy and management, and social and behavioral sciences. In the fall we will be starting environmental health and in the fall of 2011 we’ll begin the MPH in biostatistics. Just to give you a little history, the MPH program has been around now and accredited for the past eleven years. When it was started it was begun with all five concentrations so in fact the Indiana Commission on Higher Education and the university have already approved us to teach all five of those MPH. At that time the faculty didn’t come on board as quickly as people had hoped so they cut it back to three. So we currently offer three. We’re adding one in a few months and we’ll be off to all five later. Again, with moving the SPEA faculty into the department, the Masters of Health Administration on our campus also will move into it. And one of the things that I think will be beneficial both for the MPH students and the MHA students there’s a lot of similarity in courses so we’re going to obviously look for some efficiencies in terms of perhaps two courses on health policy or two courses on management that maybe can be made into one and I’m thinking getting a little more of the more business sense into our public health students and little more of the public health perspective into the MHA students. So we’re hoping that that will be beneficial to both of those Masters level students. The next slide, please? Every accredited school of public health must have three doctoral programs in three of those five core areas. We already have a biostatistics PhD that was initiated last year we just admitted our first class of PhD students in our new epidemiology program and the health policy PhD proposal is being heard this afternoon in our Graduate Advisory Council on our campus. So those will be our three doctoral
programs. The next slide, please? And the next slide? If we can add the next line, we also have two bachelors degrees. These are already in existence on our campus under SPEA. They will move in with them and at the moment, the Bachelor of Science in Public Health is focused predominantly on environmental health. As you can see from earlier slides that is really not our strength on our campus. It’s a much bigger strength in fact on this campus [Bloomington. Editor’s note]. And so we’re going to broaden that to make it a broad based undergraduate program in public health. And we actually are putting together a task force under Carol Kaciou’s oversight among several schools on our campus and that will be probably taught jointly through faculty in liberal arts, science and public health. The next slide is, and the next lines to this slide, please? As we go through it, we have very strong community connections. This of course is just a sampling of them with the Marion County Health Department, the Fairbanks Institute which actually is doing some public health research, the Regenstrief Institute, the Wishard Hospital and Eli Lilly and Co. So those are just a sample of some of the ones. These are places where our students go for internships. Some people, Virginia Caine who’s the director of the Marion County Health Department and the Wishard Corporation, teaches in our infectious disease course and is a mentor to many of our graduate students. So we have very strong connections. We have two Eli Lilly company faculty who teach full courses for us. And one of the things we’ll be able to do because of Lilly being in our community is we’ll have a specialization in our PhD and epidemiology for pharmacoepidemiology and we have faculty at Lilly who are very excited about helping us with that. The next slide? And if we could add the next lines to that slide? This just again shows some of our community connections across the state. Carol Kaciou who’s here with me today has been the former president of the Indiana Rural Health Association, the Indiana Public Health Association, the Indiana Minority Health Coalition, of course the Indiana State Health Department. I expect those will be partners to both of the schools and so we’re also very strongly connected to those. So again, this is just some of the samples of places where we have preceptors for our students to do internships and their research projects and some of the people there actually teach with us. In Purdue University I’ve been approached by the chairman of their nutritional sciences program and she’s very interested in seeing if we can have an exchange between our new doctoral program in epidemiology and their doctoral program in nutritional sciences so that if one of our students wanted to have a minor in nutritional sciences or if one of their students wanted to have a minor in epidemiology that’s a possibility, so we’re looking at that level of collaboration as well. The next slide? We just submitted last week our preliminary self-study to CEPH [Council on Education for Public Health, editor’s note]. We’re a year behind the school here. I know you did this last year and so that was submitted last week. The next line shows that our final self-study must go in in August of 2010. We have a site visit scheduled for September of this year. September 27th and 8th, yes I have memorized those dates. And on the 29th I will be very happy. In the next line please? The decision notification, I’ve actually been a member of the Council on Education for Public Health’s board and I know that their January meeting is a retreat. They do not make accreditation decisions which means it will be next May or
June before we get our written decision. And so in July of 2011 we will have a decision about the renewal of our MPH accreditation and because I know these criteria well and I’ve served on the board, I know we’re in great shape so I really don’t expect problems with that. And the next slide shows us what we need to do to form our School of Public Health. The next slide, please? The accreditation process once we have that formal renewal of our MPH program in writing we can then announce that we have the school. This is projected for September of 2011. I tend to be – I’m not conservative in many things – but when it comes to something where you have a timeline, if by September ’11 I’m convinced that we have all the pieces or nearly all the pieces that we need to be an accredited school, then we will go ahead and form the school and announce it.

Obviously, President McRobbie, as you know, that needs to be approved by you, by the board of trustees and then eventually by the Indiana Commission on Higher Education so clearly these all have to be tentative assuming that all of the review processes take place. And so this is our goal, and that’s the best way to describe it. It’s a goal. In the next line if that happens in September, then the way you become an applicant is there’s actually, if you go the CEPH website, there’s an application you submit asking to be reviewed for accreditation as a school. The plan would be to submit that application in October assuming that the school was formed in September. The next line then, there’s also an Association of Schools of Public Health. One can only be a member if you’re an accredited school. You can be an associate member once you’re accepted to be reviewed. I’ve also served on the executive committee of ASPH so I know how they work and the plan would be to submit for membership as an associate member at that time in January and then, again, from the date that we are accepted to be reviewed as accreditation we have two years to go through the accreditation process which means as soon as we’re relaxed from finishing our first self-study an accreditation we’ll be doing one for the school which is fine. And so that will take place and we estimate knowing the timeline that we would have a site visit sometime in the fall of 2013. So about three years from now. The next slide, please? The resources that we have, I have actually for Chancellor Bantz prepared a budget estimate and have submitted that to him and it shows basically 2010 through 2014 even though we’re now a department the expansion of a department clearly is not for the MPH program it’s for the development of the school and so I have submitted that and we have initiated development activities as you may have read in the next line, we did receive a grant from the Lilly Corporation Foundation of a million dollars and that is being used for a variety of things; predominantly for faculty support to help us recruit faculty and for student scholarships. Those are the two main things that those funds are being used for. In terms of our projections for the future, again I prefer to be conservative not knowing exactly who the faculty are or what their research capacity would be so we have estimated a very conservatively for researching direct costs and for tuition and for a growth that I think is much lower at least than I’m hoping it will be of just a few percent a year. And right now it looks as if our revenue is going to be about a third from new institutional funds, about a third from tuition and about a third from indirect costs. And so that is being. I know that Chancellor Bantz, I think he’s shared it with you President McRobbie, and we’ll be preparing that into a formal plan for the school over the next few months. And
then the last one is, as I always say, space is the final frontier. We never know where it is or where we’re going to find it and that’s an interesting question for us right now. At this point we’re not sure. I was a founding dean of the College of Public Health at the University of Arizona and I started that job with faculty and students in twenty-two locations. So far we’re only in three so it’s not so bad. And when I got there, I thought, ‘Gee, it’d be fun to walk around so I know where everything is,’ and my finance person says, ‘you know, they’re twenty and thirty miles from here,’ so we walked to anything that was within ten miles. So we’ll have a much easier walk in this place. And then the last one is the one I hope to invite all of you to and that would be a celebration around January 2014. So I’d be more than happy to answer questions. What I’m looking for is the slide that will let you hear the cork pop.

