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Minutes

DOWELL: Then let’s go ahead and we will do some introductions. IU East Do you want to start again? You’ve already introduced yourself but now everybody is here.

[Introductions]

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Okay! Thanks everybody for being here. We have a lot on our agenda. First thing we’ve got is approval of the minutes from... Herb, yes? You have a comment on the minutes?

TERRY: I read the minutes!

DOWELL: Good for you!

TERRY: And I would like to give Craig some minor corrections. My favorite is the translation by the voice recognition program of “Inui” as in “Inui report” into “annuity.” Most of them are similarly insignificant although out of self-interest I would note that I substituted the word in
some of my remarks that is probably closer to what I said than the word that the word recognition program chose – I’m not certain it’s exactly the word I said – but it’s the word I probably intended.

DOWELL: We’ll trust you on that.

TERRY: But otherwise they were just punctuation and capitalization and a few corrections of names.

DOWELL: Okay. I presume that we will not demand an itemization of these amendments to the minutes. Do we have any other substantive changes? Alright, can we have a vote? All in favor? [Ayes] Any nays or abstentions? You’ll have to wave hard and then we will see you. Okay, very good. Minutes approved.

AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: For Agenda Committee Business I just wanted to bring up a couple of issues. We have the – not on today’s agenda, but something that we’ll be looking at next time – is the policy on the creation of a Professor of Practice rank and everybody on the Agenda Committee I believe has made sure that that policy got put out to the campus, whatever the appropriate kind of faculty affairs body is that should be looking at it and that its review is happening. Does anybody have any comments they want to make on how that review is going or otherwise we’ll just assume that it’s proceeding and that we’re going to discuss it more robustly at our March meeting? Alright.

The other issue that some of us have been working on kind of behind the scenes is the future of our paid family leave policy which is something that was written with a sunset provision in it and we are working this spring hopefully to defend the existing policy and remove the sunset provision, but it might be necessary to revise the policy in some small way to satisfy Trustee concerns about cost. And we’ll be forwarding, I think pretty soon, a report about this to the UFC and in the meantime Maria Bucur-Deckard who’s a member of the Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda Committee and I have been working on it. And we’ve been talking a little bit with Jack Windsor, too, in Indianapolis though he’s not here today. And so I can say that we’re trying to work on a succinct report that will talk about how the costs – there’s a sort of dissonance between the Trustees believing that the costs were supposed to be pretty minimal but then a report that Neil Theobald put forward that makes them seem more substantial. That’s all kind of a difference I understand that’s between viewing the costs as sort of some sort of unbudgeted thing that deans need to cover, which is not true in most respects. The cost of family leave is already budgeted. It’s already budgeted. It’s in people’s salaries it’s just that they aren’t working for a period of that time when they are on leave so that you don’t need to dredge up that money for somewhere else it’s... And there are very few units it seems that report any kind of costs, extra costs, in replacing people with adjuncts or lecturers or things like that. So we’re working on cost, we’re looking at the use of policy which is still, even though the use of the policy has increased since the new policy went into effect, it’s still under one percent of the eligible population who could take it. So there are very few people out of the eligible population taking advantage of it and we hope that that, as well as the overrepresentation of
women in the users of the policy – so women constitute about 40% of the eligible population but they’re usually between 60 and 100% of the people taking advantage of the policy over the years that it’s been in existence, over the past about five years. We’re working on getting statements of support from, certainly from Karen here. Provost Hanson is supportive and we’re working on getting clear kind of support lined up from a variety of other areas. And then we’ll probably be running stuff past Neil Theobald ‘cause frankly, he may have more or less kind of veto power over what the Trustees think on this. And if Neil says this policy is okay, then they may go for it and if he doesn’t they may not. So I don’t know if I’m overstating the case there, but we feel that it’s necessary to try to get all the ducks kind of lined up that way. But we’ll be sending out the report that we’re going to be sharing with people and inviting people to have a more grassroots kind of effort to support or perhaps elicit some testimonials from people who’ve used the leave in a way that’s been very important to them. Steve, did you have a question here?

MANNHEIMER: Are you getting reports from academic affairs officers about its utility in recruiting?

DOWELL: We have asked for that, yes, and most of them do believe it is useful although we have actually also talked with a number of deans of different schools about their perspective on it and there are some who are very supportive and there are others who are skeptical and don’t like it. So there’s some mixed support depending on what administrator you talk to. Herb, question?

TERRY: On that front, I think when it was originally proposed, the School of Medicine said they couldn’t make it work –

DOWELL: Mhmmm.

TERRY: – and they were carved out for awhile and then they were supposed to create another one. Since they are the unit to which the Trustees pay the greatest attention, what is the School of Medicine’s take on family leave?

DOWELL: The School of Medicine does have a family leave policy approved by the Trustees. It does not have a sunset policy. It’s different from the existing university-level policy in about, I would say, two fundamental ways. One is that it combines paid family leave with sick leave. So right now our – the policy we’re defending – is only for taking leave to care for others, whether it’s a new child coming into the family in one way or another or a sick spouse, parent, child. And we have a separate policy which some people don’t really know about, I think, which governs paid leave for an extended sickness of you yourself as the academic appointee. The other significant difference in the School of Medicine policy is that it has a different structure for the paid leave. Ours is twelve weeks paid, theirs is eight weeks paid and then a couple of different options for subsequent weeks using vacation time, if you have a position that earns vacation time, or 50% paid leave. So it’s a somewhat different kind of arrangement in the extent of the leave and how your income is protected over the course of that leave.
TERRY: Would it be better for faculty who are not faculty in the School of Medicine than the old default policy if the current policy were allowed to expire?

DOWELL: The School of Medicine policy would be better than letting the current policy expire, and I believe that it is certainly one of our three fallback positions if Neil and President McRobbie say that there’s no chance of just saving our policy the way it stands. That is definitely one of the options.

TERRY: The other thing I would point out is that at least if it is taken with regard to a birth, we have faculty now who were planning on taking that leave and were kind of shocked when Maria’s description appeared in the College of Arts and Sciences Policy Committee Statements that it might not occur and these folks, you know, need—

DOWELL: – I understand –

TERRY: – notice as to what they’re going to have to do because the financial consequences for them are substantial.

DOWELL: And I would be happy to have them write a letter.

TERRY: Yeah, I’m not working on that.

DOWELL: If they would care to. And then some of the other things that we’re thinking of as possible fallbacks – Oh, I’m sorry, question?

MANNHEIMER: Well, please finish what you were....

DOWELL: No, go ahead.

MANNHEIMER: When you had said earlier that only one percent or fewer than one percent or less than one percent of eligible faculty take advantage of this. I mean to say that is essentially to say that everybody’s eligible, but what I would ask is, are the Trustees concerned that there needs to be a more rigorously defined trigger mechanism to, you know, to define eligibility or that, you know, for me to say my son broke his leg I need to stay home, you know, for six weeks or for a semester, it’s too loosey goosey or not?

DOWELL: My perception is that they are looking only at a bottom-line view of the cost and its potential growth in the future. So I haven’t heard them talk about concern specifically about eligibility although I think it would be safe to say that there’s an undercurrent of ‘is this too cushy a benefit, and that’s why it’s costly?’ But that’s me reading between the lines. The last go-around and the go-round where they asked us to come back with more information and possibly a revised policy, it was all talking about money. And Steve has a question here? Yeah, a follow-up?

MANNHEIMER: I was just going to ask a follow-up question – and I apologize for my ignorance of the situation – but other than pregnancy, which is sort of self evident, does the policy require a note from your doctor that your spouse, your child, your significant other has such a condition that requires, you know, day-to-day care? I mean, how is that arrived at?
DOVELL: There’s no kind of note from the doctor. There is a requirement that you work with your dean to develop an appropriate plan for your absence and covering whatever your duties are that you’ll be absent from, and then that gets reviewed at the next higher level of the vice provost or vice chancellor – essentially for fairness, I think – and then the leave is considered approved. So no, there’s no, as far as I know – other people who are familiar with the policy, Craig, let me know – but there’s no sense of a doctor’s note or anything like that. There is a portion of the policy that does talk about if you really just need a short leave of three weeks or less, which would be perhaps appropriate if, you know, if a son at college broke his leg and you needed to go help him get settled or something like that or more minor incident perhaps, that’s basically a matter simply for the department, the dean, whoever is necessary to be involved in, they just cut a deal to decide.

MANNHEIMER: Thank you.

DOVELL: Steve had a question I think, no? [indistinct comment] Okay, Herb?

TERRY: Yeah, if I could just point out a couple of things. You know the Trustees are very much concerned about costs and benchmarks and all this sort of thing, but one of the risks of costs and benchmarking is in the course in doing all of that you never lead. And I would hope that some impression would be conveyed to the Trustees that to some extent it’s good to be a leading institution on a few things and maybe this is one one should consider. And related to that, you know we need to keep in mind we need to remain competitive. In many areas we don’t offer competitive salaries.

DOVELL: Yes.

TERRY: We used to offer very good retirement benefits. We apparently for incoming faculty are now near the bottom of the Big Ten on that. We have had a pretty good deal in health care costs but that may be going away and as a result if we also lose this, you know whatever value it may currently have in competitive competition for new faculty, it might remain our only remaining arrow and it might be a good idea to spend it.

DOVELL: That’s certainly on our mind as part of our case. Other comments? Oh, yes?

CLARK: Karen from South Bend.

DOVELL: Yes, South Bend?

CLARK: I just wondered, Erika have you been in touch with people on the regional campuses to get support for this policy?

DOVELL: Have we been in touch with regional campuses yet?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Other than IUPUI, no.

DOVELL: Not officially other than mentioning that work like this is going on during out Agenda Committee, our UFC Agenda Committee, groups. We haven’t contacted any specific chancellors or vice chancellors or others on the other regionals. I’m sorry.
CLARK: Well, you know, it may be premature but I just want to say that you would have strong support on our campus and from our deans so if you need help with that –

DOWELL: – Okay. –

CLARK: – with that I think that we are like I say strongly committed to a generous family leave policy.

DOWELL: Alright, great. Laverne?

CLARK: So let us know what we can do to help.

DOWELL: Okay! Thank you.

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne from East. I remember that you shared a memo...

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

NISHIHARA: …and the memo’s argument was that this is not such a very costly program. So I was wondering what happened to the memo and if it was going to be shared further. [laughter]

DOWELL: Yeah, I mean, we’ve been continuing to kind of revise that report and we’re going to share it very soon with the wider array of people. Maria’s actually working on this. Maria, do you want to comment?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Well, we have shared the memo with John Applegate, with Neil Theobald, with Dan Rives, and we’ve been meeting with Dan trying to figure out what – from his perspective – would look persuasive to the Trustees. I guess that’s the kind of expertise that he brings to the table. And in fact this morning, Craig and I met to work through visuals that would drive home the absolutely insignificant percentage. We have a pie chart that has the total number of, you know, people eligible and the number of people taking it as a percentage and you can’t really see at all. I mean you can’t –

DOWELL: – The piece of pie using the policy… –

BUCUR-DECKARD: …it’s 0.68% at the most. That’s, you know, 0.68% of the eligible population that’s the maximum that it’s gone. So that’s the, you know, the stuff that we’re working on. The other part of it that we are going to present is the overrepresentation of women among those taking it. It’s never been less than 60% out of the total percentage of people taking it and women at most have been 40% of the eligible population. So if you do a visual and you sort of have a little trend like this [gestures in the air] of how many women are eligible behind it is a mountain, percentage wise, of women taking it. So it goes to the heart of the fact that this is about a woman friendly and family friendly and paying for the cost of having a diverse – gender wise – faculty.

