Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 29, 2013
2:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M. (EST)
Indiana Memorial Union State Room East, IUB

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Applegate, Simon Atkinson, James Barbre, James Barry, Jonathyne Briggs, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Claude Clegg, Susan Cress, Charles Davis, Jan Froehlich, Charles Gallmeier, Don Gjerdingen, Bradley Heim, Cathy Ludlum Foos, Mike Kaufmann, Robert Kravchuk, Jennifer Laherty, Steve Mannheimer, Michael McRobbie, Yusuf Nur, Jim Sherman, Jodi Smith, Herb Terry

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Ed Berbari, Doug Darnowski, Chris Darr, Andrew Downs, Linda Adele Goodine, Jerry Hinnefeld, Jim Hollenbeck, Michael Nusbaumer, Lauren Robel, Joel Stager

GUESTS: Jon Blau (Herald Times), Tom Gieryn (Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, IUB), Jenny Kincaid (Director of Policy Administration, EVPUAA), Karen Lee (IFC Coordinator, IUPUI), and Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office, IUB)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY13/03.26.13.pdf
2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and L. Jack Windsor, Co–Secretaries of the University Faculty Council)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY14/U1–2014.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY14/U2–2014.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY14/U3–2014.pdf

3. Presiding Officer's Business (30 minutes)
(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)[*]
(President McRobbie and Co–Secretaries Terry and Windsor)

---

[*] Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co–Secretaries Terry and Windsor should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at:
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc

5. Indiana University Principles of Ethical Conduct (20 minutes)
(Professors John Applegate and Don Gjerdingen) [ACTION ITEM]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY14/U4–2014.pdf

6. Academic Policies Migration Update (15 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, IU Bloomington; Jenny Kincaid, Chief of Staff and Director of Policy Administration, Office of the Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy) [ACTION ITEM]
http://policies.iu.edu/

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MCROBBIE: I guess I'll try and use this. Ladies and gentleman is everybody ready to commence the meeting? Well, let's get started. I just want to – before we actually start the agenda proper – assuming there's agreement from everybody around the table. I'd like to bring agenda item five up in the agenda to come next after just the approval of the minutes. Partly because John has to leave early, and to ensure that we can have a full and proper discussion on that whole issue. So with that – unless there's any concern about that – with that let me move to the agenda proper, and you should all have a copy of the minutes from the last meeting and I'd like a motion to approve those minutes please.

WINDSOR: So moved.

GALLMEIER: Second.

MCROBBIE: Second. Any discussion of that motion? Any discussion of the minutes? Corrections? Comments on the minutes? There being none, I'll put the motion. All those in favor of adopting the minutes please signify by saying "aye." [Aye] Against, same sign. [Silence] The minutes are adopted. So we move to, as I said, agenda item five which is the Indiana University Principles of Ethical Conduct [comment indistinct] to John.

AGENDA ITEM 5: INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRINCIPLES OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

APPLEGATE: Okay, well thank you for your indulgence with the agenda. This is actually an item that comes from Don Gjerdingen and me. It is a document that the UFC or Council has seen before and it is a basically a set of principles as it said. It's based on – it was drafted originally after some conversation by Don Gjerdingen, and modeled on a set of principles from the University of Minnesota. The motivation for this is really two fold. The most pointed and immediate one is our general response to the horrible occurrences at Penn State University, and it caused, I think, every serious university to – which it probably just means pretty much everyone – to take a careful look at a whole range of their operations to make sure that that

2

kind of thing can't happen here. And obviously we can never prevent everything, but we can take some meaningful steps to make sure that we are – that, in particular, children are protected – but more generally that we're creating a culture of compliance, is the sort of the phrase we use, but a culture that respects all members of the community and respects our mutual obligations. So the most specific one is that, but more generally it's part of, as I say, creating a culture of compliance, which is something that is increasingly important in the academy. I think you probably all know and see in one way or another, and maybe a number of ways, that universities have become kind of a highly regulated industry. Everything from research, which is a huge area certainly in the medical area, things like HIPAA are very familiar, very intrusive. For those of you who get alerts on the Bloomington campus you can thank federal regulation for those. And on the academic side, as you know and we've discussed before, both the federal government and increasingly the state government are interested in issues like transfer, and credit hour limits, and so on. So one of the ways to respond to that is to make sure that we have a collective understanding of all of our obligations and so the – again the Minnesota example seemed a similar kind of university to ours. We thought that it was a particularly well written document, and it is again primarily – it's an aspirational one, and it's one to express values and culture. As it says, it does not in itself create new obligations that don't exist elsewhere. In other words, we're still obligated to follow research rules. We still need to cut square corners with financial aid. But it does bring together a number of – principles of ethical conduct for lack of a better phrase that exists in a number of different documents. We also see it as a kind of guide to them. Organizing them and linking them to specific policies that already exist to be a way into that – that whole world. So it's – one of the points that I want to emphasize and then I'll hand it over to Don for anything he wants to add, is that this is something – you'll notice at the beginning – the application is to kind of everybody and that includes the, you know, the final leadership of the university, that is the Board of Trustees. I had an opportunity to discuss this informally with the Board, and I can tell you that the Board was enthusiastic about the fact that it applies to the Board of Trustees, that is, thought that the – since this is about our aspirations, and about our culture and mutual commitments, of course it ought to apply to everyone. I was not surprised but certainly delighted with that kind of reaction. I think it sends exactly the right signal. So with that I'll turn it over to Don.

GJERDINGEN: Okay, thank you. I just want to say a few things for those of you this is the second time, it was in the spring, and just to update you on what had happened since then. It is basically unchanged. There are some lawyerly changes in one way or another, but that is largely unchanged, I would think. What I would stress again is, as John mentioned, that this is something the Board of Trustees would like to do and this would cover with them, and it is really relevant and it's related to what we're going to see next and that's through these policies but – I used the word "gateway" before – but this is a way almost an index or table of contents for this stuff so it'll help to get in and supplement and be supportive largely as well by that. Just a couple of final things, there were really no significant changes. I think one thing that we did change, which – there's a slightly different title on this. We had "Code of Conduct" and were worried that maybe it would be misunderstood and puzzle the students, and that of course wasn't our impression so that's the only significant thing. The last is that I just want to thank

John's office for the help on this. This was certainly faculty drafted but we got resources in finding the proposed work, were able to significant, significant resources. It may sound scary to other people, but it was very comforting to me, we had five or six lawyers in the room in order to go through this –

APPLEGATE: – You will understand that Don and I find this comforting. [Laughter].