MCROBBIE: Before we do that, Ed would you want to add anything?

MARSHALL: Just to say that I think, you know, this is a very, very significant series of events for Indiana University. We’ve talked before about the importance of Public Health not only to IU but to the larger community we serve, both the state and nation. The collaboration between the two campuses is ensured not only through the work of the coordinating council but I think public health is founded on the spirit of collaboration and partnership. And I think that moving forward what you will see is the evolution of two programs that will have a significant and lasting impact upon the health of the state, both the physical health but also the economic health. Because as we know economic development is the key issue for us and it’s hard for companies to think about locating and thriving in an environment where the population is essentially unhealthy. We’ve seen from talks before that the amount of resources spent in this state on public health Indiana ranks in the bottom fiftieth in terms of capital spending on public health. Much of that has to do because we don’t have schools of public health to go out and compete for those dollars. So we are at the forefront of changing a lot of that. It’s a long road, it’s been a long road, it will be a long road ahead, but I feel blessed that we have people like Marie and Bob leading this initiative at the campus levels and we will make sure we bring to you a product that’s going to make Indiana University and the state proud in terms of the health that we are able to ensure.

MCROBBIE: Thanks Ed, any questions for Marie at all? Any questions?

TERRY: I hope I have a voice. First of all congratulations on your progress I was fortunate to work with President McRobbie when the decision was made to go with two schools and I’m glad to see progress being made. One question I have is what do you anticipate future relationships being with the School of Medicine? Some schools offer joint MD/MPH programs –

SWANSON: We already have that.

TERRY: You already have that.
**SWANSON:** One MD/MPH and a joint MD and we will establish more MD/PhD’s as we develop.

**TERRY:** The second question is that are about a third of revenue coming from indirect cost recovery fairly typical for schools of public health?

**SWANSON:** Actually, it’s low.

**TERRY:** It’s low.

**SWANSON:** I would say that most schools of public health are supported 60-70% between direct and indirect research funding.

**TERRY:** Okay, then I think that justifies the third question I have which may be informative for the Council. The last item on today’s agenda has to do with the IU tenure clock.

**SWANSON:** Right.

**TERRY:** You’re recruiting now.

**SWANSON:** Right.

**TERRY:** Are you having trouble with the seven-year tenure clock? What’s the pattern in schools of public health?

**SWANSON:** Since we’re a very new department and we just have started hiring people who are tenure eligible or tenure track it’s hard to know that. I personally would say to you that anybody who has to compete for federal funding from NIH or CDC the extended tenure clock is a huge advantage. It’ll be an advantage for recruiting people and especially for retaining people. Because if you look at the midterm review at about three years, if a person is really lucky and really outstanding – we’ve hired two assistant professors that I’m sure are going to be stars – but if I look at it compared to when I started and what they’re facing it was no problem for me to get an NIH RO1 in a year. It will be a challenge for them to get it and have the first one funded in two to three years. And so you have to do one of two things, you either change your standards and say, ‘okay, one grant’s enough,’ – well, tenure should mean you have established a track record. I see a huge advantage into the advanced track record.

**TERRY:** So at the moment the short clock is not posing a....
**SWANSON:** Well, it’s because we have people that have just started that. I mean, I could say that within, say, three years when the junior faculty come up it could very well pose a problem.

**TERRY:** You are not losing candidates who look at the job description and say, ‘I’m not going to apply for that because it’s only a seven year clock?’

**SWANSON:** They’re not really asking those kinds of questions.

**ATKINSON:** What’s the national environment in schools of public health in terms of the tenure clock?

**SWANSON:** They tend to model themselves after schools of medicine. My alma mater is Johns Hopkins and they have ten years. And so that I would say is becoming a standard in schools of public health.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions for Marie? Questions, questions out in cyberland? Oh sorry, Erika?

**DOWELL:** I have a question, I don’t know if it’s for Marie, but I know that the School of Public Health is affecting SPEA up in Indianapolis quite a bit and I wondered if either Simon or you might perhaps have an update on how that is going? How they’re doing with the dramatic change that will be coming to their school?

**MCROBBIE:** I don’t have a....

**SWANSON:** I’ll be happy to answer what I know.

**DOWELL:** Sure!

**SWANSON:** Obviously I’m part of that. I can say from what I’ve seen and what Eric Wright has shared with me, it began with a lot of questions, a lot of concerns, a bit of a struggle. I think what helped people was, it really was every individual faculty member’s personal choice and so when the agreement was signed last November people still had some questions, but I think they felt calmer. I have met with them periodically, sometimes I feel it’s better if someone else meets with them with me not there and that’s happened as well. And Eric Wright has really been the key person there and then they had a second chance when I sent them their letters of offer and two people had, three people, actually four people, sent me questions by email. Two of them chose to come meet with me, one of them still had a lot of concerns and I actually wrote her a separate letter from me to her saying that the MOU establishes the conditions. Basically what we said was the terms of employment under which you were hired in SPEA will not be changed as you move in. And people had the choice of staying ten months or going twelve months, so each individual faculty member had that choice and they made those
choices. And there were some other questions she had and I just wrote her, you know, I gave her my personal assurance that the things she was worried about were not going to be a problem. So I think, you know, we’re all different. I happen to thrive on change and most people are very nervous and upset about change and very concerned about what is going to be different. And there were a couple of junior faculty who actually got their tenure clock extended. They had only been there, in one case for two years and in another for one, and we gave them a choice if they moved in we told them that tenure clock would be extended. So that’s been done. So I think things are as comfortable as can be. One of the things I’ve done, we actually started in January of having faculty join us, we actually have the biostatistics faculty joining our faculty meetings now. I mean, you know, we’re making decisions, I either have to make it three times – once now and another time when the SPEA faculty join and the third time when biostatistics join us – or we have everybody now. I can see absolutely no downside to having everybody involved. And we’ve formed an executive committee and Eric Wright from SPEA is part of it and Barry Katz who’s the head of the Biostatistics Division is part of that. So it just seems to me that it’s….I want people to see that they have all the input that they want and need. And, you know, I’m open to talking to people by phone, by email, in person, whatever they want. So I’m trying to be as open as possible, and I know actually what’s really been the best thing is when I recruit people in from national searches they tell me one of the things that really appreciate about IU is the openness and the collaboration. Whether it’s people in my department or the School of Medicine or around campus actually one candidate has a doctoral student whose on your faculty here in Bloomington and wanted to see what that person thought about things. So what I’m seeing is that people are very pleased with the openness and collaboration on the campus. That is for me a surprisingly large draw for some of our national candidates. That’s a really good thing.

ATKINSON: The other component of the SPEA question is the faculty who remain in SPEA after the transfer of faculty to the School of Public Health and initially I think there was a lot of concern from the faculty who remained in SPEA about what is the future of SPEA as a viable unit on the Indianapolis campus. There have been a lot of discussions involving the campus administration, the dean of SPEA and the new associate dean of SPEA in Indianapolis and I think there’s a positive commitment from everybody to move forward and identify a new focus for the school in Indianapolis. I think that those discussions are moving forward in a productive way from what I’ve heard.