NISHIHARA: One more thing from East, a few months ago the deans who responded to the initial question, responded very favorably to keeping the current policy.
BUCUR-DECKARD: Some responded very favorably.

NISHIHARA: Not 100% –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – No. That is correct. –

NISHIHARA: – in response to this?

BUCUR-DECKARD: The College of Arts and Sciences at IU, in Bloomington, that amounts to about 60% of the leaves out of the whole system in any one year, sent us not one but two statements that were very strong and basically Bob Becker who deals with this wrote, I think, the strongest response we’ve had so far saying that the College doesn’t even keep track financially.

TERRY: No.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Because I asked for figures, and, ‘Bob you’re an economist.’ I mean, because it’s not a cost to us. This is what we need to do to keep productive faculty here and the College, you know, it is what it is and it’s really not a cost because we are already paying those salaries out. They’re budgeted. It’s not an additional cost. So that’s what we have in terms of the strongest support. We have also had people who wrote with alarming kind of numbers that were not backed up. I don’t know, may I speak? About the critical…

TARTELL: Oh, please!

BUCUR-DECKARD: It is a public statement…

DOWELL: It is, yeah.

BUCUR-DECKARD: ...it has gone to the BFC. So I, you know, so Dan Smith wrote us with some figures. I mean he actually went out and looked at people taking leaves and the figure he came up with and the numbers he came up with far surpass what we had in our picture, in our vision, and what we think was happening is that he was putting together family leave with FMLA and other kinds of leaves. And I wrote back to him to ask for clarification and I never heard back. So I’ve since then sent that whole question to Tom Gieryn’s office because they wanted to find out how this accounting is happening in terms of the numbers of leaves that they’re counting toward family leave. So that was one that was negative and sort of alarmist in terms of, ‘well, we paid something like half a million dollars in family leave last year and this is a huge,’ you know, ‘cost to us.’ And of course that has to do with the salary of people in the Kelley [laughter] which tends to be somewhat higher than the College and other parts of the university but also with this over, you know, kind of the overrepresentation of people that are not part of actually the family leave. So it might be that there are people with much higher salaries than those who were actually taking family leave for family leave purposes because I think most of the family leave ones in the School of Business were assistant professors what I saw on the list. So the people who were taking it for family leave were junior faculty with lower salaries than the sick leave folks who were probably paid more than the assistant professors. I didn’t get like ranks and all that but it just... and frankly it was like half of the total that was paid, supposedly paid
out, in the whole system for that year was the School, the Kelley. And that didn’t make any
sense to me [remark indistinct]

Dowell: – Right, the numbers just didn’t… –

Bucur-Deckard: – crazy. So we don’t, you know, so there was some negative response as
well, though overall I would say yes, positive.

Dowell: Okay, so expect more kind of reporting from that and probably a summary of what
our kind of fall back options would be if there is some sort of, you know, insistence that we
need alter the policy in some small way to show our interest in pleasing the Trustees, so… Know
that you’ll find out more about that very soon. That’s… Oh, and we do also have the UFC
Compensation and Benefits Committee working with representatives from the Budgetary
Affairs Committees of Bloomington and Indianapolis who are getting together this month so
not much time is left I think. Some responses to Neil Theobald’s call for input regarding how
health care costs are apportioned between employer and employee starting for – that would be
for calendar year 2012. So he’s basically soliciting comment and this group had a meeting with
him a couple of weeks ago and everybody was supposed to be off on their own campuses kind
of talking about this and we should be having some kind of meeting, I don’t know, soon, to kind
of get together some of this talk about what kind of principles or opinions that faculty
governance would like to forward into the mix of people who are commenting on how this cost
should be apportioned and it’s not just us commenting on it, of course it’s also being brought to
chancellors and deans and so forth to comment on how they’d like to see costs for health care
that cannot be covered by the IU budget, how they might be apportioned out fairly without
extreme trauma to employees. So know that that’s happening, if you want to know more you
can get in touch with me, or I can help you find the person who’s – probably some of the
people are the representative maybe from their campus on that committee or maybe not, but
there should be somebody from every campus who is involved with this effort that you can talk
to. That’s what I have for Agenda Committee Business right now.

Agenda Item 3: Question/Comment Period

Dowell: Question/Comment Period, it’s just me and I guess Barb is here, but I don’t know that
Barb can, wants to, volunteer to be fully a substitute for Michael and John.

Bichelmeier: I could never fully manage…

Dowell: [laughs] But if there are any questions about other things that I haven’t talked about
or that aren’t on the agenda later, then now is the time. Anybody?

Nishihara: Yes, this is Laverne from East. East is probably going to vote on the LEAP resolution
next week. It is not a vote in favor really of becoming a LEAP campus. It’s more a vote [indistinct
comment] of the UFC resolution –

Dowell: – Sure. –

Nishihara: – to urge campuses to adopt LEAP.
DOWELL: Mmhmm.

NISHIHARA: So probably that vote is going to take place next week that’s the update on that particular issue –

DOWELL: – Mmhmm. –

NISHIHARA: – from East and I think you’re soliciting the comments about the three points in the resolution by April?

DOWELL: Yes, that was the hope that by April we would know from every campus how they felt about those three points in the resolution and if you’re going to approve it wholesale that’s fine we know you’re in favor of all three and I think other campuses will split them apart probably and give us a sense of how they feel on each of those individual aspects of the proposal. And we’ll use that information to craft whatever comes back to actually the full UFC for a vote.

NISHIHARA: Thank you.

DOWELL: Thank you. Herb?

TERRY: Yeah, I want to make a comment on another thing that’s coming up very quickly out of Neil Theobald’s office, if you’ve not seen it. Neil has put together a proposal for an Early Retirement Incentive Plan. I think, I hope, he sent that out to the campuses as well as to Bloomington.

TARTELL: And to UFC, actually. It went about….

DOWELL: Did it go to UFC, too?

TERRY: Yeah, okay, so you’ve seen it?

DOWELL: Has everybody seen that?

TERRY: You know, let me just stress that that is on a very rapid time table because if anybody wants to take advantage of it the paperwork and all of that has to be completed so that they can go off the payroll for the next budgetary cycle, July 1. The deadline being established for people to submit their requests to take advantage of that is proposed by Neil to be May 15th. Our Provost might like to push that to May 30th or something like that but obviously details have to be worked out. Quickly. Overall I would say that the comments I’ve received, mostly from Bloomington faculty and staff, have been generally positive. I think more than anything else the comments are the start of an FAQ page for that plan when it is rolled out, but if any of the campuses have anything that they want to say on that it needs to get to Erika and Jack very very quickly so that it can get on to them. And I’d like to give you a little more on health care. The university has decided –

WALKER: – If you can – can I make a –

DOWELL: Yeah, South Bend?
TERRY: Sure.

WALKER: This is IU South Bend, Leslie Walker. It’s our understanding, I had the Dean whisper in my ear three days ago that this was happening but that no one knew exactly what the details were nor that we were allowed to speak about them. [laughter] So this is not yet known nor is it, you know, and folks seem to be under the impression that it’s still supposed to be somehow under someone’s hat. So I think we, if this is going to happen, I’m also Chair of a department...

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: Well –

WALKER: …and I’m very happy to hear about it, but I certainly need more details.

DOWELL: Okay.

TERRY: The details, such as they exist are in a memo that Neil Theobald prepared and that I gave to the Erika and Jack. Neil gave –

WALKER: – That has not been received by the UFC representatives on this campus.

DOWELL: Okay, well we can follow that up after the meeting and make sure you get it. It’s just a one page bulleted list that is a draft of what they think the principle aspects of this policy would be and Neil Theobald did give our Budgetary Affairs Committee –

TERRY: – He gave it to us with the express notion that we should go out and immediately give it to the Bloomington Faculty Council that day.

DOWELL: Right.

WALKER: Yeah, but for some reason if the wires have just been crossed...

DOWELL: Yeah.

WALKER: ...in communication, that’s all.

TERRY: Yeah.

WALKER: And while I’m ecstatic to hear about it [laughter] but we just need to know that we should get it out.

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: Just let me, for those of you out there, let me clarify one of the most commonly asked questions. 18/20 eligible faculty are not eligible for this early retirement plan. The reason for that is that our agreement some years ago with the IRS that set 18/20 off in Never Never Land where it shall never in any way ever be changed. And there is great fear that even offering an alternative to it is a change. So it’s cut out for reasons related to the history of 18/20 and basically protecting the 18/20 faculty from having to pay all of the taxes in the first year that
they would take 18/20 for the entire five years of benefits that they might get. That was what the IRS wanted to assess. The IRS wished to call it a deferred compensation plan. In the end they said, ‘We don’t know what to call it but you can keep it the way it is and we won’t question it.’ So that’s where the 18/20 carve-out in that memo comes from.

DOWELL: Chuck, do you have a question or...?

GALLMEIER: Yeah, I will echo my colleague in South Bend. If they had come to us and I didn’t see it, but I don’t have a memory of –

DOWELL: Okay.

GALLMEIER: – this document as well so I would really greatly appreciate seeing it.

DOWELL: Okay, well, maybe we screwed up and I will make sure we do that before the end of the day today and get it out to the UFC members so you can still have a couple of days left to let people know about it and see if you have any important changes you would like to see.

TERRY: The feedback that’s needed on health care is sort of like this. Number one, like every employer we face escalating health care costs. The university has decided for purposes of budgeting to put 6% more next year into health care than it has put in this year. There will still be additional costs that will have to be borne by employees because we predict that health care will go up anywhere from 12% to 14% next year. But given the university’s budget, to me putting in an additional 6% seems pretty good because everything else would come out of other activities that we engage in. So employee costs will go up no matter what simply because health care is going up. The second question is the issue of allocation of share of cost between the university and employees. The Trustees and others, including the state, view us as having a rich plan because IU faculty pay a single-digit percentage anywhere from 3% to 9% of all the university’s health care costs and we’ve learned that at peer institutions that can be anywhere from 15% to 30%. So, yes, we pay much less than others but we also receive lower salaries by and large. And the situation we find ourselves in now is largely one of historical making by Chancellor Wells and others who for years focused on fringe benefits when they knew that we couldn’t get salary. There are many political reasons why we may have to shift costs from the university to employees to simply make that number look better, but the result is in effect a salary or compensation reduction for employees and that needs to be understood.

TARTELL: Actually it turns into both.

TERRY: What?

TARTELL: It’s salary and compensation reduction. It turns into both.

BURNS: Yes.

TARTELL: If they’re taking away the benefit and we’re paying for it, it’s both.

TERRY: Okay, but in any event the questions that Neil was asking are, should that be indexed in one way or another to salary? The hit on lower paid employees and staff if you did it across the
board would be much greater. If you do it by percentages then the fact somebody gets a one dollar raise suddenly moves them up by dividing points and that becomes a mess if you do it by percentages. So we’re asked to comment on that. It basically, you know, the question is should we accept cost shifting to employees simply to make our numbers look better in terms of the amount that employees pay versus the university pays to satisfy political ends or should this be something where the faculty might say we don’t want to do that, let the administration take the grief for doing it.

DOWELL: Diane?

HENSHEL: Have they run the numbers to see what would happen if they did fully index to salaries or just said everybody pays 5% of your salary to health care and see what it takes across the board?

TERRY: I think that’s been run. I don’t know the results.

HENSHEL: It would be nice to know the results.

TERRY: Neil has entered this with a proclivity, which is in this memo that he has sent out, to establish just two categories. It should also recognized that there are members of the Board of Trustees who in public meetings of the Board have clearly indicated that they think the amount transferred to low paid employees has to be pretty substantial to get their attention and to start getting them taking care of the themselves and reducing all the health care costs.

DOWELL: Hmm.