GJERDINGEN: – And quite seriously that John's office – looking at the regulatory crossroads – made me feel very comfortable with that wonderful staff and those few things and was also very helpful in vetting this with some the other constituencies, the Trustees, the administrative offices. So that has all been done and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

APPLEGATE: Just one thing, by office he actually means Jenny Kincaid who's sitting at the end of the table, and will be talking about the transition of academic policies, but she has spent enormous amount of time on this and I'm appreciative. So…

MCROBBIE: Yeah, Jim?

SHERMAN: [many comments indistinct]… motivation… so… criminal conduct… report it to their supervisor… that that was not sufficient in this case… serious criminal…

APPLEGATE: Oh, absolutely. The idea – and I probably should have said with – in responding to what we know about what happened at Penn State, and particularly the report by Louis Freeh, the former head of the FBI, which has been questioned in some areas, but the president actually commissioned a fairly detailed study of that report to see what we should do and policy on programs involving children is a very specific element of that. One of the big issues that came out of that was what in – and I guess this was the problem they ended up with the NCAA – was lack of institutional control, in that case over an athletics department. We thankfully do not have that issue here. But it is in any very decentralized operation, which Indiana University certainly is, there needs to be in addition to policies on specific issues like that, again this general culture and understanding about the way we conduct ourselves and our commitment to following the law in general and specifically.

MCROBBIE: Others? Questions for Herb? [comment indistinct]

TERRY: Just one comment we urged campuses to discuss this in their faculty council bodies, and we did do that at Bloomington and there were no significant objections raised. I did get a little feedback after that BFC meeting, and I promised that I'd say something at this meeting reflecting that. What I heard from a number of people is this is good. This looks good. But with experience we may find there are things we want to change or whatever, and you know, I assured them that's the way the Council worked and this would be what we'll follow until we decide that we maybe we can improve upon it, but it's not intended to be fixed absolutely in stone and inscribed on some monument somewhere. It's intended to be a living document.

And as we gain more experience with it we may well return to it. I just wanted the record to reflect that.

MCROBBIE: I think that's true. [comment indistinct].

TERRY: Exactly.

MCROBBIE: [comment indistinct]. Simon?

ATKINSON: I'd like to suggest one change which is at the bottom of page 3 under, "Promote a Culture of Compliance with Applicable Law, Regulations, and Policies." It's been pointed out to me that nobody can possibly [comment indistinct] – remember the compulsory [comment indistinct] government policies [comment indistinct] even those [comment indistinct].

WINDSOR: He and I talked about that the other day on the teleconference, as well as on the top of page 3 [comment indistinct] "Avoid all forms of harassment." Do we want to expand that? [comment indistinct] to intervene, distract [comment indistinct] sexual harassment on our campus we [comment indistinct] if you see somebody being threatened or something, do you not have an obligation to intervene? [comment indistinct].

GJERDINGEN: I could see, I think, certainly "Avoid" is – implies something [comment indistinct] particular language that make part of that would be implied[comment indistinct].

WINDSOR: Yeah [comment indistinct] I mean we didn't come up with anything particular –

KINCAID: – Well, no, the only with that is if you look in that section five there is language that says, "Be proactive to prevent and detect any compliance violations or noncompliant activity." So applied to that avoidance, I think would be – should be – to intervene or full report. I feel like that's sufficient. It's just not in the same [comment indistinct].

WINDSOR: Right.

APPLEGATE: Especially if it's defined as part, already part, of harassment, I think we would probably have covered it, and I should respond on the learn to me at least, I think that's an improvement actually. I wish – I wish I had thought of that before. It's – because that is a question people have had, and in a way it makes it a more realistic and more powerful expectation. So…

GJERDINGEN: – I like that as well.

APPLEGATE: I think that's a friendly amendment.

MCROBBIE: [comment indistinct] take it as such [comment indistinct] if it's okay with you John. Other comments?

KRAVCHUK: I wonder if [many comments indistinct]… the reason is… you would expect…

MCROBBIE: You could argue [comment indistinct] might be going too far because policies are going to follow you know [comment indistinct] Well, you know, I would like to change it if I [comment indistinct, laughter].

KRAVCHUK: [comment indistinct] university policy [comment indistinct]

MCROBBIE: If you wish Bob, I mean, it's nice to see all the policies embraced but...

APPLEGATE: I mean I'm fine with it, as far as that goes but I…

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Yes?

NUR: [many comments indistinct] One is… since we have… the other question is… is there room for sustainability… it's mentioned in many places… the Council itself…

APPLEGATE: Well, you know as an environmental law guy I'm going to be the last person to object to putting sustainability in this. I guess I would say that the idea here is not to create the substantive obligations itself but rather the framework. So I guess I'm a little bit uncomfortable doing that on the fly. But I think it's the kind of thing, if that would be acceptable to you, that referring back to Herb's comments, you know, I think we do have a general university commitment to sustainability in a variety of ways, and I can see where it would fit in a number of elements like in stewardship, but I–

NUR: [comments indistinct] above and beyond that…

APPLEGATE: My own preference, but obviously. Well– yeah.

FOOS: Sustainability is going to be such a broad term, and I'm not sure that's the word we want to use here because sustainability as a virtue in and of itself, have something that really needs change rather than sustenance. And sustaining some particular thing is worth saying, that's one thing. But sustainability [comment indistinct] too broad.

MCROBBIE: I fully agree with that, it just seems to me that it's so broad that [comment indistinct]. Other question or comments? [comment indistinct]

APPLEGATE: I was just going to say, why don't we put that down as something to investigate because there's a lot to that.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? [comment indistinct] John, just sorry forgive me, the next step will be to vote on this in…

APPLEGATE: – November.