SWANSON: And from a finance point of view, basically the revenues that are transferred in are completely covered by undergraduate – I mean there’s nothing above and beyond the expenses that are also being brought in. So SPEA isn’t losing any money that’s sort of above and beyond the expenses that are coming in. The other thing I should have mentioned is we have a series of transition committees that are working. One is at the faculty level, one is information technology, and the other is just administrative support. So we are trying to take care of all of those things. Those have started working since January, because there are different cultures, different ways of doing things and my
impression is that things are working reasonably effectively. We’ll know on July 2\textsuperscript{nd} after everybody moves in.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? Anybody out there? Anybody on the other campuses? Okay, good! Thanks, Marie. Thanks very much. I think you’re making superb progress, very impressive.

SWANSON: Thank you, and thanks for the opportunity. I appreciate it.

AGENDA ITEM 7: DISCUSSION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRINCIPLE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE ON CAMPUSSES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MCROBBIE: Alright, let’s move on to agenda item 7. Let me start and I’ll say something about what I committed to do which was to review executive review. The key thing that I’ve done here is to remove the executive vice president from the role of sort of being a step between the chancellors and me. So the final decisions are made by myself in conversation with the chancellors. Now there have been I think – there are maybe some misunderstandings about this and I want to make it clear exactly how this works. In fact we’ve now just completed the process – this is the second year, to put some context here – I don’t have exactly in my head, but last year there were about 240 or so promotion and tenure cases across the whole university. The number that are controversial is very, very small. It was in the vicinity of five to six last year. It was in the vicinity of five to six this year. The great bulk are clear cut one way or the other. There are some that maybe take a little discussion but tend to be pretty straightforward. There tends to be just a very small number that are controversial for a wide range of reasons. Obviously I don’t intend to discuss any details these are matters of strictest confidentiality, the specific details. The process then is that I have meet with – where I have had to, and sometimes it hasn’t even been necessary where it’s all clear-cut – I’ve had discussions with the chancellors or the provost and then I make a final discussion based on that discussion with the chancellor or the provost. The chancellors or the provost are at liberty to record their own vote either the same as what mine is or a differing vote. And we have some of the chancellors on the phone, and some of them they’re not exactly shrinking violets and they have the opportunity to record their own vote if they wish. And I’m sure where they want to they will take advantage of this where it is appropriate. All appeals, nothing has changed with respect to appeals. Appeals can be made and have been as they wish. Like I said, there is no change at all in that regard. So I regard, and I know that Herb did some detective work on his own right a couple of years ago to determine, this in fact is how things have always worked. I’ve endeavored just to make this a little more transparent than it’s been in the past. And I’ve just clarified it with respect to how it works at the regionals but I have removed, as I said, the EVP level of review and made it a direct dialogue between myself and the chancellors. I should add that the role of the – and it has a rather long name – the Office of the Vice President for University Regional Affairs and Policy and Planning is purely one of handling the flow of paperwork. The amount of paperwork involved is prodigious.
in this area. That office is not involved in the formal assessment of any of these cases. So that’s what I’ve got to report on executive review. And we take the cases to the next trustee meeting next week and each campus has slightly different procedures as to how and when they notify candidates and I believe now that all decisions are taken all of that is in the process in being done or has been done, I don’t exactly know where it is on every campus. But I know it’s well underway now. Bloomington may well be the last in that regard, Tom. So that’s what I have to report. Maybe one way to proceed is to go around the table with respect to each campus having them comment where they are with respect to the implementation of the principles in the document itself. I understand in general terms from John Applegate who has been coordinating this, that most campuses where they weren’t already doing the things that were described in that document have made changes that bring them pretty much in line with that which is gratifying and commendable. Maybe we can have some comment on where the issues are, I don’t know where we want to start. Who would like to start?

ATKINSON: Maybe we can start with Indianapolis. Maybe Mary it would be...? If you could just summarize where the Indianapolis campus policy stood prior to this and the relatively minor changes that were made in light of the principles.

FISHER: We were pretty much 95% in compliance before. Some of our wording wasn’t as clear as it could have been. We had guidelines that will be posted to the web next week. We are now at 100% in compliance with the policy.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Mary. Maybe we can do cyberland first, as it were. Stuart, do you want to comment at all for Kokomo? Sorry...yeah, please, please.

GREEN: I would let John make the comments as he’s president of the Senate.


ROSS: We presented at our last meeting, five motions breaking it down smaller then the whole package trying to get into compliance with everything. By the time we discussed everything and worked on each of the words we only got two approved. Whether the five are going to have us fully in compliance Craig’s been looking at things and so we’re going to be trying to be sure that things finish up pretty smoothly early next fall as far as being on track. We were generally in compliance anyway but some of the words need to be changed.

ATKINSON: So there aren’t any difficult issues for Kokomo in terms of getting in compliance?

ROSS: Not in my view, no. Now, the incoming president of the faculty, Todd Bradley, behind me over there, he may have problems next year but I won’t have any problems. [laughter]
GREEN: Let me also observe that I think that the issues we are talking about in terms of procedural we are largely in compliance with. I think there are some other issues that we’re working on that are particular to the campus that aren’t per se about procedure that deal with how to differentiate standards for moving from the associate degree appointment to the full appointment, those are really the knottier issues that we’re still working through on the campus. But I think in terms of being in compliance with procedures, I think we’re very, very close on some of them.

MCROBBIE: Thanks. Thanks, John and Stuart. Who would like to go next?

HINNEFELD: I can report for South Bend. We’ve taken a number of actions at the last three Academic Senate meetings January, February, and March in response to the UFC document from last April. One issue that’s problematic for our campus, even as one of the larger regional campuses, is the number of full professors that are available to serve on the various committees. We had no restrictions on the membership of tenured faculty members on the Academic Senate committee before these actions. We cannot populate our PT and R Committee even at the campus level, let alone at the school and college level, completely with full professors and have a reasonable size for that committee. So what we have chosen to do is to require that at least three of the seven members of the Academic Senate PT and R Committee hold full rank. We’ve had a tradition on the South Bend campus of including one non-tenured faculty member as a voting member of the PT and R Committee so we’ve given that up in response to the UFC action last spring. So that’s probably the most problematic issue we’ve had to deal with. At the school and college level the largest academic unit is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and that college has taken a similar action in requiring a certain minimum number and that case, too, although we think that number can grow as the number of full professors in the college grows...

MCROBBIE: How many full professors do you have? I confess I can’t remember.

HINNEFELD: The campus as a whole I believe has 50, I think it’s in there, but many of those of those are in fact administrators. So the number that are really available to serve on the committees is about thirty – twenty-five to thirty – and they would have to populate the Academic Senate committee, the school and college committees. There are some units at the school and college level who have no full professors other than administrators. So our sense is that we have, in fact, made a good faith effort in response to the UFC action last April. The principle of executive review, as I think you know, has been controversial also at the South Bend campus, and the senate passed a resolution at the March meeting, outlining the reservations and objections to executive review. And that’s been included as part of the report our campus submitted to the UFC.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Erika did you?
Dowell: Jonathan Plucker is going to report for....

McRobbie: Jon?

Plucker: Many of the same issues, interestingly, but the not-having-enough-full professors issue came up at Bloomington, too. For many of our smaller COAS programs and departments don’t have a lot of full professors at this point, and when you only have four or five professors period in an entire program only pulling the fulls out for some cases is problematic. Most of the issues that came up – Tom can correct me if I’m wrong here – were largely procedural interpretation, how were we defining this versus that and I think most were fairly easily clarified. The issue of proxy versus absentee balloting came up often. A lot of people think proxy means absentee and vice versa, I think there was some miscommunication early on where people on this campus thought that absentee balloting was explicitly prohibited. That’s actually not our reading of the policy. So we are recommending at least that part be clarified. Executive review came up early and often as you know on this campus. We heard very passioned arguments in both directions. This is defiantly an issue where very reasonable people can disagree reasonably. We really didn’t have any recommendations on that point other than that it probably needs to be discussed some more. I think those were really the major issues. Tom, did you have some others?