TERRY: They’ve said that in public meetings so I’m not talking out of school. So we will have some difficulty arguing to the Trustees that we should protect the low paid employees because...

HENSHEL: What’s the rational on this low paid employee...?

DOWELL: (audible sigh) That’s –

TERRY: – It’s got to be enough to get their attention.

DOWELL: That’s back to the whole kind of tying biometric goals to how much you pay in premiums which we’ve established I think at this university is a highly unpopular option that some Trustees still state publicly that they would like to see. But I don’t know, I really don’t think that Neil communicated that as something he’s taking into account in this talk about how we apportion the cost between the university and the employee.

HENSHEL: So has anybody run the numbers to see what level of employee is actually costing us more per overall amount? Because my guess is it’s the high cost older people that are –

TERRY: – Well, it’s not actually our employees who are costing us the money.

HENSHEL: Then who is it?
TERRY: 85% of the money goes to 5% of the lives we cover.

HENSHEL: And it’s mostly the families.

TERRY: Yeah.

DOWELL: It could be the families, yeah.

TERRY: And it’s basically, it’s spouses, who in many cases are so sick they’re unemployable.

HENSHEL: And they’re mostly older.

TERRY: Yeah.

HENSHEL: So...

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

HENSHEL: And it’s mostly higher level or lower level?

TERRY: Don’t know the answer to that.

HENSHEL: So before we make assumptions or before the Trustees make assumptions it would be nice to have that backed up by some sort of evaluation.

DOWELL: Yeah.

TERRY: You can ask them.

DOWELL: Definitely. Okay, Steve?

BURNS: One more issue here that seems to be on the line and that is we’ve got to stop letting administration and ourselves do these comparisons based on salary. It should be total compensation is what needs to be compared because, you know, otherwise you’re always going to lose. You know?

DOWELL: Right.

BURNS: You can take 100% salary cuts and then suddenly we’ve got an infinite proportion being put on costs for health care.


TERRY: One final comment on the budget. You may have noticed that the House Budgetary Affairs Committee has passed the budget. The budget does not implement Governor Daniels’ proposed 3% reduction in state funding, which sounds good. But it also provides that tuition would be reviewed by the Commission for Higher Education which is not so good. Here in Bloomington we will get nowhere by writing to our local representatives urging them to oppose this because our local representatives already are in the minority. But I would hope that individually members of the Bloomington faculty, – of the IU faculty – who may live in or reside
in legislative districts represented by the majority party and in the majority party will on their own, not representing the faculty, not representing that, will contact and tell them what the consequences of that would mean for higher education in the state. Bloomington can talk to Matt Pierce and Peggy Welch and others all we want but it won’t change the votes. But we have faculty who are represented by others and I hope you will contact them.

DOWELL: Okay, thank you, Herb. Alright, let’s go ahead and move on then to item four on our agenda unless... yeah, let’s go ahead and go to item four.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PROPOSED UPDATES TO THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC HANDBOOK

DOWELL: This is the proposed updates to the Indiana University Academic Handbook and this really is not a substantive update as far as the content goes. This is to get a final kind of a green light to turn the IU Academic Handbook into a truly electronic document, it will be something like a wiki format and it will allow updated policies to be updated and included in the Handbook very quickly after they are passed instead of the long delay we’ve been experiencing lately such that some policies that were passed for librarians defining librarian appointments in 2009 still haven’t appeared in the Handbook – which I get hassled about constantly – and so this will be a wiki format. There’s actually already a kind of a draft of what this would look like and the Bloomington Academic Guide has been in a format like this for about a year, I think, and it seems to be well liked. So do we have any questions about this in concept? Alright, then could we just have kind of a straw pool vote in favor? Aye? [Ayes]Any...? [More ayes] Okay, great. Any nays or abstentions? Waive your hand. Alright, very good. So we now have an official statement that we are for that. Item five, amendment to the W. George Pinnell Award for Outstanding Service.

AGENDA ITEM 5: AMENDMENT TO THE W. GEORGE PINNELL AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE

DOWELL: This is something that the President’s Office I guess came with us to help even up. There is some other award which we raised the award amount for I guess in a previous year. Craig, is that correct? And this one now needs to be increased in order to match. And so this is, there’s that one change in the very last line of the policy, changing $1000 to $2000. Okay, any questions about that or qualms?

GALLMEIER: I have a question.

DOWELL: Yes?

GALLMEIER: I won it last year and it was already $2000 that doesn’t mean I have to give $1000 back? [laughter]

DOWELL: Well, congratulations and no, I’m sure it doesn’t. I think they probably – in someone’s head – they were both probably amended to $2000 at the same time but the policies were
lagging behind so I assume this is the policy catching up with the practice. Alright, can we have a vote to approve this change to the Pinnell Award. All in favor, aye. [Ayes] Any abstentions or no’s? Very good.

AGENDA ITEM 6: RESOLUTION ON SB 475 PUBLIC EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN ELIGIBILITY AND HJR 6 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON MARRIAGE

DOWELL: Alright, our next item is a draft of a resolution on Senate Bill 475 regarding Public Employee Health Plan Eligibility and House Joint Resolution 6 Constitutional Amendment on Marriage. So this is a resolution against discriminatory state actions against GLBTQ populations and colleagues here at the university. So this is just something that I wrote up very quickly based on a previous UFC resolutions from I believe 2007 updated with new numbers and new language from at least one of the bills included and so I now invite anybody if they’d like to suggest any changes or voice opposition or what have you. Herb?

TERRY: I have one change to suggest and it’s the last sentence.

DOWELL: Mhmhm.

TERRY: In the state bill numbers change, new bills get proposed, that sort of thing. So I would propose and amend the last sentence to say, “If these or similar proposals are adopted, they will have a profoundly negative effect on Indiana University’s ability to attract and retain the best scholars, staff, and students.” As it is now it just talks about the amendment it doesn’t even address the legislation.

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: I think that language actually came out of 2007 so...

DOWELL: Which one?

TERRY: The one that limited the last sentence to the amendment probably.

DOWELL: Oh yeah.

TERRY: So I would....

DOWELL: That makes sense, yeah.

TERRY: ...make it a little broader. Overall, I hope we adopt this as these things begin and move once again through the General Assembly, because I have been involved in this discussion earlier at the UFC and BFC, I started getting emails from faculty and staff on this campus and had one from a regional campus expressing our hope that the UFC would once again step forward and speak out on this matter and I hope we do that.
DOWELL: Other comments? Yes, South Bend? South Bend, yes? We can’t hear you South Bend. No, can’t hear you still.

WALKER: Okay?

DOWELL: Yes, there we go!

WALKER: Okay, then. [laughter] I just had a reaction to the word “tolerance,” and I realize that was taken right from I believe a resolution from an organization in Bloomington. But to me tolerance suggests that we are enduring something that’s a burden and I’m wondering if we would consider replacing with “is inimical to the principles of diversity, respect,” maybe “broadmindedness” or “open-mindedness and freedom”?

DOWELL: Okay. Or we probably could easily strike “tolerance” just figuring we kind of got it covered with “respect” and “diversity,” I suppose. But...

WALKER: Yeah.

FARGO: Well, since we said the legislation expressed intolerance I guess tolerance would be suggested.

DOWELL: Well, that’s a suggestion. If anyone wants to comment on that? Maria did you have separate comment?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I am trying to figure out if, I mean, this is just a resolution it might not matter, but in the law the way they’re talking about children, it’s kind of funky, right? Because they say, “coverage under any of the following is not available to an individual other than an employee who is covered under the program or contract and the spouse and children of the employee.” Right? So even if you’re married to somebody, as opposed to having a domestic partner, and that person has children from a previous marriage that you have not adopted the law stipulates they’re not going to be covered. Now, so I’m just saying the way it’s formulated doesn’t necessarily cover that and I don’t know if we should worry about it, I just...

DOWELL: Right.

BUCUR-DECKARD: So if there’s – if you can think of another way to make it more...

DOWELL: Yeah, I think the tricky part of that is how to say it, I don’t know, succinctly.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right, exactly. “And minors who are not [laughter] biologically or legally the employee’s?” I mean that’s what we’re talking about.

HENSHEL: Not “unadopted children?” Can’t you just say that? Or “unadopted...”
BUCUR-DECKARD: Well, but if they’re yours and you give birth to them they are also unadopted. [laughter] It’s just...

DOWELL: Okay, yeah, sorry. I mean it’s just a resolution so I think –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – It’s the law that’s messed up and that’s not in here....

DOWELL: – The sense of it is there. –

BUCUR-DECKARD: ...that’s what I am saying.

DOWELL: Okay, well are there any other comments while people can maybe...

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yes.

DOWELL: ...if there are other comments maybe we can talk about those and people can scribble and try to figure out something that says that if we think it’s worth it. Any other...? Indianapolis there, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: Steve Manheimer, it’s a good idea – it’s not going to be turned into, this language will not be lifted and then pasted into a piece of legislation –

DOWELL: – Right. –

MANNHEIMER: – so as much as I admire the careful wordsmithing and calibration of semantic nuance it’s the general expression that counts more than the detail.

DOWELL: I agree. That’s well put.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Well calibrated.

MANNHEIMER: Thank you.

DOWELL: Sure. Any other comment? Would people feel comfortable taking a vote on this today?

TERRY: Yeah. [general assent]

DOWELL: Okay, then I think we’ve got definitely one change that I think makes perfect sense, Herb’s...

TERRY: If these....
**DOWELL:** ...edit of the last sentence “If these or similar proposals are adopted...” to replace the “it is...” which makes it a little more grammatical also, and then if we want to, we have the comment about tolerance and what tolerance connotes. I don’t know if we feel strongly about striking that or perhaps we want to keep it in. Any thoughts? Yep, Diane?

**HENSHEL:** I just want to comment on the tolerance, because there’s been a major campaign nationwide on teaching tolerance and so tolerance is a key word that has a whole lot of connotations no –

**CLARK:** ...it’s been very... [indistinct] ...use of the word...

**HENSHEL:** – and I think that’s the reason why it’s used.

**CLARK:** [indistinct comment] ...smart people who advocate...

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**CLARK:** ... underrepresented groups.

**WALKER:** They don’t like it?

**CLARK:** I don’t think they feel it captures what they’re doing.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**HENSHEL:** That’s interesting.

**DOWELL:** Alright, so –

**WALKER:** The term “tolerance,” also has a long, you know, history connected to sort of democratic politics. I mean you just might add, so I sort of like it.

**CLARK:** I sort of don’t!

**DOWELL:** Yes, Geoff?

**SPRINKLE:** I guess I do have a question. I’m curious about, I mean the specific language that’s proposed, “a legal status identical or substantially similar to that of marriage.” What does that even mean in the State of Indiana? I mean, why would they use that language if –

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** – We’ll find out soon if this other bill passes.

**TARTELL:** So that you can’t pass a law legalizing civil unions. They’re trying to say in this they don’t want civil unions.
SPRINKLE: They don’t even want the...?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Exactly.

SPRINKLE: So there’s nothing that would currently be recognized in the State of Indiana as...?

TARTELL: No, but this would prohibit that from even happening...

SPRINKLE: ...even happening...

TARTELL: ...in the future.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Exactly.

SPRINKLE: Okay.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Exactly. That’s the...

TARTELL: Future that’s what this thing is intended. ...

BUCUR-DECKARD: ...nastiness of it all.

TARTELL: This is intended to stop the discussion.

SPRINKLE: Okay.

TERRY: At the state level.

TARTELL: At the state level, at the federal court level....

TERRY: A federal court could still rule that the Indiana...

TARTELL: Right, so. Right.

SPRINKLE: If the federal ruled we still wouldn’t recognize that is what is what...okay.