MCROBBIE: November, and then go to the Trustees for approval. And my hope is to do that in December?

Applegate: Yes.

MCROBBIE: [comment indistinct] This has been [comment indistinct]. Any other comments on it? Any other comments? There being none, can I ask for – well, this doesn't come for committee I don't think, so we need a motion to adopt. [Comment indistinct]. Second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: [Comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: Okay that's the motion from the floor to adopt this. [comment indistinct].

WINDSOR: [comments indistinct]

MCROBBIE: [comments indistinct]

APPLEGATE: But we're not embracing, right? Or are we?

WINDSOR: Not yet.

APPLEGATE: No, we're not embracing yet, okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We are embracing [comment indistinct].

APPLEGATE: Great, and I think numbering the bullet points is a good idea.

WINDSOR: [comment indistinct] go to prioritizing.

APPLEGATE: I don't think so. I think that'll be fine. For clarity, there's much to be said for doing that.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion, any further discussion on the resolution? Any further discussion? Okay. There being none, I'll but the motion. All those in favor of the adopting the principles, please signal by saying "Aye." [Aye]. Okay, same sign. [Silence] They are adopted I believe I would say unanimously. Alright, thank you, John. Okay, let's move to agenda item two and then move on [comment indistinct] number three, of course.

AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

WINDSOR: Not a lot to report yet. [comment indistinct] been kicking things off, we've been meeting with John Applegate [comment indistinct] to talk about looking at administrative

review; how can we do it more – do it better – how to gain more value out of it, looking for best practices. So that's one thing that we'll been putting forth. Herb, do you want to bring up the resolution at this time?

TERRY: I'll mention it, go and finish your report that's what you want to – okay. Several things, first of all the last meeting of the UFC was to hear the president's State of the University Address and I want you to know that we plan, the schedule that he has put forward for developing the university master plan – strategic plan – was an aggressive one, and the Executive Committee of the UFC will be working with the president to make sure that there's opportunity for faculty comment and discussion on that plan – although some of that may happen in the summer, and under the new constitution we're more nimble and that should help deal with that. Same thing may happen with the university's strategic digital plan which is on a roughly [comment indistinct] schedule. The president's State of the University Address talked about innovative combinations of professional schools and the liberal arts, but mostly I think that will be a matter of consideration by your campuses. But I would urge you to think about it because that challenge was not just made for the Bloomington campus, or just in the context of the Media School here, it was a broader commitment and that should be a major issue on your campuses. A couple things about – arising from the Trustees meeting, first of all your favorite topic, parking. The Trustees decided that for the moment they are taking the idea of monetizing and privatizing the parking operations at IUPUI and Bloomington off the table. They did that because they received a report from MaryFrances McCourt saying that she believed that the same value could be generated for the university's use retaining control, as might be generated for the university by bringing in an outside operator. During the Trustees meeting there was lively discussion about whether or not that belief needed to be tested, and basically the outcome of the Trustees meeting is that MaryFrances is supposed to prepare a report for them explaining how she would do that. How would it be possible to generate the same value it is estimated an outside operator would bring? What happens when she presents that report to the Board of Trustees was a little bit confusing, but I think the outcome was fairly clear. She is supposed to present that report to them at a very – their meeting is in December, Michael?

MCROBBIE: – February.

TERRY: February, and if – that will give the Trustees an idea of how this is going to be done. We will probably have an interest in that. Hopefully we'll have some insight from MaryFrances or recommendation we can support. If –

CALLOWAY THOMAS: – Herb, may I say, that MaryFrances McCourt [comments indistinct]

MCROBBIE: She brought that recommendation after discussion with all the various parking committee chairs.

TERRY: Yeah – that said – there was not a lot of campus discussion about those recommendations. Not that I think people disagree with it but mostly the conversation was between Mary Frances and that – those groups. In any event –

MCROBBIE: I think I asked [comment indistinct] properly constituted groups [comment indistinct] discussions.

WINDSOR: – A lot of faculty input.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

TERRY: In any event there will be a report. It will recommend – it may say that the assumption is wrong. That she looks at it and she can't generate that revenue, but assuming she does it will explain how she would do it. Some of the Trustees clearly believe that if a comparable value cannot be generated then we should proceed to monetization and privatization. Other trustees want a more expanded discussion of that before proceeding, and that's what I imagine would happen at the Board of Trustees, if she recommends and says, it can't be done. There'll be another trustee discussion. So at the moment that's the report I think on parking unless in his own comments President McRobbie has something else to add.

The Trustees also approved, primarily affecting Bloomington but also affecting IUPUI, the creation of the Media School on this campus to be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. I think that's relevant here to the UFC for a couple of reasons. The president released the proposal to the Board of Trustees in time for us to follow the policies on this campus and policies of the UFC on core school reorganization. Working with Jack we've created a committee to do all of that at once. We included representatives from IUPUI, since a part of the School of Journalism operates on the IUPUI campus. We forwarded our recommendations to the president, to the chancellor at IUPUI, to the provost here, and to faculty, deans, on this campus. They put that into account in making their presentation to the Board which was unanimously approved by the Board. I think out of that we've learned that it may be wise to take a look at those policies. Those policies imagined that proposals would be written – they'd be very complete when they were done. They would be kind of a little package all tied up in a bow, and there would be an opportunity for faculty to comment on that. Actually, these proposals for reorganization evolved and spread out over time and had multiple steps, and I think both at the Bloomington campus, and hopefully at the UFC we need to take a look to see what we learned about that not – mainly just to make these kinds of recommendations when they are presented better. There was a substantial amount of faculty comment throughout the process of creating the Media School. I think it improved the proposal, and we just need to take a look at our policies and see if they imagine the kind of a realistic proposal that would be complete with faculty to react to or other – when we may have to design something that takes into account that these things evolve with time. I want to thank you for coming to Bloomington. We do recognize that the new constitution or the bylaws, I think, says that the meetings of this Council are supposed to be at IUPUI. They are. We were unable to get a room at IUPUI, and so we thank you for coming here and we're certainly planning on having the

spring meeting at IUPUI. And finally before you, you have a resolution that Jack and I have drafted. It pertains to an announcement the university made a few days ago concerning the proposal – the constitutional amendment. What I propose we do with that is wait for President McRobbie to present his business. I understand he has some things to say about that proposal and then we may take up this resolution, and perhaps if you're interested any other matters arising from the State of the University Address that we have an opportunity to discuss.