Gieryn: One specifically that I’m sure will come up at some point has to do with the categories, the evaluative categories and the need to introduce “Very good.” This is needed because in a balanced case, as you know, the implicit standard is “Very good” across all three areas of teaching, research, and service. So we need to add a “Very good” in the list on point eight in order to allow for universitywide standard in balanced cases.

Hinnefeld: That was noted in the South Bend report.

McRobbie: Good, reasonable. Let’s see, Southeast maybe? Joe?

Wert: Yeah, this is Joe from Southeast. Our faculty affairs committee looked at our faculty manual and made the changes to the wording in that part of the faculty manual which dealt with faculty promotion and tenure procedures and we actually were pretty much in compliance already. The main thing that came up – a couple of things that came up – were the number of letters. We were kind of an outlier there, but we have put the four letter policy into place. And another question that had come up was related to lecturers, and I know we had talked about lecturers being dealt with at some point in another document, and there was basically some question if that was actually going to happen or whether this policy actually was supposed to apply to lecturers and clinical faculty. But as far as the procedures we have put ourselves, I think, pretty much in compliance with the document. We haven’t had any problems this year, but I think next
year may be a little more problematic as these procedures actually get put into practice especially in terms of the membership on some of the committees.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Joe. Laverne? Nasser?

**NISHIHARA:** Yes, this is the report from East. IU East has had a lot of problems finding enough full professors to comprise 100% of the P and T committee here. We have nine faculty with the rank of professor and some of them are deans, also. We do permit deans to serve on the promotion and tenure committee when those deans do not themselves have people from their schools coming up for P and T. We decided that what we can do, and I agree with this, is we must at all points have at least two members of our P and T committee of six people be full professors. I’ll share that I’m trying to put together some alternates for another committee of simply tenured professors, not necessarily full, and I’m having trouble coming up with a slate of just tenured professors who are not from the Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences. So in the years to come perhaps we can increase the number of fulls on our committee. We did make more explicit that each faculty member and administrator who participates in the P and T process votes only once in any particular case, so people who are on the school promotion and tenure committee may not vote on the campus P and T committee. And otherwise, yes, everyone gets only one vote. We made it explicit that external reviewers cannot have a personal relationship or significant relationship with the candidate. And we did not alter the practice, policy, and procedure at East that at every stage of the P and T process a candidate must receive a copy of the letter of recommendation. So the candidate receives a letter after the school P and T committee makes its recommendation, after the dean makes its recommendation, after the executive vice chancellor makes its recommendation and we have kept the provision that the chancellor also writes a letter of recommendation before the dossier leaves campus. About the executive review process, this was a reaction from the faculty affairs committee of East. There was objection of removing the pre-executive review letter that the chancellor has always written before the dossier leaves the campus. So we wanted to keep that for sake of transparency, informing the candidate at every stage of the P and T process. The FAC committee also is questioning whether executive review can be instituted unilaterally without the approval of all the faculty as well. Finally, there is uneasiness that people coming up for tenure early who can expect only one full review, according to the policy, may be disadvantaged because the executive review is fusing the decision of the chancellor and the president into one stage instead of the two different stages. So that’s the response of the FAC committee from IU East and I’ve also summarized the responses to the P and T guidelines. So I think we did quite a bit coming into compliance.

**MCROBBIE:** Could you explain your very last point, I confess I didn’t quite understand it. About the fusing and whatever?
**NISHIHARA:** This is about candidates who seek tenure early. That people who are seeking tenure early can expect only one full review. They can be informed of any negative decisions and recommendations before it reaches the final decision, and such a candidate coming up early for a review maybe disadvantaged because the final two stages of the review are fused into one.

**ATKINSON:** The idea is that a candidate that comes up early can withdraw their dossier at any point in the process –

**NISHIHARA:** Yes.

**ATKINSON:** – before a final decision is made.

**MCROBBIE:** Let’s have a look at that. Let’s have a look at that, that’s a good point. That’s worth giving some thought to. Okay. Jack, you?

**GALLMEIER:** We were pretty much in full compliance, you know, from the beginning. Our only difficulty of course is the one that everyone seems to have shared – Jerry and others – is the rank - full professors on all campus P and T. We struggled a bit with that but this year actually we did quite well, we had a clear majority of full professors. I think we had two that were not and that stems more from the College of Health and Human Services is still new and much of the population there are lecturers and the full professors are administrators. So that’s something we still need to work with, but I think it’s stopped a major problem when you have a majority of full professors and only two associate professors… I think that’s getting as close as we can right now to compliance and it might improve since we’ve just discovered in the past couple of days that SPEA it looks like is going to become part of the College of Health and Human Services along with the other schools in CHHS. That’s going to give us better population. One of difficulties we have is getting representation from CHHS to meet that issue of full professors. So we’re getting there. We also took the opportunity this year since we had to do this to start revising our P and T guidelines campus wide. Also to take a look at department and school guidelines to make them more standardized. And also to take a look at some of the issues that have to do with promotion to senior lecturer. That, of course, isn’t completed and I expect to see more of that, since I was re-elected, in faculty affairs committee in the fall and we are going to continue moving that direction so we have better standardization. So I would say we have done well. I appreciate your response in terms of executive review and what I would like to respectfully ask is perhaps we can get that in writing or something? A document that I could have to share with my colleagues?

**MCROBBIE:** Sure.
GALLMEIER: Because that’s the only thing we were still waiting for, but our executive review, our process, has never been an issue for us in the same way many of our colleagues on other regional campuses. So that’s where we are.

MCROBBIE: Sure, sure. Have any of the campuses having trouble with finding enough full professors thought about, you know, the case of South Bend, people from Notre Dame and East, I guess Earlham, and up there, you know, maybe from Purdue at Calumet? I mean, have people thought about whether they could be used to help fill out the ranks of fulls. I realize that’s very complicated and it raises all kinds of difficult issues but has that ever been looked at?

HINNEFELD: The committee that was dealing with it at –

GREEN: At our campus we’ve also looked at using emeritus faculty members who’ve obtained rank, and re-engaging that, and part of what we have been working on – the Kokomo campus – is to develop criteria for those emeritus faculty members and faculty members who are not actually on our campus who could serve. So, for example, borrowing faculty who are in that school and at that rank from another regional campus, that’s another approach that we are looking at.

MCROBBIE: Right.

GALLMEIER: At Northwest we’ve thought of that in terms of South Bend, but apparently they’ve had some difficulties themselves. [laughter] I think that’s an interesting idea because we’re close of course to Notre Dame and Saint Mary’s and other places in the area. That might be something I think we should investigate. I wasn’t sure we were able to do that, but certainly I would like to pursue that if that would be possible.

MCROBBIE: Well, actually I can’t think why we couldn’t do it but maybe there’s some reason that one can think of very rapidly.

DOWELL: Well we think the Handbook probably has....

MCROBBIE: Would it specify that they have to be IU or something?

DOWELL: I think so, I mean, you’re our expert...