HENSHEL: Not this...

TARTELL: Then you end up fighting all the way to the Supreme Court through every state which is already happening.

TERRY: What do we do with this resolution if we adopt it?
DOWELL: Well, I mean the fact is that the university is against both of these things and I know that they’ve worked reasonably hard lobbying against the health plan eligibility part of it. I don’t know if they’re doing any lobbying particularly on the marriage amendment. But what we do with it, I know that we could certainly send it to legislators if we wanted to, but I think our university’s position which we share is known. I know that when I mentioned it to Provost Hanson she said at the very least it’s good to have on our books because they can use that to try to show people who might be being recruited by Indiana that we’re not all like that and that our university does not think that the way our legislature does if any of this stuff actually moves forward. But I mean realistically we can send it off to different places if we want to, but I don’t know that it will make a major impact. I think it’s a statement of support for our colleagues who are victimized basically or singled out by all this stuff like this and it is a statement for people who we’re trying to show that we’re different from the rest of our state. Or some parts of our state, there’s other part of our state who feel the same way we do.

TERRY: I would suggest that we do this if we adopt this thing. I note that there are no members of the news media here today. I would hope we would send it to the Herald Times with hopes that it would get on the Associated Press wire and that, you know, we can get a little bit of publicity saying that faculty at Indiana University...

TARTELL: Sure.

TERRY: ...think that....

TARTELL: I think we should make it as public as possible....

DOWELL: Alright.

TARTELL: ...send it to every state legislator in this state so that they have it on record and know that one of the largest employers in the state is on record as saying we are violently opposed to this.

TERRY: And we have some support here.

TERRY: The Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the constitutional amendment.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right, it’s bad business.

TERRY: Yeah, they think its bad business. So it’s not like we’re....

DOWELL: Which is hopeful because I mean there are so few things the Chamber and some of us agree on.

BUCUR-DECKARD: That’s why the domestic partner benefits passed because they thought it was good business.
DOWELL: Yeah, alright.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It works.

DOWELL: I know that sending stuff to every legislator is a little bit tricky but we can work on that. We can certainly send it to three big newspapers in the state and see what happens.

HENSHEL: Their emails are all online now.

UNKNOWN BLOOMINGTON MALE: Yeah.

DOWELL: Yeah, but you have to send them individually as I understand or collect the emails and compile them.

HENSHEL: It’s a [indistinct].

DOWELL: Yeah, I know but you have to collect them all right? So...

HENSHEL: I bet if you contacted an NGO they would have a list.

TERRY: Yes.

UNKNOWN BLOOMINGTON MALE: Yeah.

DOWELL: Okay.

HENSHEL: Just sort of a guess.

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I can give you a few...

DOWELL: I just remember the last time we did something like this and Herb scraped the website and complied all that stuff.

TERRY: We got it together...

DOWELL: Yeah, we got it together.

TERRY: ....that’s the important part.

DOWELL: Alright, also we can gather on that tomorrow.
TERRY: We should vote.

DOWELL: We should vote. Yes. [laughter] Alright with the one change and we will leave “tolerance” in for right now for better or for worse. Can we have all in favor, aye? [Ayes] Do we have any abstentions or votes against? Okay, thank you very much. We’ll work on getting that out in public. Does anybody have a need for a break? Or anything like that at this point? Okay, let’s keep going. If I disappear briefly you know I’ll be back soon.

AGENDA ITEM 7: PROPOSALS FOR THE REFORM OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

DOWELL: Our next item is some discussion on proposals for the reform of the University Faculty Council and you have before you one report from November from a task force ad hoc group put together over last summer which we have seen before and talked about in November. And then you also have a newer memo that the Agenda Committee has seen before but might be new to some of us which Craig mostly and I drafted with some alternative directions that we could follow and I mean to summarize I think, you know, I looked at the proposals from the reform task force that Herb and Simon Atkinson and Markus Pomper worked on as perhaps very good for an ideal world, but I didn’t think they really addressed some of the real problems we’ve had in our meeting with, our relationship with President McRobbie and also with the interest in people serving on UFC and getting appropriate numbers of people together in order to vote on things. So this is an alternative vision, I know that, in general, in discussions that Jack and I have had with President McRobbie he’s pretty interested in a model that would have a very small group perhaps one person from each campus be an Executive Committee and a small group that he could talk with informally, perhaps. He said he might even be willing to meet more frequently with a small group that he could view as sort of a faculty sounding board than with a large group. Obviously, I don’t think we want to deliver the whole faculty governance administration into the hands of just seven or eight people but I think we could certainly think about having the Agenda Committee have more happen at the Agenda Committee and perhaps having fewer meetings that would bring everybody together and perhaps also having meetings that were shorter because I think that there’s a mental – I don’t know – there can be a mental obstacle to going to a three hour long meeting and if you’re on the Agenda Committee then you meet for an hour before and so it’s a pretty long meeting and... At any rate I won’t say much more but if you’ve had a little bit of an opportunity to read some of the new ideas I think that we aren’t really setting out that the newer proposal is not really a specific proposal but rather a new direction to go and we’d still need to have some people work on exactly what it would mean if we decided we wanted to proceed in that way. So let’s open it up for comment. And today we’re just kind of discussing it and maybe we’ll decide what our next steps are. Steve in Indianapolis?

MANNHEIMER: Steve in Indianapolis. I apologize for not having thought about this years ago or or months ago or weeks ago. It occurs to me that – I’m in the School of Informatics, The Media Arts and Sciences Program, and I should have thought of this before – I would suggest that it might somehow be a useful ingredient to have in any sort of overall plan or report is to include various electronic, a wiki-like or chatroom-like, forum of some sort. I think a lot of people, well
maybe I’m just talking about myself, we forget about some of these issues in-between meetings and then we just sort of scramble to reacquaint ourselves, refamiliarize ourselves with some of the larger conceptual dynamics and if the UFC maintained a, you know, obviously secure website of some sort or maybe not, you know an insecure website, where some of these issues might be posted and postulated about or posited in advance of a meeting this would help people like myself at least reacquaint ourselves and as a sort of a corollary to that I mean – I would imagine that is an ongoing thing – I would suggest that prior to any face-to-face meeting that there be a kind of a, you know maybe a week in advance – this is sort of a strange idea perhaps there be a preliminary video meeting – no longer than an hour, and say here’s what we’re going to talk about next week, you know, and here’s what I feel about it. Because I think in any face-to-face meeting there is a reasonable percentage, whether that’s 20% or 70% of the time an energy that is expended sort of looking around the room and trying to figure out who’s in favor of what and I’m not quite as familiar with some of these nuances. If some of those issues could be put on the table either in an online platform that’s ongoing as well as a kind of a preliminary video get-your-feet-wet meeting before the actual physical meeting, you know, and one or both of those ideas may prove to be, seem like a good idea at the time but it really doesn’t work, that’s fine, but I think it behooves us to at least consider digital amelioration to the process.

DOWELL: Thanks. That makes a lot of sense. Diane?

HENSHEL: It’s interesting that there’s a statement at first that says that the UFC as currently made up is not very responsive or needs to be more responsive and then proposes to reduce the number of meetings because if nothing else that’s going to decrease the ability to respond quickly. So my suggestion is, I agree with the digital use, if the timing of the meetings is difficult then maybe every other month it could be done digitally by email.

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

HENSHEL: With some sort of consensus developed within a certain timeframe so you’re going to get information, you know say by Friday or Monday of a week, and then that you’re expected to get it back within a week and then the results are... And in that timeframe there can be email going back and forth that everyone’s included in so you can track it. You could also potentially get the batched type of email instead of the every moment that it comes out so you could just check it at the end of the day. But there are ways to do it digitally so we could replace one digitally, but I don’t think that reducing down without some sort of way of increasing the ability to respond within the same sort of, at least monthly, timeframe is going to cause problems with the responsiveness.

DOWELL: Okay. Herb, next?

TERRY: Let me explain why Simon and Markus and I went backwards and argued for more physical meetings. We concluded that the benefit of the University Faculty Council extends beyond what it does during its meetings. That some of the best things about the Council
physically meeting together was when people from different campuses could talk to each other away from the meeting room; talk about what was going on on their campus; talk about what was going on on others, form friendships, relationships that sort of thing. All of which we found adequate electronic substitute for, and we began to speculate that part of the reason for the declining interest in participating in the UFC might actually be its lack of off-meeting conversations and familiarity and the ability of people to get to know each other and talk about issues that weren’t on the agenda and weren’t’, at that point, up for discussion. So we kept the size and frequency of the thing in part to continue to allow those opportunities to exist. The size was largely – not making very many changes – largely was that every time started calculating how to keep students involved – if we were going to do that – how to keep the regionals fairly involved, how to keep IUPUI involved, how to have some participation from the School of Medicine because every so often they drive this, we kept coming up with relatively large numbers.

DOWELL: Mmhm.

TERRY: And that’s where that came from. So we knew what the president wanted. We knew the president wanted this smaller more nimble group and I would add one other thing that didn’t come up during our discussions, but if the Agenda Committee becomes the de facto Faculty Council in many ways, how are you going to bring up and train and socialize younger faculty to join the Agenda Committee?

DOWELL: Mmhm.

TERRY: You know that comes about now from time to time by somebody at one of these campuses that actually takes an interest in the UFC, shows up and then two or three years of experience there learns what it’s about and then a few years later after they’ve sat out becomes a member of the Agenda Committee. So we were concerned about training up younger faculty and how that would work in more of an Executive Committee session compared with a larger one where inexperienced people might participate. So that’s what’s not in our report as to why we went that direction.

DOWELL: Other comments? Thoughts?

WALKER: Hi, this is Lesley again at IU South Bend. As you guys, as you noted in your reports, you know, in some ways this is really a problem on the regional campuses.

DOWELL: Right.

WALKER: I mean since our representation is two or three, we manage to find those two or three people that are interested in doing it. I wouldn’t however – if we were going to go down two and we were going to follow Erika’s solution – I do think it would be a little bit of a hardship, too, for us to have only one representative for the entire campus, to both be the president and then the president becomes the de facto UFC representative. As you see today
our president isn’t here, because you know he’s overwhelmed with responsibilities as president. So if we’re going to a leaner, meaner model, you know, I would hope on the regional campuses we would still maybe have two people as representatives that we could just in a very practical sense –

DOWELL: – Sure. –

WALKER: – You know just because I think it’s almost too much for the president of our Executive Council.

DOWELL: Mmhmm. Understood.

WALKER: We could go down to one.

DOWELL: Right. Chuck?

GALLMEIER: Chuck Gallmeier, IU Northwest. I want to echo my colleague’s sentiment on that issue. I think we’d have the same difficulty, if there were just one representative.

DOWELL: Okay. Herb?

TERRY: There was another reason why we wanted to keep physical meetings and that was we had especially thought that for the regions, Markus was you know a prominent advocate of this, it was their opportunity for face time with the president. Especially once the reporting lines had kind of changed so that instead of their chancellors reporting to the president, they were reporting to John and all of this sort of thing. So that’s another reason to why we –

DOWELL: – Right. –

TERRY: – recommended that.

WALKER: Yeah, and I’m –

DOWELL: Go ahead, Lesley.

WALKER: Okay, on the regionals we completely support that, and one of the reasons why I accepted this job was because I was willing to drive to have these face-to-face meetings. I mean that’s one of the, you know, one of the great criterias; do you have a car and will you travel [laughter] to these meetings? And I was willing to do that. So we do and the other folks that have participated in the UFC and who have been presidents feel that the face-to-face meetings are really advantageous for us and for, you know, trying to, you know, establish a sense of the greater community of IU.