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Herb. Any questions from any member of the Council to Jack or Herb? Okay, there being none let me then move on to my report. I want to – I want to start with the very matter that Herb mentioned. There has been, going back some period of time, discussion in the state legislature about an amendment to the constitution that would effectively ban same sex marriage. The ban against same sex – same sex marriage ban amendment – already is already part of state law – statute – it's not [comment indistinct] constitution, that is what House Joint Resolution number six would do. My own preference, of course, in working in these matters is to try to resolve these matters quietly and behind the scenes as has not been the case. We must remember that the legislature was really supportive of higher education the last session. But I believe that this particular amendment was at a point where it was important for the university to express itself, express its views on this matter publicly, and after some discussion, and the discussion of this matter not of a particularly organized kind, but the [comment indistinct] of the informal kind, goes back really quite some time, goes back [comment indistinct] certainly before I was president. And based on that, the decision to have the university support the Freedom Indiana Coalition, which is a coalition of various organizations, in particular including, you know, I believe [comment indistinct] both major group [comment indistinct] in Indiana both of [comment indistinct] but as it did just last week, [comment indistinct]. I assume you've all seen the [comment indistinct] circulated there's been one [comment indistinct] I'm sure you've all we've seen the statement that was released yesterday. The response to it has been, I would say, overwhelmingly positive of course there are [comment indistinct] who are critical [comment indistinct] take a stand like this. But I don't think that we should take this kind of a stand lightly under the circumstances. We take it for two reasons, one is that the – my concern about the lack of tolerance implied with this particular constitutional amendment. The fact that by making the constitutional amendment would make it extremely difficult to ever change it – ever to change it, to move in a different direction in some point in the future. And then secondly, it also is a fundamental concern for business [comment indistinct]. Then of course it's carried out by faculty and staff for the institution would be, as I say it again, a statement of an uninviting atmosphere in the state to accommodate [comment indistinct] who also may be affected [comment indistinct]. So, on that basis I issued that statement joining the Freedom Indiana Coalition. I then made contact with Herb and Jack and said that I would like to propose that this be discussed by the UFC today, and that I would ask you to consider adopting a resolution endorsing the university's position [comment indistinct] and in turn to refer this to the campus faculty councils [comment indistinct] within all the schools within the university. My belief would be that depending on the outcome of those declarations by those bodies, it would demonstrate what I believe to be

10

the thorough opposition to this constitutional amendment by the faculty and staff of the university. We also may be able to have the student body express its views through this governance as well. So that's basically the situation, again it's all pretty much straightforward as per the release yesterday in the press [comment indistinct], and very pleased to see that they have proposed a short, very much to the point resolution to bring before you. I'd note that this has been a position of the UFC for a long time, and this predated my becoming the president of the university as well, and also [comment indistinct] faculty governance bodies within the university consider [comment indistinct]. With that, maybe I could just simply just ask for comment with Herb – with Jack want to formally move this motion from their position, and we'll leave it open for a few minutes. Yes, Donald?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

GJERDINGEN: The only thing that I would add and this came up in Executive Committee, is because there is an existing resolution, I think you could argue that it's even stronger with reference and in subsequently made reference to this, because we have an official record of I don't know how many years it is. I just think it's truly consistent but is also correct and it's also strong.

MCROBBIE: Maybe I can ask for someone to formally move this –

WINDSOR: I –

TERRY: So I may move for [comment Indistinct] Second.

MCROBBIE: So then we can consider that as a friendly amendment.

TERRY: Let me add something based on Don's comment. This may predate Michael's presidency but it does overlap with the prior tenure I had on this Council. In 2007, I think it was late in the academic year, this movement got a good head of steam up in the General Assembly and I think at its last meeting of that year the University Faculty Council adopted a resolution directed at the General Assembly, basically saying that the faculty did not think this was a wise course of action. It was a very short resolution. It was like this. It basically said, you know, what the state of Indiana should do. Because there are many reasons why people would support that action and many reasons why they would oppose it. But on balance, we certainly believed at that time that our faculty fellows did not want amending the state constitution, and this was a good idea. In subsequent years this has from time to time come up, and what the Council has usually done is refer back to its 2007 resolution. So the council has not actually reconsidered what it did in 2007, but it did it then and I assume it still stands by it today. I thought about when I wrote this language, including putting it in there and I decided I would put in "long-standing." But if there is a strong desire to do it with the reference that I – I would note that it is a little bit awkward because of a problem we use to have with this Council getting quorum together. We were a few votes short of having a quorum when this finally came up for discussion. So we did an electronic vote afterwards to confirm that the resolution that we

adopted in 2007 was approved, and it was. But therefore, there's not exactly a set of minutes I can cite back to and say, 'Ah ha! Here's where we did it,' because we said we were going to do it there, and we did it electronically over the next few days."

MCROBBIE: I'm sure we can [comment indistinct].

TERRY: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Yes, yeah sorry?

FOOS: Now I just wanted – my comment's not about the resolution per se, I [comment indistinct] when I saw the report of the standing [comment indistinct]

MCROBBIE: Carolyn?

CALLOWAY THOMAS: I'm just wondering if in this instance [comment indistinct] specifically say what this is all about [comments indistinct].

WINDSOR: [comments indistinct].

CALLOWAY THOMAS: I don't know, but I just know I [comment indistinct].

WINDSOR: [comment indistinct].

FOOS: [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: Alternatively in this modern electronic age maybe one could just add a URL [comment indistinct] Herb and I see precisely the document, I think that's a friendly amendment, too. Other… I'm sorry. Yes, Jim?