GIERYN: I don’t know the text for sure, but Michael I doubt if it would be easily done.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, you might be right.

GIERYN: Probably just familiarity with the standards and expectations.

MCROBBIE: But within IU it might be doable so, you know –
DOWELL: – within IU potentially –

MCROBBIE: – maybe borrowing back and forth between campuses might be doable.

GIERYN: In the same way we borrow back and forth across departments if you have a small unit that doesn’t have....

MCROBBIE: Right, precisely.

WALKER: I’ve served on tenure, written letters actually for Northwest, for tenure because I’m in French and there aren’t a lot of people in French, so we have done it at that level.

HINNEFELD: The idea of explicitly including faculty members from other IU campuses was discussed by the committee at South Bend that responded to this and their decision was not to recommend that as a possibility, and they focused on the fact that the tenure is campus specific within IU and they thought it just made more sense for those decisions to be made by members of the campus committee.

MCROBBIE: Okay, I mean, I think as a general principle that’s probably right, but maybe cases when you’re sort of in extremis as it were, where you have no fulls because they are all ruled out for conflicts or something like that, that in order to do justice to a candidate that you might get some colleagues from, you know, in your case Northwest or Fort Wayne, I guess, is a possibility too.

ATKINSON: But you’d have to make sure those folks really understood the standards on that campus.

MCROBBIE: Right, right. Tom, were trying to get in, I thought, before...?

GIERYN: Nope, covered.

MCROBBIE: Are we...is that everybody who’s commented? There’s no one at Fort Wayne...

NISHIHARA: At East – Yes? Am I on?

MCROBBIE: Yeah, you’re on, yeah.

NISHIHARA: At East, it has been mentioned but not pursued so far.

PAYDAR: When I worked at Columbus – Columbus being a small campus – we did borrow faculty, interestingly enough, from IU East to make the composition full
professors. I’m not sure maybe we violated some kind of a rule there, but that was done.

GALLMEIER: I guess my question from Northwest is – and maybe this is naive or something – but I’ve been asked on many occasions to review colleagues for promotion and tenure on other IU campuses and, of course, with the guidelines and the standards, I don’t see why that would be – I mean if I can do it for that reason, I’m wondering why it couldn’t be done, as long as you understand what the standards and guidelines are, if you couldn’t make the same kinds of decisions like you are making the same kind of recommendations when you are writing a promotion and tenure letter for somebody from another campus.

HINNEFELD: Chuck, I mean, in that context you’re considered an external reviewer, so it’s a little incongruous that sometimes somebody from another IU campus would be an external reviewer and at other times they would sit on the internal PT and R committee...

WALKER: …and vote.

HINNEFELD: And vote, right.

WALKER: Not just recommend.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, there’s definitely a tension there.

ATKINSON: I have a question about the resolution of the absentee/proxy voting issue on the Bloomington campus. Could you…? That was somewhat controversial when we were discussing the principles, and the...

GIERYN: Indeed, and we worked very hard to get wording Simon, as you know, that would be appropriate for all the campuses. I think it’s understood that the idea of designating someone else to vote for you is off the table. That’s not allowed. In Bloomington given travel schedules, timing issues, the size of some units, it is difficult across the board to require actual physical presence. So that the wording that was agreed up in a good one, that is, that people who participate fully in the deliberations should have the right to vote. We’re finding it much easier to hookup via various information technologies and communication technologies so that physical co-presence was too high a bar and was restricting too many faculty members from exercising their right to vote. Faculty members who had prepared themselves to vote, who had reviewed the dossiers, reviewed the letters, and then were disenfranchised because they happened to have an academic meeting or a performance event somewhere in the world that took them away on that particular day. And when we talked about these with deans of all the schools and the BFC FAC we realized that the exact understanding of fully participating in the deliberative process has to be understood in a commonsensical
kind of way. I mean you’re ready to vote, you should be able to give your vote in advance to the chair of the department or whomever the dean of a small school, if you feel you are ready to vote. And if you feel you haven’t because you’ve been away for a long enough time that you weren’t able to review the materials you would simply abstain.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, I think that was a good resolution. I was concerned about that because of the situation where somebody is not exposed to the to-and-fro on the committee and hearing the cases made and the reputations and so on, who ends up voting is not necessarily doing justice to the process and that person. But I mean, I think that was a pretty good resolution.

GIERYN: In some cases, it might be necessary...

FISHER: I think in – I’m sorry – in Indianapolis we had the discussion about this, too, and we feel that a member needs to hear the discussion before they have the authority to vote. If they’re out of the room for a phone call and they aren’t there for the discussion even on our campus P and T committee they do not vote for that case, if they have not heard the discussion. So preparation is one piece, but listening to the back-and-forth is a very essential component to be fully informed.

GIERYN: We decided that it may be necessary in some cases to pursue this in an iterative way. That if fundamental things are introduced in a meeting that change the assumptions, the understandings of the case, it might be necessary to postpone the vote until a later time when faculty members can be apprised of the deliberations and the changes in the understanding of the case.

MCROBBIE: Good, I mean I think there is a bit of room for flexibility on this, and that the spirit of this is to make sure that everybody is exposed to all the arguments and all the material. And it may be not done in the kind of temporally connected way, it may be disjointed over a number of months or weeks – well weeks anyway – days maybe. Any other comments or questions, any comments from anybody? I think we’ve gone...

NISHIHARA: There is one from East, Laverne, I’m looking again at the memo dated December 2008 and this in is the description of executive review and if there has been a change in that practice, I would like to see how the practice has changed. Because we’ve been operating with the understanding that this memo is the current practice also –

MCROBBIE: – Well, I’ve already –

NISHIHARA: – I’m not 100...go ahead –

MCROBBIE: – No, no please go ahead I interrupted. Go ahead.
NISHIHARA: That’s what I wanted that if the practice has changed since 2008, I and I think East would appreciate having any changes articulated and before us.

MCROBBIE: I made a specific change about the EVP level of review, eliminating that and in order to make that clear, as I said in response to Chuck, I will send out a revision that picks that up.

NISHIHARA: Alright, so the revision will be a description of the whole practice in that case.

MCROBBIE: That’s right, that’s what I committed to do to Chuck, yeah, that’s right.

NISHIHARA: Alright, thanks.

MCROBBIE: Okay? Any other questions or comments?

WERT: Yeah, this is Joe from Southeast. Will there be a separate process that is made for lecturers and clinical faculty at some point?

MCROBBIE: I’ll have to take that one on notice I think John I’m not quite certain where that one sits. Clinical faculty I think have gone through, because I know I have obviously dealt with quite a few of those in the recent weeks, I think clinical faculty go through, at least on most campuses if not all maybe not on yours, in the same way as ordinary faculty. But lecturers I don’t believe do.

WERT: Right.

GIERYN: Bloomington, yes. I mean the provost –

MCROBBIE: – but lecturers don’t go through –

GIERYN: – but not all the way to the executive level.

MCROBBIE: Right, right, right.

GIERYN: There’s a campus level review –

MCROBBIE: Right, right.

GIERYN: – but it doesn’t go to the executive level.

MCROBBIE: Does it go to you in Bloomington?

GIERYN: Yes.
MCROBBIE: It goes to your level and stops at your level?

GIERYN: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Right, okay.
GIERYN: Yes.

MCROBBIE: Is that the case for all campuses? Does it stop at the chief academic officer?

GIERYN: For example?

MCROBBIE: For lecturers.