GALLMEIER: IU Northwest, we couldn’t agree more.
NISHIHARA: This is a comment from IU East. Actually I spoke briefly with Markus Pomper who was on this subcommittee, I suppose, task force. And he expressed the opinion, and this is from a few years ago having been on UFC that the lack of attendance not achieving quorum was not due to the number of people on the UFC or the frequency of the meetings. He had a comment that it might have been the meetings themselves. He would see sometimes issues getting dropped that seemed to be important issues or maybe items not being perceived as important enough by the faculty members to justify faculty attendance and if the issues and items were not being perceived as important enough, faculty were less likely to show up. I do not know if that’s the general sentiment now. I think we don’t have attendance from a couple of the campuses today and I can’t speak for them about why they have not showed up, but that’s my understanding of part of the rational for the task force’s report. East is consistent in wanting at least two reps, two representatives, from this campus.

DOWELL: Alright, thanks. Yeah, I mean I think that – I mean I’m hearing – I mean I think I’m hearing – what people are saying, and multiple representatives from campuses is going to help make sure that a campus is always represented and keep the weight off of one person and also help out when you president maybe is called away to do other things or can’t attend. That makes a lot of sense. I do think though that the concept of the UFC being important for face-time with the president is in danger right now. As you will notice the president is not here and that at the very least, even if we don’t substantively change the Agenda Committee into an Executive Committee – although I think that’s still an open question, depending on the size of it – I do think we have to really think about meeting frequency and how that jives with the length of the meetings because I know we don’t often – we haven’t at least this year – often met for our full 1:30 – 4:30 time, although we might today. But that’s a long meeting. I think that conceptually, psychologically, that takes up a lot of space in a person’s brain when they’re looking at their schedule and I’m sure that is a function of why sometimes President McRobbie is not here, you know? That he looks at his calendar and has to weigh a half day of University Faculty Council with other demands on his time and we lose. And I think that we need to just – you know not that that’s a good thing that we’re thinking of having to reorganize in order to maintain the attention of, you know, our president – but I think it’s a legitimate issue that we have to put out there and think about in how we structure our schedule of meetings. And maybe it will mean not substantive changes in the structure of the Council overall, but will mean changes in our pattern of meetings, you know? I don’t know how that functions with meeting in person, if it makes it harder to meet in person if you know you’re only going to be there for an hour and a half than if you were going to be there all afternoon. But there are a lot of competing factors here that we need to try to put together to make UFC functional and attractive and something that people are willing to attend to and Laverne, I definitely taken to heart your comment from Markus about the content of meetings. I’m certain that has an effect sometimes on who’s willing to show up and for how long and when. Absolutely. Steve, here in Bloomington?

BURNS: I think content is an important feature in getting people to come out, but I think you can merge this idea that people have, because if we have sort of an electronic pre-meetings.
You come here ready to get right to the meat of the matter in that case. You can identify the controversies and talk about them in a much more time efficient way –

**DOWELL:** – Right. –

**BURNS:** – but it requires both parts, I think. It would be more meetings in a sense, because we’d sort of alternate some sort of email exchange or something and that. So I think, I do think face-time is important, but I think, you know, we could make these meetings more eventful.

**DOWELL:** Good way to put it. Hitesh, yes, at East?

**KATHURIA:** I have a comment here. What we do at IU East is Laverne attends the Agenda Committee meeting which is a week before the UFC. After the Agenda Committee she makes it a point to meet with me and discuss, go over, ‘okay, this is the policy that we discussed today this is the content.’ We go over the paperwork together. Kind of she speeds me up really fast about a half an hour, forty-five minutes, one hour. And so when I actually walk into a UFC meeting I have pretty much read most of the documents that are going to be discussed. So my point is that instead of reducing the number of people on the UFC, reduce the time of each UFC meeting by making sure that all individual campuses meet amongst themselves before they come into UFC. [indistinct comment] policies so like today when you came in today you talked about what was in the Agenda Committee business, we all know about it already now.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**KATHURIA:** So meet with local people on the campuses and then come into UFC. Everybody should be finished, prepared, like done in an hour.

**DOWELL:** Mmhmm.

**KATHURIA:** And even I think the same thing as South Bend is that we should have at least two people per regional campus so that like if one person is unable to be here the other one can substitute and still know what is happening on a routine basis.

**DOWELL:** Right, so good for you Laverne. You’re doing a good job with your campus representation and keeping them informed. We’re not so good here are Bloomington, certainly. But I could see that definitely either an in person meeting might be appropriate for some campuses and others the idea of the electronic kind of advanced discussion could help get us to that same place. So that seems like a convergence. Tony, here in Bloomington?

**FARGO:** Yeah, I just wanted to support the idea of the creation of some sort of electronic forum or wiki or some other thing for somewhat a different reason. It sounds like one of the problems – I haven’t been on the UFC that long – but it seems like one of the problems from what I’m hearing is a kind of a lack of interest or a lack of enthusiasm maybe sometimes for the three hour meeting, which is understandable, but one other thing you could do with an electronic
forum is facilitate the possibility of people talking about issues among each other between meetings which keeps peoples interests and level of support going. It is fairly easy sometimes with all that we have to do to kind of forget that the UFC even exists until you get the agenda and say, ‘Oh my God, we have a meeting coming.’ And I’m not saying that’s ever happened to me. But it’s a possibility if you can keep kind of an interest going maybe it won’t be quite as hard to get people dragged out for the meeting.

BESEL: Karl Besel from Kokomo, you’ve probably noticed that I’ve been the only one here this whole year.

DOWELL: Yes!

BESEL: There’s some reasons behind that. We have a new chancellor but we also have a Senate president who unfortunately has a class conflict with this time. So I think that, I mean, we probably do need to have electronic in addition to the physical meetings if we’re going to have more than one representative. And even for this meeting, I don’t know if it is possible to get the agenda in a little bit earlier, I didn’t get this until yesterday and I know that my chancellor’s kept on saying, ‘well, what’s on the agenda?’ and I couldn’t tell him. And it would be great if we had some electronic meeting a week prior like what was mentioned so I could talk to him. but anything. Like what Herb was saying, I try to make a point of coming down to IUPUI or Bloomington because it does benefit me professionally, personally to get to know other people at campuses a little bit more.

TERRY: [indistinct comment]

DOWELL: Sure.

TERRY: I’d make one comment. That’s something we discussed that was if there wasn’t an agenda maybe we should just have a parliamentary-type question time with the president from time to time. That one of the things that might make the UFC livelier would be more of an opportunity for faculty to preemptively bring issues to that attention of the president rather than just sort of wait for some agenda item to bubble up through the process. So we didn’t put that in our final report, but we did hope that that would be something that could also find its way into the activities of the UFC.

DOWELL: Sure. Elizabeth, here in Bloomington?

BOLING: I’d offer two suggestions about the electronic idea. The first would be to use some kind of technology that shows who’s read things and who hasn’t. [laughter]

TERRY: Yeah.

BOLING: Because it’s very similar to showing up to meetings or not showing up to meetings. If it’s easy not to show up then that will be the default position. The other is that I think electronic
media can work to enculturate people and get people known. Somebody mentioned wiki format before and I hope we’re not making the Handbook an actual real wiki. [laughter]

**DOWELL:** No, not a participatory wiki.

**BOLING:** But for this kind of forum, people who come in and have a voice, who have thoughtful things to say, those people then get sought out face-to-face. And I find large face-to-face meetings to be pretty anonymous and nobody gets to know each other who didn’t know each other already. So I think online can actually – if we structure it correctly – can do some of the things we’re hoping to have done.

**DOWELL:** Oh gosh.

**FULTON:** Hi, this is Jan at IUPUI.

**DOWELL:** Yes, Jan?

**FULTON:** In addition to thinking about a wiki approach how about something like Google docs or something like that where people can contribute [indistinct].

**DOWELL:** Sure.

**MANNHEIMER:** Same general idea as Erika.

**DOWELL:** Right, same general idea for...

**FULTON:** And it’s not necessarily tied if you do do something out in the cloud that’s not tied to a particular site, you can do it from anywhere.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**MANNHEIMER:** We could be the first university in the nation to have our Senate meetings...on Facebook! [laughter]

**UNKNOWN BLOOMINGTON FEMALE:** What if I don’t want to friend that person? [laughter]

**HENSHEL:** Let’s stay away from Facebook.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**HENSHEL:** But could we use Oncourse?
DOWELL: I’m certain we could use Oncourse. That would be – if we were interested in having internal kind of communication – that would be an obvious kind of place to start potentially. Laverne, yes?

NISHIHARA: Yes, we have an observation at IU East. Last year UFC had a wiki discussion, but our observation was that very few people participated in the wiki discussion. We’re also familiar with some of the blueprint regional campus Oncourse discussions where there are problems getting people to read what’s on Oncourse and respond to what’s on Oncourse. So I really like the concept, unfortunately I haven’t seen it working extremely well in practice...so far.

DOWELL: Good point. Maria, here?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I’m on the Graduate School Council also, among many other things, and that operates a lot through Oncourse. All of our documents are pre-circulated through Oncourse, a lot of the comments that we can post between meetings it’s the same thing. You meet once a month or maybe even less often than that. A lot of work gets done through the Oncourse site. Now, if people don’t access it or there’s a technical problem, that’s one issue but the way they usually function is to get an automatic update if someone has posted to it. So it’s ultimately your choice to go or not go there and it might not be appealing to go to yet another Oncourse site when you are already on, you know, thirty, but if there’s not a lot of activity all the time, I don’t know how burdensome that would be. Just in my... I haven’t found it burdensome. That’s all I’m saying.

DOWELL: Right, again that suggests to me that it does to a certain extent depend on the content of what’s being discussed and how, you know, how strongly people feel about wanting to monitor a particular conversation or contribute their comments to the business of the Council so it definitely sounds like these are things that are worth pursuing and experimenting with and that’s – you know with an issue like this or an effort like this to try to think about ways we can do things better – there’s no one answer and there’s probably no, you know, perfect prescription for us either so we’ll try some things and go from there. I feel like conversation’s winding down on this a little bit. I think the Agenda Committee can certainly talk about if we want to charge a new group to kind of take what people like from other policies and give us perhaps more concrete kind of something we can vote on or vote up or down. Yeah, Leslie in South Bend?

WALKER: Yeah, can I just say that it does seem to me, at least from your comments Erika, that you feel an urgency to somehow respond to McRobbie in a more – in a way in a stronger way then your initial report did. And you know it seems, I’m wondering if a suggestion might be you know trying to kind of meet part way –

DOWELL: – Right. –
WALKER: – which would be, you know, something like fewer meetings. You know, I’m thinking of a third, to cut the meetings by an hour to cut the group composition from sixty-something to forty-something.

DOWELL: Right.

WALKER: You know to in some ways to give the president, you know, a little bit to give a little bit on his demands or otherwise, you know, is he just going to not come...?

DOWELL: Well...

WALKER: I mean, I do think that what you... I mean there is a strategic question here at stake.

DOWELL: Right.

WALKER: In addition to what seems to me – in addition to the functioning of the body.

DOWELL: Right.

WALKER: So, you know, I guess I would encourage us to try to come up with some actions –

DOWELL: – Right. –

WALKER: – some time soon.

DOWELL: Thank you, Lesley. I agree and I don’t want to represent President McRobbie as making necessarily demands on us but I am concerned that we have said we were going to do some reforms and if we don’t really change anything, that looks bad. But I think I’m definitely in tune with you Lesley that what we need to do is find some sort of right, you say, in-between kind of route that could maybe tighten up things a little bit, but not perhaps go as far as we might. Steve, here in Bloomington?