SHERMAN: [comments indistinct] Do you know if other universities [comment indistinct]

MCROBBIE: No I don't, I don't. All I know is what I read publically. Every institution [comment indistinct] make the appropriate decision. Yes?

GJERDINGEN: I was wondering, is there a [comment indistinct] whatever the change is it possible just to have one standard just to have a link for [comment indistinct].

TERRY: We could do that. I can cite evidence to the UFC meeting that I was discussing.

GJERDINGEN: [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: – Yes, Oh I see what you… Yes. Yes.

GJERDINGEN: – then if you want, you wouldn't have to change anything.

TERRY: So that the amendments now be to put two links in here.

MCROBBIE: Yes, I think that's a good idea. Other questions or comments? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I noticed a couple typos on here.

TERRY: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So, one is the Indiana University Faculty Council, at least my draft has the Indiana University Faculty Council.

TERRY: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And secondly, it's referred to as the Indiana Freedom Coalition, I think the freedom and Indiana are reversed. The actual coalition being Freedom Indiana.

MCROBBIE: Yes. Other questions, comments? This is obviously an important step for the Council in place, so I want to make sure everybody who wants to make comments has done so. Anything else? There being none, I'll sign in the motion. Everyone has had a chance to comment? Okay. In that case, I'll put the motion. All those in favor of adopting this resolution, those couple of [comment indistinct] as noted, please say "aye." [Aye]. Against same sign? I believe that we can record those as being passed unanimously.

WINDSOR: [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: I think that would be excellent. I mean actually [comment indistinct]. Thank you.

WINDSOR: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Thank you very much to the Council members for passing that resolution. I think it's an important occasion of the strong support of the faculty of the university. Let me then – let me say just a few words about my State of the University speech a few weeks ago. The speech hopefully gave you a – it was distributed and was – it was interesting in terms of how the themes got picked up. The theme about asking schools, faculty, frankly anybody who has got ideas here about what mostly we can think of as being simple combined degrees that is the link that degrees – degrees plus certificate, five year degree plus masters, which is a whole bunch of information here. That was picked up fairly extensively. Externally, what was picked up in higher education would be comments about digitalization for the university. But I was pleased both themes were picked up. Just picking up on Herb's comments, to start with the framework that I've tried to establish for the whole State of the University speech was the fact that we actually have a bicentennial in academic year 2019-2020 [comment indistinct] the founding of Indiana University, and as in any institution that is one of the events that happens

in the history of such institution that one can correctly use the word unique. It is an event that I believe that we should be starting to plan now for how can we best take advantage of that, as a way of driving a whole range of different programs, including the institution that would all culminate in that year and can be both celebrated and also enable us during that year to really be able to both reflect back on the progress made both on the campuses and institution, and begin sitting ourselves for the forthcoming century after that. I tried to describe a way in the speech, and I indicated that a number of exercises that are already underway. For example, our next major campaign – if people don't know – that we completed the campaign, the Impact campaign at Indianapolis with a record of nearly $1.4 billion dollars raised for that campaign, that was on top of the $1.14 billion raised for the Bloomington campaign a few years before that, and we indicated that the next campaign which of course has already started in silent phase, and will move to its proper phase in the next couple of years will be the campaign for us [comments indistinct] ambitious plans that we have for that. And of course as we move into the year [comment indistinct] there will be far more fickle state funding being totally depressed, philanthropy of course becomes more and more important to us as well. Then I was also mindful that a number of the campuses were starting to look at strategic planning and we discussed bringing all that strategic planning together if you like under one framework, and the idea is ensure that the – that each of the two major campuses, and then each of the individual campuses under John's office will already begin preparing strategic plans that's [comment indistinct] Indianapolis [comment indistinct] as well, and those plans would be completed by the roughly mid-spring and then they will be in turn aggregated under one final university strategic plan that will go to the Board of Trustees for approval. The processes in Bloomington, Indianapolis, and I expect that John will put in place – has put in place – that will pretty much parallel the process that was used for the blueprint for student attainment. All of that has got very substantial faculty involvement and broader involvement from the whole university community. There is very, very substantial involvement as well and, you know, I expect them to put that through to the final version. It is a relatively short period of time, but I'm mindful that some of the more effective plans of this institution have been put together in a short period of time, and I think we've proved over and over again in the past that it can be done. I want to use as I said the bicentennial year as a key marker for a number of different plans. I've asked Tom Morrison to formalize the plans that I announced in my inauguration speech for the complete overhaul of student [comment indistinct] by bicentennial year and a number of other plans as well. And I've also asked Brad Wheeler to oversee the development of a comprehensive digitalization plan for the whole university. I'm actually not aware of any institution in the country that has such a plan and conceived of completely, comprehensively as [comment indistinct] well. More specifically, I announced what has been called the Media Digitalization Preservation Initiative which is a vision across the whole university to digitalize all of our video, sound, and eventually all of our film holdings, deemed to be significant by the officials and experts in those principal fields. And the idea roughly is you've got the digitalization of books, texts, and song, and really you started twenty five years ago when the institution [comment indistinct] data through recording devices [comment indistinct] innovations in digital data from experiments I mean you really have all this other data [comment indistinct] this [comment indistinct] data that's in the [comment indistinct] for the whole institution for all of that kind of material. And the motivation here is, I think is as we all

know, is that as universities we really have three key missions here; one is the dissemination of knowledge which of course involves teaching and education, the second is the creation of knowledge which is research, scholarship, and [comment indistinct], the third which maybe gets less attention is the preservation of knowledge and so this is one thing to be [comment indistinct], the preservation of knowledge in the digital age in a comprehensive way. So that – that was really the key parts of my speech I wanted to go over that in some detail and I've had subsequent discussions with the Herb, Jack about some aspects of that and various other groups as well. It is frankly – there is still more to be done. There are other parts of the university that I want to see quite into this bicentennial planning exercise. And I'll be doing that, working with the vice presidents and others over the next few months to [comment indistinct] that as well. The administrative part of this development of the [comment indistinct] John's office and we've started [comment indistinct] logistics [comment indistinct]. The final thing is that you remember the measures of principles of excellence, which we adopted some years ago, which is really a framework for what I would call components of what's important in the institution. I've asked that they be used as the framework for the strategic planning [comment indistinct]. I think with that, Herb and Jack, I might just pause to see if there are any questions from you on any part of that. Questions? I'll take that to indicate that the speech was clear. [laughter]. Which is – which is gratifying. Alright. Okay, there being none now I've really finished the two key things I really wanted to talk about, and I think we can move on to agenda item four if there are any other matters [comment indistinct] questions to either myself or Jack.