GIERYN: For Senior Lecturer? Yes it does.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, right, right.

GREEN: [remark inaudible] goes all the way to the chancellor.

GIERYN: And goes to the Provost only if there was a problem.

MCROBBIE: Right, right. Maybe, this might be something, because I think – clinical I’ll have to check on – but I’m pretty certain that was uniform, but maybe not. But we should check on that and then check on the process for lecturers. I think Joe you were suggesting that maybe we might want to look at whether this is something that could be brought into better alignment as well?

WERT: Well, I know that back when we had this joint administration/faculty committee that we talked about whether this document was going to apply to lecturers and I think the decision was that this would only apply to tenure and tenure-track faculty and not to lecturers and that would be dealt with later. I wasn’t sure what the status was on that.

MCROBBIE: What the latest was on that.

ATKINSON: So I think that would be something for the UFC Agenda Committee to look at, is whether the UFC wants to take establishing procedures through the university for lecturers and all clinical ranks.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

PLUCKER: Research faculty, too.
MCROBBIE: Right.

PLUCKER: I believe there are more research faculty in the system then in all the other non-tenure track ranks combined we just tend to forget about them.

[Many voices speaking at once, remarks indistinct]

MCROBBIE: Chuck, please.

GALLMEIER: I should say that at Northwest, we’re already kind of pursuing that with the lecturers maybe we should stop or whatever. [laughter] But we are hoping to bring that up to more of a standardization with what we see in the Handbook, the Academic Handbook, for lecturers because ours isn’t exactly the same. So we just thought while we’re doing all this we should take the opportunity to look at lecturers as well to make sure it’s a fair process or a process that’s similar to what the university does at large. We’re already engaged in that, so should we stop or continue?

MCROBBIE: Well, I’d hate to discourage you from doing it because it’s probably worth doing, Chuck. I would continue, but I think as Simon and Erika said we pick it up on the Agenda Committee and then have a think about what might be the way to proceed. This could be an area where there are pretty divergent procedures for historical reasons.

ATKINSON: One place to start might be just to look and see what the procedures are on the individual campuses right now.

GALLMEIER: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Herb? Sorry.

TERRY: I think when we adopted this last year the expectation was that we would get these reports from the campuses and the Agenda Committee would take a look at all the reports and ask if the documents, the principles stated in this sort of thing were workable, needed any tweaking, fine tuning, footnotes perhaps as to what you might do perhaps if you had difficulty getting complements of tenured faculty, a question now about early promotion cases. I would think that’s the task of the Agenda Committee now is to receive all of these reports and come back to the Council next year, early, with a report on what we learned.

ATKINSON: I should point out that Craig’s office is going to compile a report summarizing the actions and the status on all the campuses and included with that will be the individual reports from all the campuses. That will be available presumably on the UFC website for the Agenda Committee and the UFC to look at going forward.
TERRY: If I may, as last year’s co-Secretary I want to thank all of the campuses for the good faith in which they carried out the task we gave them last year. I know it may, you know, change custom and habit and culture on some of the campuses and I am very grateful that you did what you did. The reports are sound and I’m grateful that that worked out.

MCROBBIE: I absolutely endorse that and consider this to be excellent work. I think it’s all for the betterment of the university as a whole, too.

GIERYN: One small – excuse me – one small revision the campus level review that would come all the way to me are only in cases of denied promotions or reappointments. So that if the college or school approves it, that is where it stops.

DOWELL: For lecturers?

GIERYN: For lecturers in Bloomington.

MCROBBIE: Okay, but we’d really better move along because agenda item 8 is, in fact, a really weighty and important one and if we could move to that please and if I can ask Simon and Erika to comment on this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 8: DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED EXTENSIONS TO THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY TENURE CLOCK

ATKINSON: Right, maybe I’ll give a little of my usual historical introduction. Really picking up where we left off at the last UFC meeting which was that the Indianapolis Faculty Council, IUPUI Faculty Council, have passed a policy allowing schools who met certain conditions and with the endorsement of the IFC Faculty Council Executive Committee and the campus administration to move forward to allow extensions of the tenure clock on a school wide basis for their faculty up to nine years in the case of the policy that we passed. This is with the idea that faculty could usually come up in the usual time but could elect to take a longer tenure clock based on their circumstances. This raises some issues with the extent to which this policy complies with what’s in the IU Academic Handbook and there is an argument that this is at least sailing very close to the edge of what the Handbook allows if not going beyond it. So we discussed this at the last UFC meeting and in the interim between the last meeting and this, John Applegate and I attempted to – with assistance from Tom Gieryn and Uday Sukhatme and others – attempted to craft some language that would have essentially been enabling language for the kind of policy that the IFC passed. The concern has since been raised particularly by members of the UFC on the Bloomington campus but I think it’s shared more widely on campuses other than Indianapolis that the UFC as a whole has not had enough time to be able to discuss this policy and the potential modifications to the Handbook for people to be comfortable moving forward with that kind of language now. And the
suggestion has been raised that the matter should be referred to the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee which would entail appointing the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee as a first step to enable that to happen. It’s been suggested that the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee could work on looking at this over the summer and perhaps be prepared to bring something back to the UFC at its first meeting in the fall of next year. This is obviously concerning to those of us who have supported this change in the policy on the Indianapolis campus particularly those who have supported the policy in the School of Medicine, because we would like to move forward a bit to implement this policy which many of us consider to be an important and necessary step for the school to take. I won’t say there is unanimity on the campus in supporting that and there isn’t unanimity in the School of Medicine in supporting that. I see Bob Bigsby in Indianapolis, and I think Bob will probably make his views known. So that’s to sort of frame the discussion for the meeting now and perhaps Erika can comment on the discussions that have occurred on the Bloomington campus and then we can go from there.

**Dowell:** Certainly, there has been a meeting of the Bloomington members of the University Faculty Council, we also discussed this at the phone meeting of the Agenda Committee last week, but sadly Simon had a conflict and there weren’t any other representatives from Indianapolis at that meeting. But at both of those meetings I think there is concern just as Simon expressed. In that there was this language that we are bringing forward today, but there is some language that could be inserted into the Handbook that would that would as you say enable or legitimize kind of in reverse the policy passed in Indianapolis. And that people had a general anxiety about approving something like that which essentially sort of set – well, it set a precedent that enabled campuses to feel that they could sort of press the envelope in what they could do policywise and have it approved later by the UFC. And that secondly, it created a lot of concern related to changing this very fundamental part of our shared policies. And while it’s acknowledged that it doesn’t immediately change anything, there are processes that need to be gone through, the language that was being proposed and certainly the existing IFC policy do open up this door for any school to pursue, or any campus to pursue, I’m sorry, and schools within the campus. And that that raises a lot of other questions and that principally we have been presented with supporting materials created by the School of Medicine that didn’t answer some of the questions people had about what’s happening at other schools where this had been put into place? Had it ever been put into place in this way that enables lots of different schools to potentially pursue this avenue? Questions like that. We’ve talked about this just at the Agenda Committee meeting that proceeded our general meeting today and talked about a couple of different ways we could potentially, I don’t know, split the difference perhaps in expediting some sort of UFC review or enabling the Agenda Committee to vote on this without convening the entire group since that would push things back. But in a general sense those are the concerns that are coming from other parts of the university besides Indianapolis. And Indianapolis has had the benefit of having most of the year to discuss these issues, but we weren’t having those discussions at UFC and so that’s how we find ourselves where we are right now. I should note that at least in our Bloomington
meeting people were not without sympathy for the request of the Medical School there are some people who felt that they had more questions, other people thought that they were very willing to accept the judgment of a particular school that is has specialized needs and to allow them to pursue a different tenure clock. But that this, the policy we are being asked to consider, needed more understanding. I don’t know if anyone else would like to comment, we can open up the discussion. I think what we want to discuss right now it not the merits of is a ten- or nine-year tenure clock good or bad, but I think we want to basically have a procedural discussion about how we want to move forward in trying to get out of where we are now which is a little bit of an impasse and we have competing interests in wanting things to move fast and wanting things to slow down at least a little bit for further investigation. And so I think that’s kind of what we want to talk about today and hopefully come up with something we can all maybe agree upon today. We’ll see. that’s an ambitious goal. Michael, did you want to say something more at this point or do you want to hear....