BURNS: I guess I say that one thing on the table that we’re not saying is it’s not that the president probably isn’t willing to meet with the faculty, because that’s a major constituent you might say for the president, but that he doesn’t think this group is particularly efficient for communication with the faculty. I don’t know that any of these proposals are actually going to address that.

DOWELL: Right. Fair enough. Yeah?

WALKER: But on the other hand, if we make an attempt, an effort, and you know I mean it is all about you know give and take and so if we you know at this point you know it’s easy to see that the president can say I’ve asked for this and you’ve essentially said no. But if, instead I mean –
**DOWELL:** – Right. –

**UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS FEMALE:** ...but we have good reasons. I understand Herb and Simon and Markus’ reasons and I think that they’re well thought out. I’m trying to think at a sort of strategic level if part of what we want is the attention of the president, we might have to give a little bit on it. And to think of strategic ways in which we can keep the basic ideas of Simon, Markus, and Herb’s ideas intact while also being responsive to the president’s perceived dissatisfaction.

**DOWELL:** Sure. Diane, Bloomington?

**HENSHEL:** Can I just extend that question, then? So could somebody actually approach the president and say what do you recommend and maybe incorporate that not as the total overall UFC but as something that is incorporated at least maybe once a semester for him to get feedback?

**UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS FEMALE:** [indistinct comment] he just wants the Agenda Committee.

**HENSHEL:** Well does he just want the Agenda Committee?

**DOWELL:** Well, I mean I don’t think he set out a specific thing. I think he’s very interested having perhaps more interaction with a smaller group. I think his frustration is with the large group at a bunch of different sites having a very long dry meeting and so... But I don’t think he has a specific demand to do one thing or another except...

**HENSHEL:** So then maybe we have a physical meeting once a semester –

**DOWELL:** – Right. –

**HENSHEL:** – that’s in the same place and he can use that as a place he can bounce off us as well–

**DOWELL:** – Right. –

**HENSHEL:** – and keep that as a more focused, shorter meeting. Well, it can’t be too short if you’re going to spend three hours driving, you know. But you know a more focused meeting...

**UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS FEMALE:** Two hours.

**HENSHEL:** ...and then we would use other meetings to carry on our usual business.

**DOWELL:** Yeah, I think that’s kind of the direction we’ll be going. I think in sort of some kind of middle way trying to accommodate maybe that need for a little more focused, in some ways
informal, sounding board environment for interacting with the President but keeping some aspect of the larger representation in perhaps a more streamlined meeting with electronic communication to help us prepare for that in person meeting. Diane, again?

**Henshel:** Can I recommend that he already has the means and already takes advantage of the means to pull individual advisory groups?

**Dowell:** Yeah.

**Henshel:** And that I think it may not be such a good idea to say we’re going to pare down the UFC when we meet with you just so that you can have a smaller body to have a sounding board from, because I think then he’s losing something that he doesn’t recognize he needs.

**Dowell:** Okay. Chuck, were you..? You were waving your hand hard and there’s actually Subah in Indianapolis, too.

**Gallmeier:** I recall the last time we met with Michael that he made it pretty clear that he likes a smaller group.

**Dowell:** Yeah.

**Gallmeier:** But I think although while that is an idea that we should of course try to meet him halfway with, I do think it’s also important that we meet with our larger group as well. I agree with my colleague in Bloomington. I think he doesn’t know what he might be missing that way.

**Dowell:** And Subah? That is you, right?

**Packer:** Yes, yeah. So you know after sort of looking at this now several times over some months and coming to a number of meetings with President McRobbie and so forth, what I can’t get a feel for is what does the President view as the role of the Faculty Council? I can’t get a feel for whether he values our input and whether – and sometimes on occasions when we have an opposing view than his – whether he thinks that is of any value...

**Dowell:** Mhmmm.

**Packer:** ...or what does he think the purpose of this is?

**Dowell:** Well, that is a good question. And Craig?

**Dethloff:** I just have to step in here. I think, if you’re asking what the President thinks of the UFC, I think we have to go back to the question of quorum. I mean, you think you passed something here today but you don’t have a quorum. When the President comes here he wants action taken and he doesn’t have a quorum to get the action taken by the UFC. And these are decisions that were already agreed up in the Agenda Committee that happened in one hour.
We rehash it again for another three hours with a group that’s supposed to be three times as big, but rarely gets to twice the size. I mean there’s some really fundamental issues here and I think we’re not going to decide it today, but I think we should at least have an empowered body that takes a look at this over the long haul. We have to take another look at this.

DOWELL: Yeah.

PACKER: So I wonder if the Faculty Council at-large understands that we’re going to lose our voice if we don’t start having a quorum?

DOWELL: Probably not. But that’s, you know, that’s the perpetual problem of faculty governance I think is trying to make people care about what’s really important about it and I think Craig is right that we need to try to do what we can to address this. And if some of it is making getting a quorum easier, that’s good. So that might mean shrinking the Council somewhat and if some of it is trying to drum up information and perhaps find ways for people to vote on things electronically if they know they can’t be at the meeting then that’s another way to do it but... Steve?

MANNHEIMER: Well, that’s – you took the words right out of my mouth. There are synchronous quorums and asynchronous quorums –

DOWELL: – Right. –

MANNHEIMER: – and ways of saying yes so-and-so has read the documents or at least they say they have and their electronic presence has been noted and their vote is thus dually calibrated.

DOWELL: Right.

MANNHEIMER: There you go.

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: I agree.

HENSHEL: I agree.

DOWELL: Okay. Thank you Craig for putting that out and the Agenda Committee will work on charging some people to work on a new proposal, a hybrid thing, I guess. And if you’re interested in doing that or working on a small group to do that let me know or let Craig know. Alright, I think we can move on at this point. Number eight.

AGENDA ITEM 8: DISCUSSION ON THE CREATION OF A UNIVERSITY POLICY ON PROGRAM CREATION, MERGER, REORGANIZATION AND ELIMINATION
DOWELL: The document that’s been circulated to you is really only something for discussion. This is not something that we should take with any super seriousness if we don’t want to, okay? But item eight basically considering do we need a university-level policy or statement of principles on program Creation, Merger, Reorganization and Elimination. Now, I know that Bloomington and IUPUI have campus-level policies that look at this. Bloomington is in the midst of trying to rewrite its policy about this and the document that you have here is sort of – it was actually just written by a vice provost here in Bloomington, Tom Gieryn, as an idea of what a very sort of stripped down policy could look like. And frankly some people believe that this is probably too stripped down, but it was something convenient for us to kind of circulate and perhaps talk about as an idea. And now we don’t have to spend a lot of time on this right now necessarily. If people think it’s a good idea and would like to – we think maybe the best thing to do would be to get some volunteers to work on a document like this at the university level we could do that and simply send them off to work on it. But you know considering the budgetary environment and considering what people might think might come out of some of the New Directions Reports, it’s something that certainly in Bloomington is on people’s minds as wanting to make sure that our policy is in order the best we can to try to protect faculty rights and to ensure the integrity of academic programs that we’re all involved with and care about. Geoff? Here in Bloomington.

SPRINKLE: I just have another construct question today, I guess. What is financial exigency mean in terms of, is it a campus-wide construct? A system-wide construct? Or is it...?

DOWELL: Right.

SPRINKLE: I just worry a little bit about that you go through, you know, the reorganization and if the construct is defined sufficiently small then you could say, ‘Well gee,’ you know, ‘we’re having difficult budget times and we’re going to apply this to this new school.’

DOWELL: Right. Our current –

SPRINKLE: – I don’t know how the construct’s defined, I guess...

DOWELL: Well, I mean that’s an issue with this kind of stripped down thing, because it’s not.

SPRINKLE: Does anyone recall in the...

DOWELL: Yeah, I mean our current policy has a rather extended kind of description of what financial exigency means. Herb did you want to say more on that?

TERRY: Well, generally within AAUP the construct is broad. It would have to be the university confronting financial exigency. The problem is that we’re a very odd university in the sense that we’re a system –

DOWELL: – Just a second. Indianapolis, yeah?
**UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS MALE:** Herb, can’t the budgets follow campus? So your budget is separate our budget. Our budget is separate from Southeast’s budget. So it seems like the budgetary construct on this would be at the campus level.

**TERRY:** I think that’s accurate given our budgeting system.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**DETHLOFF:** Yeah, this is taken from our MRE policy which is designed for campus exigency.

**SPRINKLE:** Okay.

**DOWELL:** Okay, Steve, here in Bloomington?

**BURNS:** I would argue – and I realize there’s an opposite argument to this that’s also valid – but I would argue now is not the time to take up something like this. I can see it going through a long reasoned process and reaching the Trustees and having just immediate political responses come up as we’re seeing in other parts of government service that would not be desirable.

**DOWELL:** Mmhmm.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** What would not be desirable? Just to understand the full...

**BURNS:** Well, why do we have such good deals about academic freedom and things like that? I can see the argument going in totally inappropriate ways if the university is under financial exigencies. And I think it’s important to consider these things and plan for them, but I can also argue that now is the time actually to prepare for it and do it right. But I’m going to right now argue now is not the time to be dealing with this thing. So I don’t know what the right decision is obviously, but...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Well, the issue is that there is a current policy.

**BURNS:** There are current policies...

**DOWELL:** There are policies...

**BURNS:** ...changing them is what I’m talking about. [indistinct comment]

**DOWELL:** I don’t think we are aware of any university-level policy. There are some campus-level policies...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Right, there’s a BFC policy.
DOWELL: ...that are not necessarily on all campuses.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right.

DOWELL: So I mean one question would be, do we need a university-level policy? One question would be, would we rather simply put this forward and say should campuses who don’t have a policy perhaps discuss whether they would like to develop one for their campus if we also believe that’s really where, you know, where a lot of the action is at the campus-level, say, for things like this. And there’s a hand? South Bend, yeah, Lesley?

WALKER: Yeah, I think our campus would be interested in developing such a policy. We have an example in the very recent past of SPEA being dismantled on our campus and I feel that that was done in a pretty, I don’t know what I would say, you know, kind of an authoritarian way. It was a choice made by a particular administrator and then and thus it was without a lot of faculty consultation. So I mean, you know again, whether or not that should have happened is not what’s at stake, but the procedures by which it did happen I think are troubling. So I think on our campus a general university policy in how these kinds of things should happen would be welcome.


GALLMEIER: When the agenda came out – besides what we were talking about earlier about faculty not paying much attention to the Council – when this agenda item came out I received ten emails –

DOWELL: – Wow! –

GALLMEIER: – from my colleagues on this campus. I’ve never seen that happen before so obviously this struck a nerve and I just thought besides what we said earlier clearly our colleagues here in these particular times saw this to be something they wanted to know what this was about –

DOWELL: – Right. –

GALLMEIER: – And wanted me to report on it. So clearly this is something that interests us at IU Northwest.

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

GALLMEIER: Having a policy that in a way protects faculty and perhaps not having more South Bend experiences that kind of stuff.

DOWELL: Okay. I hope I didn’t cause great alarm at Northwest by putting this on the agenda, or we didn’t, but –
GALLMEIER: – No one is driving into the lake or anything, but I’ve never seen this kind of quick reaction. People rarely look at this when it comes out but ten emails is, I think, a significant amount –

DOWELL: – Indeed. –

GALLMEIER: – and I would like to put it out there.

UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS FEMALE: “Contingency” in the title is kind of scary.

DOWELL: Okay, thanks Chuck. Indianapolis, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: Well, if I think that’s exactly the kind of response we would like to for all UFC communications. [laughter]

DOWELL: Indeed!