CALLOWAY THOMAS: I have a general sort of question. When one thinks of the educational trends [comments indistinct].

MCROBBIE: I just got back from a meeting with the AAU last week in Washington. I certainly think that there is an enormous amount of concern about the effects of the next round of sequestration where the cuts would be more substantial than last time and really start to have an impact. I think we're already starting to see some of the impact of the sequestration cuts and other cuts in terms of the amount of funding [comment indistinct] but from what I've been hearing and seeing there is some decline in the realm of our faculty in terms of the confidence in the success of grant proposals because the success rate is at the moment such a small figure. I mean that I certainly understand that if you've got a one in ten chance of getting a grant [comment indistinct] So basically impact of sequestration and the, I think the stalemate in Washington on the research and education enterprise in this nation, which is the best in the world and the research enterprise which has been such a massive component of the national economy [comment indistinct] All of that, I think is – really concerns me. And I think concerns other presidents who were at the AAU meeting. And the AAU is moving vigorously to try to do what we can to advocate for some resolution of these issues in Congress. We did hear – we have heard – I think [comment indistinct] I think a lot of people in Congress didn't expect the sequestration would actually happen [comment indistinct], thought they'd reach some kind of agreement beforehand. They didn't. So I think Carolyn overall, at the moment, that is probably the matter that sort of concerns me most. I think it's important – it's vitally important - to sustain [comment indistinct] do what we can to ensure that this research and scholarship being done continues to be supported through endeavors [comment indistinct]. I am an optimist by

nature and I'm hopeful that people start to understand the really substantial impact that this stagnation, this stalemate, is having on the nation, and that we might start to see some compromise and start to [comment indistinct]. Yes, Simon?

ATKINSON: I just wanted to add to that that [comment indistinct] the trend [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: Yes, Jim?

SHERMAN: [comment indistinct] I think we're all familiar that the [comment indistinct] which is [comment indistinct] the possibility [comment indistinct] the way we think about it [comment indistinct] the campus [comment indistinct] students as well can think about [comment indistinct] so that we can [comment indistinct] it needs to be enforced [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: Let me ask – John is our expert on [comment indistinct] legislation. Ask John.

APPLEGATE: Well I just couldn't agree with you more. The – this is exactly what I was referring to about when I said it had become a highly regulated industry across areas like this where we're not use to being highly regulated though we're actually do okay by comparison to some states, and the – by comparison to the degree of prescriptiveness. I mean we've been successful with the state legislature and commissioner – Commission for Higher Education and keeping these at a level of frameworks and outcomes rather than, you know, these are the ten General Education courses that exist in Indiana period, end of story, which is where that started. And so I think that we do need to take every advantage, and I just, again, couldn't agree with you more, that something like degree mapping in particular offers significant benefits for students. It's also like the whole 120 credit hour limit, I think it was a – it was a real success story for this university because it went right to the faculty and the faculty really worked through their degrees and used it as an opportunity to think about the accretions over the years and what was really important and what was really needed, and I think that we bought ourselves a great deal of credibility with the state by doing it that way, because every exception from 120 that we asked for we got – every one. And that's because I think they felt that we made a really credible effort to comply with this, and as I say updating it. Degree mapping is I think another opportunity. One of the things – I mean, what does a degree map mean? You know, at one level it means a piece of paper like this that has the major requirements on it like this, right? And the state wants something much more automated in the sense that students can use it, advisors can use it to give updated authoritative advice. Faculty can use it to understand what they're requiring and how that fits in with the whole curriculum. And so what is the real fast track is getting that software infrastructure in place to migrate what we already have to – but it's what, again, offers the real advantages. And the things – the place where I think we have the most vulnerability is where we end up having requirements that cause students to take more credits than they need, or are slower to graduate than they would otherwise be. Some of that is inevitable, students, and we want students to be exploratory, we want students to try things that they – that are out of their comfort zone. That ought to be what we're all about, and we're always – that's kind of a

novelty in a lot of the – you know – the discussion you read about in *The Chronicle for Higher Education* and so on… But at the same time we've – to protect that core value of exploration and rigor and providing first class education we need to be sure that we're not getting in our own way, and that's the balance we seek to achieve. So if we can use this as an opportunity to think about our curricula in – newly – I think it's a good thing. Some of the other parts, the more mechanical parts of it, the requirements, that if we have to keep changing that degree map as students do other things, and if we put it in there than we have to – if we don't provide it, then we have to offer it tuition free. Those are the kinds of pitfalls we need to make sure we don't fall into too much.

FOOS: [comment indistinct].

APPLEGATE: It's House Bill 182.

SHERMAN: [comment indistinct].

APPLEGATE: – well that's the… yeah, I'm sorry you're right. 1348 is the degree mapping one. And then it's Senate Bill 182–2012, and 182–2013 which are the General Education transfer and articulation, and the – what? – ten most popular degrees articulation plans.

MCROBBIE: Herb and then Chuck.

TERRY: If I may add just a little bit to John's comments. John's office has created a task force to look at how we comply with this law and to do it against a very short time frame, and for your information the task force is quite a hybrid group of people. There are faculty on it, I'm on it, I mean, generally they are people who have had some experience dealing with the higher education commission before because it's their policies that, implemented, that we really have pay detailed attention to. This involves advisors. There are advisors on the committee. This involves student information services and systems, and that sort of thing. Hopefully when everything is coordinated it will work better than healthcare.gov.

APPLEGATE: – You're setting the bar high. [laughter].