**MCROBBIE:** Well you know….probably hear discussion. I am concerned that the School of Medicine, at least the administration, spent a long time on this issue, put a lot of effort into making the case. I think we have to take seriously their claim that this really is important from a point of view of being competitive. They are by far the largest academic unit in the institution. They buttress the university’s clinical operations which are even bigger than the whole university taken together and that this is of some urgency and importance to them, so it maybe that there is a no answer, but either way I think – and that will, of course, have consequences – but I think either way there’s a lot to be said for expediting this decision and one way to do that might be to give the Agenda Committee the authority to make a decision or to at least to be able to make a decision if they feel they can over the summer vacation. Otherwise, the earliest this will be acted upon is going to be in September and I’m afraid this is exactly what people criticize about these kind of processes that you go into a sort of hiatus from April to September.

**ATKINSON:** There’s an issue of the continuity of the discussion if you go into that kind of hiatus and people aren’t thinking about it over the summer and then there is a changing composition in the UFC and its committees.

**TERRY:** I think there are two different discussions, one is the discussion about the needs of the School of Medicine for this and the other is the recommendation already adopted by the Indianapolis Faculty Council that this might be something that might be beneficial to other campuses and other schools. There is an extensive record, there’s a very thoughtful record generated by the School of Medicine so far on the Bloomington campus, you know, I fall on the side of saying they seem to have made a pretty good case. I might wish that we were a little more certain of the levels of faculty support for that case within the School of Medicine. But the evidence that this is a pattern in some competing medical schools, although the documents reveal that some other major schools have decided not to do it, is pretty good. And if you want to trust the School of
Medicine to know the unique needs of the Indiana University School of Medicine they made a case that they would fall on the side of doing this. I would support, if the Council was comfortable with it, the Council allowing the Agenda Committee to complete whatever additional review it thinks is necessary of the request of the Indiana University School of Medicine for the extension of the tenure clock system they have proposed. It would authorize the Agenda Committee to take whatever time it needs to take to respond to any questions that faculty have and trust us, that is, in effect in my view, delegating an amendment to the Academic Handbook to the Agenda Committee of the UFC which is I think a momentous decision path to go down. But I think the case is there, I was interested to explore with the School of Public Health that they aren’t encountering difficulties hiring right now. As she said, incoming faculty are not asking those questions. And the School of Medicine has found a workaround with hiring people on clinical lines and then transferring them. So I’m not so sure it’s a truly urgent issue but they put a lot of work into it at the School of Medicine and I would think a prompt decision might be reachable by this year’s Agenda Committee before it goes out of office. Which I think is June 30th. And so I would kind of hope at this point that the Council today would vote to entrust to the Agenda Committee the decision on the request of the IU School of Medicine and expedite for next year a discussion of whether this should be campus types of discretion embodied in the Indiana University Academic Handbook. Because I think the case may be there for that in some fields to be honest.

**MCROBBIE:** So you’re separating out the two into two questions, one for the Agenda Committee to discuss. One would be an exception for the School of Medicine and the second would be the broader issue.

**TERRY:** Correct.

**MCROBBIE:** And delegating the authority to the Agenda Committee to make a decision on both.

**TERRY:** To make a decision on the School of Medicine and to pursue in a way it thinks appropriate the broader question.

**MCROBBIE:** Will you make that as a motion?

**TERRY:** I’ll move that.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. There is a motion moved. Is there a second for that at all?

**HORNE:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, I’ve got a second now. So discussion now.
**GIERYN:** I’m concerned about that motion, Herb. I think that a better way to go is to perhaps make the process of changing the Academic Handbook more nimble. Indeed it’s a very important document and we don’t want to make changes capriciously. On the other hand, I cannot read the Academic Handbook in any way that allows the Indianapolis School of Medicine proposal to be consistent with the wording in the Academic Handbook. So a change needs to be made. The question is, do we have to wait until the Fall to make such a change and I don’t think that is possible. We’ve already received a draft of enabling language from John and Simon and Uday and Mary and I have commented on it. It seems to me that with a bit more crafting from the Agenda Committee it could go to a vote of the UFC. Without necessarily gathering this group together to see whether or not we want to amend the Handbook in ways that would enable the School of Medicine proposal to go through in ways that are consistent with our basic policies.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah?

**BURNS:** I want to step back just a minute because I do want to enable changes but part of the reason for the Handbook, and correct me if I am wrong about the Handbook, is these things have interactions. For instance, if we extend the tenure clock many schools or universities that allow that decouple promotion from tenure. So you don’t have to wait ten years for a promotion. Now was that discussed? Is that a decision not to do that? I mean, I don’t know enough about the background of this process, but there are interactions of these things that have wide implications immediately that an assistant professor may now be waiting ten years to become associate professor.

**BIGSBY:** [Remark indistinct] ...make a couple of comments on this?

**MCROBBIE:** Hold it, could you – sorry, before you –

**BURNS:** It’s more an issue of doing a due diligence for the university-wide not the specifics.

**MCROBBIE:** Because it was more in the form of a question, maybe Simon could answer before I call the next speaker.

**ATKINSON:** Yeah, and Mary can correct me, I don’t think it’s come up in the school the question of decoupling the promotion and tenure decision.

**FISHER:** If the person is qualified and ready to meet the promotion to associate, if they meet the criteria, then they ready for tenure.

**ATKINSON:** Right.
**FISHER:** We do not separate tenure and promotion. You have to be promotable at the time of tenure. If you’re promotable, you’re ready to go up for tenure. So the way we’ve written the policy they can go up in the normal time or they can go up early, or if they are ready or they can go at the nine-year mark. So there’s quite a bit of freedom for faculty if they are actually meeting the criteria.

**BURNS:** Thank you.

**FISHER:** It does not change the criteria.

**MCROBBIE:** Sorry, um...Yeah?

**BIGSBY (FOR SUBAH PACKER):** I’m Bob Bigsby at IU I’m sitting in for Subah Packer. I’m on the IFC here and I’ve discussed this with Simon and others quite a bit. The idea of extending the tenure probationary clock I think effectively, not intentionally but effectively, would raise the standards for promotion and tenure at the School of Medicine. Presently our standard for promotion and tenure is – with regard to funding of grants – is that the School requires a promise for sustaining the funding. As opposed to promotion to full professor the wording says, “evidence of sustained funding.” And in the discussion of that wording it was very important to make that distinction. The document that the School of Medicine supplied in an argument to extend the probationary period embodies an example of how an administrator might seek to have evidence of a renewal of a grant rather than mere evidence of grant funding before a person could be put up for tenure and promotion. So that would, in effect, raise the standard to that which is currently used for promotion to full professor. And I don’t think you can get around the tendency to do that even by saying that you have given the person the opportunity to come up on the normal seven-year clock. What chairman would you entrust to not impede that sort of move on the faculty’s part? Indeed, you hear Dr. Swanson say maybe you’d have to lower your standards. Well it wouldn’t be lowering of our standards if we accepted one RO1 that’s what we do now. It would be a heightening of our standards to require more than that and to require renewable opportunity.