MANNHEIMER: It’s not necessarily, you know, a warning shot across the bow but if it elicits an unprecedented level of local interest, we ought to say, ‘Aha! We have struck a nerve!’ and it behooves us to, if nothing else, I would suggest that we send the IUPUI and Bloomington documents around to all of our sister campuses and say we are interested. I mean first of all this is just an informational matter, but here are the policies that currently are already in place on the campuses. We’re currently considering the advisability of a university-wide policy, but you know your comment is welcome at this point, good luck. You know and we would then be responsive to those ten emails and create a greater sense of cross campus collegiality.

DOWELL: My instinct is to kind of go with just what you suggested and to kind of just start a conversation at this point and see if a consensus builds that we need something at the university level. That’ll also give us an opportunity to perhaps address some of the questions that Steve brought up as far as Trustees or what are other kind of side complications that could arise by creating or seeking to create a university-level policy and talk those over maybe with provost, chancellors, the president, various other people to kind of see what seems like the right road ahead. So anyway, I like what you said. Other…? Yeah, Laverne?

NISHIHARA: This is really a question. There is a line in the IU Constitution that reorganization and elimination of programs and units are part of faculty legislative authority. So that’s part of the Constitution it’s in the IU East Constitution as well that faculty have legislative authority and so my understanding is that the need for a contingency policy such as this one would be on cases of financial exigency over which administration would have the authority. Am I right that that’s what is intended to be addressed by this policy or are there other cases we should be thinking about when this would be essential?
DOWELL: I think you are very right to point out that part of the Constitution, but I think the way we’ve been thinking in Bloomington at least recently about the policy is that it’s meant to cover more than these kinds of mergers or changes driven by financial exigency that it’s meant to be a statement of some greater or lesser specificity about what expectations there are for faculty authority over these kinds of program mergers and eliminations – and I can’t list them all four every single time – but these types of things and to set out some kind of, I don’t know, we are kind of in a debate in Bloomington about how much procedure, you know how specific we should be about how things should happen because you know there are a lot of other things that could spur a reorganization or a change besides financial exigency. And how do we want to kind of stake out what our expectations are for the protection of faculty rights and for faculty consultation in those processes. Because as much as the academic programs are under the authority of the faculty, you know not all of these decisions are, you know, grassroots kind of inspired. I mean, in fact, it’s probably rather the opposite, so... Lesley, in South Bend?

WALKER: Yeah, and I just want to say that on our campus over the last I would say, you know, four or five years there have been cases where faculty have been in serious distress and this isn’t about financial exigencies it’s about simply a dean, a vice chancellor comes in and decides that this is a better organization for X, Y, or Z and so you know again, “Let there be light,” and it happens. And so again advocating for the faculty and that these matters should stay within the faculty purview I think would be something that on our campus we would, I think we would find a lot of support for.

NISHIHARA: I think I understand. Thank you.

DOWELL: Oh? Okay. Sorry. Laverne, were you just chiming in with a yes or a... I missed that.

BESSEL: She said she thought she understands.

DOWELL: Okay.

NISHIHARA: I understand.

DOWELL: Thanks. Alright, okay, so for right now let’s say take the idea of this policy to your colleagues on your campus and see about getting back to the UFC, your representative to the UFC Agenda Committee, about what you would like to see happen at the UFC level relating to this issue and the UFC Agenda Committee will plan on talking about ways forward soon. And if you would like to consult with chancellors or others that’s fine and we’ll see what we can do about talking with Michael about it, too. Or John Applegate. Or Barb.

BICHELMEYER: I guess I would just add that you brought up the point earlier that this is actually pared down version of the Bloomington document back to Laverne’s –

DOWELL: – Right. –
BICHELMEYER: — comment about the use of this. I think the fact that it is in the Constitution is a statement of principle and this document in its much larger version from the Bloomington Faculty Council particularly —

DOWELL: — Right. —

BICHELMEYER: — Council is the practical issues and principles that should guide that action —

DOWELL: — Right. —

BICHELMEYER: — So I don’t think it’s a one or the other, they go hand-in-hand this give guidance about —

DOWELL: — Right.–

BICHELMEYER: ...exactly how that info would be collected.

DOWELL: Mmhmm. Right. Thanks, Barb.

AGENDA ITEM 9: DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR CORE SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW

DOWELL: Okay. Alright, then this item is again one of these big mushy kinds of, I shouldn’t say big mushy kinds of things [laughter], but it’s something that we can introduce today. We’re not going to resolve it today, but it’s a document that we’d like your input on and, you know, again perhaps this, you know, half this meeting perhaps is a poster child for why we should do electronic consultation before meetings, but that’s why we need to talk about reform. So the document you have that has a typo in the first word as it turns out, “Thrird [sic] Year Core Dean Survey Questions,” this is a follow-up that the Agenda Committee needs to resolve in the next probably few weeks, I would say. We passed, I believe it was just last year, a new policy for the review of deans of the core schools and so principally this is an issue for Bloomington and Indianapolis. The policy states that for the surveys, third year surveys particularly, there will be a certain number of questions that are the same for each review and that ten of these will be determined by the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee in consultation with the survey agent. You can see the quote from the policy there and so what we have here is sort of a compilation of — in bold you have the questions as it says here. Those, I don’t know that those exact questions, those are questions that the review needs to respond to. We don’t have to use, I don’t think, that exact phrasing and underneath those questions are some ideas of how they have been phrased in other kinds of reviews. What other kinds of reviews? Other reviews, so examples of how we have sought information about the bold kind of issues in other ways, there’s eight of those and then nine and ten are kind of new possible areas for questions and some examples of how those might proceed. Already before the meeting I know we had somebody here in Bloomington suggest a kind of, couldn’t one of these questions that would be all new relate to…Diane what did you say? Was it more like climate or…?
HENSHEL: Work environment, climate, the sense of whether you even want to be there or not be there is one of the issue sometimes.

FARGO: Morale, in other words?

HENSHEL: Well, morale is part. It’s that whole sense of is it a – Does it feel like a place that people actually want to work or be?

BURNS: I have written in “desirable place to pursue [indistinct].”

HENSHEL: Yeah, well, but the word that I used, the words that one usually hears are “work environment” or “climate,” are the usual two phrases that I can think of from the work world, the non-academic world, and so I don’t know what else captures it besides that.

DOWELL: Right. At any rate we can discuss this for a little while maybe get some sense of what people want, but in general it’s the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee that needs to just decide what the questions are, consult with the survey agent, and get this ready for Review of the Dean of SPEA that’s getting kicked off soon.

HENSHEL: Oh, that’s interesting. Could I ask one other question?

DOWELL: Yes, absolutely.

HENSHEL: Could a part of this be a requirement that nobody associated with the university actually runs this so that confidentiality is 100% ensured? Because that’s never happened in my experience here.

DOWELL: Well, I don’t think that’s within the brief of these questions.

HENSHEL: No, I understand, but if this is a policy that’s being developed, can that be part of the policy? To establish a set of surveys? Because so far every single time we’ve done this, it’s always been somebody internal to the university and usually associated with the school.

DOWELL: Really?

HENSHEL: Well, yeah. And so I think this problematic I think then there’s a reluctance especially of the untenured faculty to respond.

DOWELL: Well, Craig, can you look at the policy? I mean we’re not really opening up the policy for changes necessarily right now although maybe this would spur such effort.

HENSHEL: As a recommendation, maybe? Could it be put into that?
**DOWELL:** As a recommendation and we can certainly see what language we have existing and how it might relate to that issue and see.

**BURNS:** It’s probably more cost effective to just let the survey group administer the survey instead of people internally who don’t –

**DOWELL:** – I mean I think that seems to be the way this SPEA review seems to be moving forward, but I don’t know how that relates to what the policy calls for.

**HENSHEL:** Just to make sure that the responses are always 100% confidential, which it hasn’t been in the past.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**BESEL:** I think that’s a good idea. I have some personal experience with this. I actually Chaired the Dean Review Committee as a non-tenured faculty member which was very awkward. [laughter] I would strongly suggest not doing it. [laughter] On regional campuses I think it was mainly a function of we couldn’t find enough people to serve on the committee. So I’ve actually strongly supported and advocated for it to be as external as possible so I think that is a great idea.

**HENSHEL:** Yes.

**DOWELL:** Steve, in Indianapolis?

**MANNHEIMER:** Well, I’m a little surprised because as far as I know, and I’ve sort of been around three or four of these Dean’s reviews here at IUPU, I they are always chaired by somebody outside of the school. And they include you know –

**HENSHEL:** – That’s not the point. –

**DOWELL:** – Yeah. –

**MANNHEIMER:** – the... I’m taken aback that apparently it’s not – obviously [comments indistinct] at Bloomington.

**DOWELL:** Well, I’m pretty sure they’re always chaired outside the school. I don’t know how that relates to –

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** – How they’re run. –

**DOWELL:** – how the survey is run.

**HENSHEL:** And where the information goes.
DOWELL: Right.

BESEL: Yeah, it doesn’t mean it’s anonymous which is kind of what you are getting at.

HENSHEL: It’s absolutely not anonymous.

BESEL: Yeah.

HENSHEL: Yeah.

BUCUR-DECKARD: [indistinct comment] communication is anonymous.

HENSHEL: Yeah. No, I mean, when people within the school or connected to the school are asking you for feedback that’s not unconnected to the school. I don’t care who the chair is. It’s just completely inappropriate in my opinion to have any of the stuff come without stripped out names.

DOWELL: Mmhmm.

HENSHEL: And without stripped out anything that would identify. Otherwise you’re not protecting untenured faculty, especially.

DOWELL: Sure.

UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS MALE: I think this...

MANNHEIMER: I stand corrected. So what you are saying is important, but does it cut both ways, though? Doesn’t the university want to hang on to that information, or should it just be a one shot thing and then forgotten about?

HENSHEL: I don’t know. I just think that there is no... Confidentiality I think is important. People that don’t want to have it be confidential certainly make their voices known and it’s usually people that feel in enough power within the unit that they don’t feel that they can be touched which is usually the senior faculty, you know, at the highest level and that has happened too, in my experience. But there’s never been, in my experience, a completely anonymous way of doing this. No matter what they say.

MANNHEIMER: I agree. I agree with what you are saying. I’m just wondering if it’s valuable information... I mean, I don’t know.

BUCUR-DECKARD: But the survey results can be made available even if there is no.... In other words you aggregate the results...
MANNHEIMER: Okay

BUCUR-DECKARD: ...right? And you provide... Well that would be part of what is shared publically, in fact.

DOWELL: Right.

BUCUR-DECKARD: How can you have a review without a public sharing of the information?

HENSHEL: And then it was interesting like for the last SPEA one, which was before this dean. It was done with the – there was one attempt to use Survey Monkey as a part of it, which was great, but the questions identified you instantly. [laughter]

BUCUR-DECKARD: The answers to the questions?

HENSHEL: Yeah, absolutely.

DOWELL: Yeah.

HENSHEL: So, you know, what was the point? “How many years of service?” Well, huh? [laughter]

UNKNOWN REGIONAL CAMPUS FEMALE: Oh right...right.

FARGO: Oh, I get it.

DOWELL: Oh, they collected that demographic information?

HENSHEL: Oh, yeah! Yeah, that’s completely inappropriate.

DOWELL: That is definitely inappropriate.

FARGO: Yeah, I don’t think that was – we just went through one of these and I don’t think that was one of the questions. I was having trouble figuring out what you were...

HENSHEL: Oh, no it was a...

BURNS: ...were referring to. Now I get it. We didn’t have that.

DOWELL: Well, as we consult with the survey agent, whoever that turns out to be, we can certainly keep that in mind as we move forward on these questions.

TERRY: Your dean was a core dean?
**FARGO:** Mmhmm.