TERRY: Because in many ways what we think we can do is bring together a number of data systems and services that we already have to help students plan, and link them up in ways that will achieve compliance with the statute. IUPUI is on it, I'm on it, there are regional campuses, so they're on it. We will do what we can to try and reach out and make sure you know what is going on, but we are up against very aggressive deadline and hopefully we'll solve the problem and meet the deadline.

APPLEGATE: – and the maps themselves – I'm sorry –

MCROBBIE: – No, go ahead.

APPLEGATE: Have to come from the departments, I mean, there's no other place for them to come from.

GALLMEIER: I think [comments indistinct] my students will think [comments indistinct] at the end of the semester [comments indistinct] still make that goal [comments indistinct].

APPLEGATE: And in fact, on a different front having to do with financial aid, we've been working very hard to make sure financial aid is available during the summers. And the state's most recent changes to financial aid made state financial aid available during the summer, which it hadn't been. And I think that's huge for a lot of reasons, including performance funding and on time completion, and also with the junior/senior year "finish in four" tuition. Summers, three summers are included in that specifically so that more students will be eligible.

MCROBBIE: Jim, are you – was your hand up? Your hand wasn't up. Yeah, sorry – no, Herb?

TERRY: But please don't be upset when you are told that every degree map must include the 15 to Finish logo. [laughter].

APPLEGATE: – That's not ours.

TERRY: That is specified in the statute, okay?

APPLEGATE: – IU is finish in four. Just to be clear.

TERRY: Whatever, but there are things that you will see when these things are out that you'd rather not see, but they're there. A component of John's taskforce is a group studying how we engage in communications, outreach to students, to advisors, to faculty and others, and part of that will be explaining that, yes 15 to Finish is aspirational but here at IU we – if your circumstances deem that it be slightly less and you can't get up in the summer, that's commendable as well.

MCROBBIE: Questions on any other topic? Any other topic? Okay, there being none, let's move on to agenda item 6, which is Tom Gieryn and Jenny Kincaid.

AGENDA ITEM 6: ACADEMIC POLICIES MIGRATION UPDATE

GIERYN: Thank you, Michael. Jenny and I are here to provide the Council with an update on a project that you first heard about a year ago in October 2012. Up until 2008, university wide policies were in this form, to go to the point of digitalization, I'm bringing it home. At that time we decided that we could make the great leap forward, and our academic policies were then gone to a Wiki based website, and that's where they exist today. When the decision was made several years ago to create a common site for all university policies and to develop a template so that the policies, regardless of the particular area would have the same look and feel, it became necessary for us to migrate the academic policies once again so that they could fit on

to the new university webpage. The last time we made a major change from print to online, the entire batch of changes that had to be made were approved omnibus style by the University Faculty Council. There were actually many more substantial changes there that resulted from the fact that – at least on the Bloomington campus – there were significant changes in the administrative structure that required renaming of the office; chancellor to provost, the dean of faculties becomes provost, and so forth. We approved them in one broad sweep. During the last year a group of us headed by Jenny, Elizabeth and her office, from my office Indermohan Virk and Susan McCammon who knows more about university policies than all of us combined, and Craig Dethloff met throughout the year to go through the policies on the Wiki form to figure out how they could be moved into the template set up by the university policies pages. This took a lot of time, not because there were changes, but just because we had to go through and make sure that the [comment indistinct] stored, for example, how the text could be placed under the categories as you'd see in a second of the policy statement, the procedures. We added statements about the scope of the policy, contacts, responsible administrators, the history of the policy. So we had to do all of that work. It was considerable. We're finished at this point. There were only a few bits and pieces from the Wiki version that did not make it over to the list of policies. Most of those were not policies at all. An example would be the history of the university, which you can read about on the web, but really it's not an academic policy that belongs on the university policies page. All of the material that we did not put into the new template on this page went into a dump file which exists as such and will be made available for you to examine if you wish. If there's something that you find there that you believe is a policy and is germane to this site, we can probably move it if you wish. I'm going to turn it over to Jenny right now who will talk us through what it looks like.

KINCAID: Thanks, Tom. So now you've all been staring at this for a while. This is our university policies page as you've probably seen over this last year. It gives you multiple ways to search – my apologies [comment indistinct] for policies both here, both at the top if you go ahead and click here you can do it by categories, by A – Z, we also have an archive for old policies. Having the policies in the web database also allows us to really have some good analytics that we can see how people are getting to the policies. We've had over 75,000 visits to the site in the last year, and that's really without HR policies or the academic policies. We can see how people are getting there from whether it's search traffic, whether they're being referred from a news article, or another policy, or just going there directly, and so that's valuable information that we can – that we will be able to provide for the academic policies as well. We moved about 70 policies from the Handbook to the academic side. This says review site. This is what we put when we're on the test side. This looks just like a live side except these are not live. So we created categories that sort of made sense to us, but we're always open to suggestions, and then we also had the ability to cross reference policies from another area like we have here the HR policies that cover academic employees that we can put into the same category. The same would go for research. So what we did on the academic policies that we moved in was that we – I told Tom I tried to pick on that was non-controversial to put up there – but we left the link at the top to where it is in the Handbook. So for this next period, perhaps next academic period, the next year, you could click on this and see how it looked in the Academic Handbook Wiki. If you – you can see that we added the scope. This where it said the applicability here, and then

we put the rest into the policy statement, and over here we added the dates that were there. The responsible office is the office who's responsible for working – sort of housing – the policy, and then the administrator is the authority. We can also link related information. This takes you to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct and so we can do this back and forth to other policies as well. We left about 12 – 15 policies in a category that we would not make live right away. These are ones that sort of require some review or revision that we know that they're just not quite up to date in the Wiki. But I think most of them we can fix pretty quickly. There's a couple there that I think will take some work over the course of the year. Also, there are some policies that could be improved. We could go ahead and make them live, but – for instance, classification of academic appointments. There's a second policy general provisions regarding academic appointments. I think over the next year, once these are here, those could be combined. I think we could do – certainly do some of these more efficiently. But in the meantime, we're able to link to the other policy – to the related policy here – so people would be able to be able to go back and forth. So our recommendation after many, many, many hours is that we would go ahead and make the policies live that are in good shape. I think Craig has been working on setting up a committee that could look at the ones that need some work and could really look at all of them. None of these are sort of etched in stone, if there's work that needs to be done, things that could be added to the other – the policies that we even the ones that we make live, we're able to do that. And then we're also – this will also enable us, we have policy feedback, we have questions, we've really become – especially since our change to University Academic Affairs – [comment indistinct] sort of a traffic cop we get a lot of inquiries and we can direct them to the right place. Also the ability is there for the – on the – Tom will talk about this – that we can list policies elsewhere by linking to them directly here so that the – say in our financial policies on the VP and CFO page they link to them directly here so that we're all looking at the same version, and the most up to date version. Any questions on anything on the site looking through it?