**FISHER:** I think that’d be –

**BIGSBY (FOR SUBAH PACKER):** – With that being said I’d like to make one more point the IU constitution gives faculty the legislative authority over matters concerning standards and procedures for tenure and promotion. To allocate that or to entrust the Agenda Committee or any other small committee with final approval, I think, abrogates that legislative authority given to the faculty by the constitution. This is an item that needs to be voted on by the entire faculty.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other comments?
FISHER: One of the things, I would like to comment on is the issue of specific safeguards that were put in to the IUPUI policy. Even if a school wants to do this the faculty have to vote in a two-thirds majority of all those who are eligible to vote which would be tenure or tenure-track faculty – all of them – not just ones choosing to vote. So it’s a very, very high bar before a school is going to get this through and allow it to occur. So the faculty have to have a huge impetus for this and they have to want it. And that doesn’t mean it’s 100% but it certainly means it is a very, very high bar, almost higher than any other bar we have in the university. So, you know, I think if you would also as you’re talking as an Agenda Committee, because I would support that the Agenda Committee should be doing the negotiation and then sending it out to the UFC for a vote. Because we are the body that does the voting and I think that that’s exactly how it should occur.

ATKINSON: I think my preference would be to agree with Tom Gieryn’s suggested solution.

MCROBBIE: Well, since we’ve got a motion in front of us here would you willing to kind of modify that?

TERRY: I need to know an answer from Tom to a question. Does the language that you’ve worked out – is it limited to the issue in the School of Medicine or does it more broadly go to the question of....?

GIERYN: No, it is an enabling language that would allow the School of Medicine program to not contradict the Academic Handbook. So it’s not written...

ATKINSON: ...the IFC policy to not contradict the Academic Handbook.

TERRY: I guess my question is, does it ratify the IFC policy?

ATKINSON: It’s indifferent.

GIERYN: It’s indifferent with respect to that policy. If the conditions are met – go ahead Simon.

ATKINSON: Yeah, I think it’s indifferent to the merits of the IFC policy, it merely makes it possible.

TERRY: ...For the School of Medicine.

BIGSBY (FOR SUBAH PACKER): How can you not contradict the Handbook? The Handbook explicitly says, “a probationary period of not longer than seven years.”
ATKINSON: That’s why we’re suggesting that the UFC adopt the modified language to the Academic Handbook which would also have to be adopted by the trustees to be enacted.

MCROBBIE: Right, it would have to go to the trustees. Tom? Sorry.

GIERYN: The modification would require the adoption of a campus policy and that would require – the language is still being worked out – but it would require approval of all sorts of administrators and faculty governance bodies. Once the campus policy is in place then schools who met a set of very stringent requirements similar to those from the IFC policy – sorry, the School of Medicine policy – individual schools on those campuses could appeal for a longer clock. It’s certainly not changing the length of the tenure clock, it’s enabling those changes to happen if a very long set of conditions are met.

MCROBBIE: My question was, do you want to modify what you said to allow that possibility so the Agenda Committee would work on this rapidly, I think is the way I see it, and then put it out for a vote. And I assume that would be before the end of the academic year, by 30 June.

ATKINSON: As an email vote.

MCROBBIE: As an email.

TERRY: I’ll go for that.

MCROBBIE: And the second is happy with that?

HORNE: Yes.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so you may need to sketch that out, but can we have further discussion and comments? We actually have a formal motion before us.

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne from East. I want to address the question of what the Agenda Committee can or should vote on. My understanding of the IFC policy from IUPUI is it does have the potential to affect all of the campuses in IU and I’m just very uneasy with the idea of the Agenda Committee voting on something that will probably affect all the campuses.

ATKINSON: So, Laverne, that’s why we’re now suggesting that the entire UFC –

DOWELL: – vote –
ATKINSON: –vote. That the Agenda Committee will wordsmith the suggested language and then bring it back to the UFC for an email vote.

NISHIHARA: Alright, alright.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

MCCORMICK: Tom, the language you are proposing, this is Bryan McCormick BFC representative, is limited to simply to the tenure and promotion policies within the Handbook. Is that correct? I mean – the variance being allowed – does this permit campuses to address other issues within the Handbook that can make modifications…?

ATKINSON: No, it’s just...

GIERYN: It’s limited to time...

ATKINSON: It's limited to the timeline for tenure...

MCCORMICK: [Remarks indistinct]

FISHER: ...by email about the draft of this. The other thing that’s not codified in the Handbook explicitly is the common practice on all the campuses of individual extensions for life events. In one part of the Handbook it talks about changes of research or family situations and that sort of thing, but there is the one dogmatic statement of seven years being the tenure clock without any indication in that statement that there are in fact individual exemptions. And, you know, every campus does this and does this through the dean of faculties’ office in concert with the department chair and the dean and the candidate requesting an extension for family reasons or research reasons or health reasons or whatever. And if we’re fixing this other issue I think it would be nice to make that more explicit in the Handbook as well while you are doing it.

BIGSBY: Actually, there is a paragraph in the Handbook that says in instances of family –

FISHER: – I know, but where it says the tenure clock, the tenure clock is –

BIGSBY: – a hundred pages away.

FISHER: – it’s a hundred pages away from that and it only says seven years and it never gives any indication that it ever goes beyond seven years. So I would love to see that cleaned up too, because people don’t understand that. You know, I have people all the time email me, ‘Why are you allowed to give an extension, it says here seven years,’ you know.

MCROBBIE: Herb?
TERRY: Maybe I have something here.

MCROBBIE: Herb’s got a sketch of this motion here in more careful language.

TERRY: I will propose the following that the UFC vote that the Agenda Committee will review proposals to amend the Academic Handbook in ways that could allow extended timelines beyond seven years for tenure decisions. That would, I think, include the language that Mary was talking about, that’s another way of extending the timeline. The Agenda Committee will promptly submit any proposals that it deems worthy for an electronic vote by the 2009-2010 faculty council.

ATKINSON: I’ll second that, I don’t know whether I can.

MCROBBIE: It’s been seconded. Okay, that’s the motion, so I think that’s pretty clear. It means it’s a way of getting this to the Faculty Council electronically for an up or down vote as they say by the end of the academic year. Alright, I am mindful of the time, and I am going to put the motion. All those in favor of the motion as read by Herb indicated by saying ‘aye?’ [Aye] Against by no? I’ll take... [No] There’s one no. At least one no. So I think that can be taken as being passed overwhelmingly though. Alright, ladies and gentlemen, unless there’s any other comments on this issue I think we are adjourned until next year, in which case it will be a different UFC. Those of you who are here in Bloomington are invited to a reception my wife and I are hosting at the University Club. My apologize to everyone out in cyberland that you can’t be there for it. We will toast you in absentia. So thank you all very much.