**TERRY:** Do these seem like good questions to ask?

**BURNS:** Yeah, these look vaguely familiar. What we did, if I remember correctly is, we basically these eight questions were the primary guides when we sought comments for inside the school and outside the school of various consistencies, just those eight questions not the subquestions.

**TERRY:** Just looking at question four, it seems to me, I wouldn’t interpret it as including what’s under it. “How well this Dean manage resources to maintain the integrity of the unit when faced with outside pressures?”

**DOWELL:** Mmhmm.

**TERRY:** I would say it was more like internal and external pressures. Budgeting I think of internal. External I would think of as legislative relations –

**DOWELL:** – Right. –

**TERRY:** – and all that kind of stuff. So that question struck me as a little oddly worded.

**FARGO:** Yeah, I don’t remember it being phrased that way, but it could be...

**TERRY:** But what you’re after is leadership is this dean a leader that maintains and establishes goals? That seems good. Is the dean working successfully to achieve these goals and objectives? Is the dean a good representative to external forces? Does the dean manage to deal with internal and external pressures well? Is this core unit perceived appropriately among faculty and staff within the core and throughout the system? I’m not sure they might – that there’s much of a perception of these core schools throughout the system, but you can find that out. Is the dean faithful to carrying out Affirmative Action and other policies? Is the dean paying attention to faculty governance?

**DOWELL:** Yes, we definitely need to have that.

**TERRY:** And effective? That seems pretty comprehensive.

**SPRINKLE:** I just had a question about the purpose of this?

**DOWELL:** Mmhmm.

**SPRINKLE:** It seems like, I mean, deans have five year appointments, is that right?

**DOWELL:** Yeah.
SPRINKLE: And so our dean also went through the evaluation process. Is this going to be used for contract renewal? Because we go through the process for contract renewal and if it’s not for contract renewal or is it just information to the dean’s that, ‘Gee, you’re either doing well on this dimension, not well...?’

BUCUR-DECKARD: [indistinct] the provost?

DOWELL: Right, I mean –

SPRINKLE: – I mean I understand that but you would go through a contract renewal process and then faculty can voice their concerns and presumably you wouldn’t get another five year appointment. So if this goes–

DOWELL: – Right. –

SPRINKLE: – I mean I appreciate that if this goes to the deans or the provost. What does the provost do, sit you down and say, ‘Gee, you know, your faculty don’t think you’re doing a good job. You need to –’

DOWELL: – Right. –

SPRINKLE: ‘– switch directions?’ I just wasn’t sure in terms of how –

DOWELL: – Right. –

SPRINKLE: – this is going to be used. –

DOWELL: As far as I know none of our review policies for deans have any direct link to any kind of contract renewal. They are advisory to, I think, the dean and whoever the dean reports to and the president. If they don’t re – so you know I think that you’re right. That gap does exist.

FARGO: You know one of the things we talked – just because I recently was [indistinct comment] we talked to Karen a little bit about what was going to happen at the back end of this and you’re correct there’s no linkage between this and the contract necessarily, but what we did talk about was the dean often mentioned to us that he had been faced with being given a set of goals when he arrived and he kind of talked to us each year about how things were going with the goals. So one of the things we talked to Karen about was well, couldn’t he maybe be given a new set of goals? Well, I assume that she was going to do a new set of goals for the next five years or whatever and include some of these concerns. So it is one of the ways that she can evaluate –

DOWELL: – Right. –
FARGO: – the dean down the road.

SPRINKLE: I just have a quick question about...

DOWELL: I see you Steve, you’re coming up soon. Or do you want to go now?

MANNHEIMER: I, I just, the wisdom up here such as it may be, the rule of thumb is these things don’t – if somebody is performing at a C or a B level, you know that’s subject to interpretation, these reviews probably don’t have a lot of impact. If somebody’s performing at an A level and the faculty and the community perceive that and that can be an empowering or validating thing. But if somebody’s performing at D level or even part of their portfolio is being handled at D level of quality or efficiency, it can be a pretty powerful instrument and there have been examples even at darn near the highest level of campus administration where a, you know, a mixed review given to an administrator and particularly sort of pointing here’s where you are really tripping over your own shoelaces, pal, has resulted in substantive changes. But it’s easy to be cynical about this stuff and that’s because most of them come in at the B or C level. It’s okay, not so bad, could be a little bit better. It’s the either end where these instruments actually do have some power.

SPRINKLE: Fair enough.

DOWELL: Geoff, did you have anything else to add?

SPRINKLE: No, that’s very helpful.

DOWELL: Maria?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I just want to say that the way I’m reading all these questions seem to be a kind of self-fulfilling prophesy. Meaning that everything here seems to be kind of, ‘Let’s talk about the RCM model and see how well you are implementing it,’ as a way possibly to justify the RCM model. I mean that’s the kind of my lurking fear here. Because if you look, I mean, what we’re evaluating, I think, here is the ability of this person to act as an advocate for the RCM unit and to do things well within the rules that are setup. Things that the New Academic Directions is considering seriously – and there will be some kind of public statement about this at some point in the future hopefully this semester – are bridging gaps between different RCM units, trying to put student’s interests at the forefront of how we think about managing our resources and trying to enable them to do what they want to do, even if it doesn’t fit inside out little boxes. And I think the only question that deals with such sort of questions is still kind of a passive one; number six, “How effectively has the Dean lead the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies?” I’m saying reactive because it’s all about, you know, living within, you know, the means and the budget and in a way that’s fair. You know you want to evaluate a person according to the policies that exist, but by the same token this kind of initiative and thinking forward is nowhere in here.
DOWELL: Mhm.  

BUCUR-DECKARD: And I worry about that because it’s sort of – how does that serve the higher community, the larger community beyond RCM, is what I keep asking myself. Right? Why are we talking about this in the UFC as opposed to, instead of the SPEA, you know, Faculty Council?  

DOWELL: Right.  

BUCUR-DECKARD: For instance, there’s a higher goal at stake, right?  

SPRINKLE: Well, it does kind of setup a few questions on am I being taken care of as an individual faculty member.  

BUCUR-DECKARD: That’s what I am saying! So –  

SPRINKLE: – and if it is then there needs to be some [indistinct comment] –  

BUCUR-DECKARD: – you’re rewarded for saying yes or no to that and not thinking, ‘Oh that student that came to me who was in the Music School, you know, can I take that class with – is there a deal with them properly?  

SPRINKLE: It does seem to minimize the actualities that exist.  

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right  

FARGO: So in other words what you are saying what we need is a like question that says, ‘How well does the dean think outside the box?’  

HENSHEL: Oh, good question!  

FARGO: And innovatively?  

DOWELL: Or to address more explicitly things that aren’t just internal to the school, you know?  

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yes.  

BESEL: Yes.  

BURNS: How is the Dean serving to advance the school within the university’s overall goals and mission?  

BUCUR-DECKARD: The interest of the student body at this university whether inside or outside, and then, of course, the question is who is the survey going to go to?
**Dowell:** Mmhmm.

**Besel:** Yeah.

**Bucur-Deckard:** Is it going to be only faculty and staff and students in that unit in which case again self-fulfilling prophesy because it’s about efficacy in keeping resources in, right?

**Burns:** [indistinct comment] should have something broader than students. Students in one part of the group there are some aspects to that who [indistinct comment].

**Bucur-Deckard:** Right, right, right.

**Terry:** There’s another way –

**Dowell:** Okay, we have Ed Berbari in Indianapolis.

**Terry:** Alright.

**Berbari:** Yeah, this is Ed. Having just sat on one of our senior administrator’s reviews and it wasn’t a core dean, but we really came to the conclusion that the survey was more to make faculty feel that they were involved with the process and that [indistinct comment] came from interviews and so on. I mean what happened in our case was that most of the data comes in some sort of a standard distribution of responses. You know you ask enough people these questions and you get everything in the middle, and a few things on the end –

**Dowell:** – Yeah. –

**Berbari:** – and you kind of realized – I mean we didn’t know this at the time – but after the fact, it did provide us with a lot of data but people felt involved with the process.

**Dowell:** Mmhmm.

**Berbari:** And so, usually you think of a lot of other ways to get information about performance rather, you know, than what the constituents and what a lot of different people – and that was where our valuable information came from.

**Dowell:** Right.

**Berbari:** It made the evaluation as opposed to the survey. So I wouldn’t knock yourself out over the survey.

**Dowell:** Geoff?

**Sprinkle:** That’s the other side of the coin –
DOWELL: – Right. –

SPRINKLE: – is that you do ask people to – and this was part of my question – if you ask people to complete this and then you know if you’re in the B or C or A range and then you don’t attend to faculty member concerns then –

DOWELL: – Mhmhm. –

SPRINKLE: – what happens, you know? And that to me is a bit worrisome.

BUCUR-DECKARD: If there’s no follow up.

SPRINKLE: Yeah, if there’s no follow up, then you feel like –

DOWELL: – Mhmhm. –

SPRINKLE: ...alright, my dean’s not listening to my voice.

DOWELL: Sure. Herb?

TERRY: There’s another way to look at Maria’s observation I think that’s reflected in this whole process. The results of these third year reviews of deans generally aren’t know by the Agenda Committee or other groups at the campus level. So if you view these as RCM officers and you restrict the review to within the RCM you restrict the reporting of the data to the RCM.

DOWELL: Mhmhm.

TERRY: You’re not encouraging anybody to look at the interaction of that RCM unit with the other units in the overall missions of the campus or –

DOWELL: – Sure. –

TERRY: – with the university.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I mean if the point of the policy is to inform the provost or the chancellor or the president about, you know, the performance of this person, I would think that they would want to know about interaction of this person beyond their own unit. You know, how they play with others, right? That’s a pretty basic question, yeah?

SPRINKLE: Does the dean play well in the sandbox?

FARGO: [makes motion of checking a box] Plays well with others. [laughter]
TARTELL: [enumerating categories] Excellent, satisfactory... [laughter]

DOWELL: Okay. Yeah, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: The other thing that I’d throw out there is that I actually served on the committee that reviewed Jerry Bepko years ago and we opted to do a narrative sort of summary of all the data and we got a lot of very positive feedback out of it. People appreciated what was a – you know, I think I remember it was like four or five page – encapsulation of what all the data points meant at least as we understood it on the committee, and that was a lot more palatable for people rather than sort of flipping through page –

DOWELL: – Sure. –

MANNHEIMER: – after page of bar graphs and such.

DOWELL: Okay. Alright, well I may be speaking only for myself but I think maybe some of you’d join me in thinking that maybe we’re running out of gas on this and I take Ed’s comment to heart that maybe we shouldn’t knock ourselves out about the questions necessarily, but I also think we’ve had some valuable comments about what kinds of other things we might want to fold into the questions we do end up with, so unless there are objections I think we can welcome further specific comment about the questions to me or Jack or others on the Agenda Committee and we’ll work it out and we could adjourn now. Thoughts? Objections to adjournment at this point? South Bend? I can’t hear you. Can you unmute?

CLARK: I just wanted to make sure that we would be receiving the information about the early retirement...

DOWELL: Yes.

WALKER: ...plan. We don’t have that and the Academic Senate will meet Friday.

DOWELL: Okay, we did – actually Joey checked and if members of the UFC Agenda Committee should have received it last Thursday in an attachment, but that’s just the Agenda Committee but we can follow up with another one, too.

CLARK: Okay, I can contact the person who’s on our Agenda Committee. I just want to be able to circulate it.

DOWELL: I understand and we can do a broader one, too.

TERRY: The acronym is ERIP.

DOWELL: Right.
TERRY: Early Retirement Incentive Program.

DOWELL: Right, ERIP maybe in the subject heading of that from last Thursday. Great, thank you everybody.