GIERYN: I'd like to add just one point –

KINCAID: – Yeah.

GIERYN: Exactly what Kelley has finished doing. Now that we have our policies in a simple format and gathered together on a single page it may become very important for the campus specific policy pages to be consistent with these policies, ideally by providing a link. All of you list your own policies, if they're campus specific that's fine. To the extent that you reproduce university wide policies, I can assure you instead of having the text that is now not going to be in the same format and not have the same look and feel of this, take those off your sites and replace them with links to this particular site. And if you don't have to amend it with provision of campus specific discussion; you're welcome to do that. But the key here is consistency. These are policies that guide decision making, handle personnel cases, we really can't have multiple versions of similar policies floating around the link.

MCROBBIE: That's fine, Steve?

MANHEIMMER: Thank you. Two related questions. First, what happens when I leave some sort of feedback? What is the agency or mechanism that communicates that feedback to people who could say, 'Oh is that right? That's an interesting point. How do we consider that?' And the related corollary question, are there data analytics that can be generated if, for instance, one spring we have 5,000 hits on some - pick the policy – so

KINCAID: Yeah.

MANHEIMMER: – what's happening?

KINCAID: Yeah. No, that's correct and here I'll show you what that looks like. I didn't get to this slide in the interest of trying to be brief. But we do, we can pull up every single policy and see how many hits it gets and reorder them. So this is actually even available on our site so that – those analytics are available. In terms of feedback, if anyone leaves feedback here through the "Contact Us" or on the – to our office, what we do is direct it to the right person and try and stay involved at least be copied on it to make sure that someone gets the answer that they need.

MANHEIMMER: I may be overthinking this but if, for instance there is an unusual spike in attention –

KINCAID: – Yeah –

MANHEIMMER: – paid to a policy or a set of policies, other than human reporting, 'Oh that's interesting everyone is looking at page 42, subparagraph 3,' are there plans to create a little bit sort of a deeper dialogue of analytics that say, 'Oh, for some reason people are perceiving these two policies to correlate – or linked –

KINCAID: – Yeah –

MANHEIMER: – and to do that computationally, algorithmically, is that… ? I mean, maybe I'm overthinking it…

GIERYN: We hadn't thought about that. Particularly the way things work now is when any of you or any of the campuses have questions about our academic policies and [comment indistinct]. One of the things that we've been careful to do is every way strengthen the policies that we think could tell us sometime [comment indistinct] why is it our policy [comment indistinct] UFC so that's the feedback loop. It will come back through either Jenny's office, our office, or both [comment indistinct].

KINCAID: We also have a Policy Advisory Council that has representatives from every campus and VP, and Tom's in that group, and that group looks at the analytics quarterly at least. We're looking at them more often and so hopefully if we – if we do spot an issue or a problem we can just sort of say, hey what's up? And if we can't sort of tie it to, say, a news article that we have a

recent – we certainly, that's something we can certainly be aware of. And I think it'll really be telling once these policies are there as well as HR, I mean we're going to really expand the database greatly I think and it'll be interesting to see what we get so… And we're happy to bring that to this group as well.

MCROBBIE: Jim, then Don.

SHERMAN: Following up on what Tom has said, [comment indistinct] for every single one?

GIERYN: I think we're hoping after a period that you and Craig informs the committee to look at these tough cases that we will come back and request the second list [comment indistinct] which is really, just think of it this way, we've put the policies in a new format, a more accessible and consistent format. I hope we can [comment indistinct]

KINCAID: And we do have now an established university policy on policies. And that really– I know [laughter]

GIERYN: [comment indistinct].

KINCAID: You know you're onto something. And that required really an approval process – significant changes. So that's a little bit of a grey area, sometimes there's discussion around that, but there is the opportunity to not have to post for review and all the things that we do for a singular change. Sometimes someone has to make the call, you know, whether it really is, you know, minor. But hopefully, I would like to do that as well, just come back with a list; here's what we changed in these policies with the committee's help.

MCROBBIE: Don?

GJERDINGEN: I know it's hard sometimes with policies to [comment indistinct]. But I speak, I've been a lawyer for 35 years and that whole time [comment indistinct] parliamentarian and I got to tell you that first look at that site, that was as user friendly as anything I've ever, ever seen, I mean by far, just the way that it's set up. When you're done with this you can handle Indiana statutes with ease. [laughter].

GIERYN: We need Jenny to go –

GJERDINGEN: – Just everything it was easy, without knowing what to expect it was very easy and that's part of the detail, the model [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: I noticed that. I think it's really fabulous work, much, much overdue. Other questions or comments? [Silence]. I know Jenny you said recommendation, I'm not certain this needs to a recommendation. I certainly think getting a sense of the meeting broadly endorsing proceeding in this way, I believe you probably have that. But I – does anybody demur from that

at all? Just [comment indistinct] support, endorsement of [comment indistinct] the Faculty Council [comment indistinct] seems to be [comment indistinct].

KINCAID: Okay, thank you.

MCROBBIE: Alright, with that meeting adjourned. Oops!

WINDSOR: [comment indistinct].

MCROBBIE: I could [comment indistinct]. [Laughter]. Well with that ladies and gentlemen we are adjourned. Thank you very much. And again, I do appreciate your support.