

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
March 7, 2006
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: LTC Lori Bass, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Les Coyne, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliott, Emily Fairchild, Dennis Groth, Barbara Hawkins, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Robert Kravchuk, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Alyce Miller, Theodore Miller, Harold Ogren, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES: David Daleke for Gene Kintgen, Greg Kitzmiller for David MacKay, Harriett Figg for Isabel Piedmont, Grant McFann for Alex Shortle

MEMBERS ABSENT: Katy Borner, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Patrick Harbison, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Susan Jones, William Leckey, Gerald Marker, Theresa Ochoa, Lisa Pratt, Larry Thibos

GUESTS: John Graves (BFC Office), Adam Van Oedol (Media), Richard McKaig (Dean of Students), Patricia Steele (Interim Dean of the University Libraries), Julie Knost (Director, Office of Affirmative Action), Bradley Wheeler (Interim Chief Information Officer)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
February 21, 2006
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/02.21.06.htm>
2. Memorial Resolutions
Associate Professor Emeritus Mary I. Benedict
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B33-2006.htm>
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller)
4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)

5. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)
6. Search and Screen Procedures for Senior Administrators (20 minutes) [FIRST READING]
(Professor Theodore Miller)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U13-2006.doc>
7. Further Discussion on Conflict of Commitment (10 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/Commitment.htm>
8. BFC Presiding Officer (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller)
9. University Reorganization Updates (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Interim Provost Michael McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)
10. Report from the BFC Library Committee (30 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Interim Dean Pat Steele and Professor Harold Ogren, Chair, Library Committee)
11. Standing Committee Reports
12. Old Business
13. New Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Ladies and gentleman why don't we start. I'm sort of reluctant to use this, I've never used one in my life and I think you need a license to use it or something like that. Welcome everyone. The first item is approval of the minutes. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from somebody?

TERRY: So moved.

MCROBBIE: And second?

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Discussion?

TERRY: I've given Bonnie some minor corrections; she agrees they are minor.

MCROBBIE: Any other discussion on the minutes? Seeing no other discussion can I move the motion? All those in favor? [aye] Against? So the minutes are duly carried with those minor changes.

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

MCROBBIE: We have one memorial resolution. Jeanne can you?

SEPT: Thank you, Michael. Today's memorial resolution is for Emeritus Professor Mary Benedict and as always the extended version of the resolution is in the minutes.

Those who knew the late Associate Professor Emeritus Mary Benedict will not be surprised to learn about her wishes for the disposition of her ashes: She wanted them scattered on a private all-male golf club.

This story and many others were recounted during the celebration of life party held in Mary's memory at The Garden (Beef & Boards Dinner Theater) on the northwest side of Indianapolis April 22, 2004. She died unexpectedly at her home April 17. She was 81.

Among the themes that surfaced during testimonials were Mary's vivaciousness, her ability to lead, her competence as a journalism educator, her deep love of family and friends, her power to influence people positively, and her love of golf and scotch – not necessarily in that order.

She served on the School of Journalism faculty from 1972-1986, and during her 13 years as director of the High School Journalism Institute (HSJI), more than 6,000 high school students attended. She also taught courses and conducted workshops for future and current teachers of journalism. For several years she coordinated and taught the J200, Writing for Mass Media, course. She was also the primary public relations instructor. She gained respect of her students as a taskmaster, but always got high student evaluations.

As a specialist in the service area, she inaugurated Media Merit-thon, a statewide on-the-spot contest for high school journalism students. She also directed "On-Assignment" days on the IUB campus. These were one-day events that brought high school students and their teachers to campus in order to experience individually tailored educational opportunities in journalism. Hundreds of high school personnel came for these special meetings with Professor Benedict and the colleagues she recruited to meet with them.

Between 1950 and 1972, she was a teacher at both Washington and Arlington high schools in Indianapolis, where in 1967 she won National Journalism Teacher of the Year honors bestowed by the Dow Jones Newspaper Fund. She also won Indiana's top teaching award for a journalism educator – the Ella Sengenberger Award presented by the Indiana High School Press Association of Franklin College in 1964.

After being graduated with a bachelor's of science in journalism from Butler University in 1945, she worked for the Red Cross in the Pacific for three years. During college, Mary worked for

radio station WIBC, and from 1965 to 1970, she did public relations part time for the Indiana State Teachers Association. In 1953, she earned her M.S. degree from Butler.

Mary enjoyed a national reputation as a giant in journalism education. Aside from many teaching honors, she also took on leadership roles at the national level. In the early 1980s, she was head of the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, an organization of university educators. She was also a board member for Quill and Scroll, international honorary society for high school journalists, and was president of both Indianapolis and Bloomington chapters of Women in Communications. The Journalism Education Association, primarily comprised of high school teachers, presented her a Pioneer Award for her long service to that organization.

The late Indiana Gov. Frank O'Bannon named her a Sagamore of the Wabash, and she was inducted into the Indiana Journalism Hall of Fame, headquartered at DePauw University in Greencastle.

After her retirement from full-time teaching at IU-Bloomington, Mary taught part-time on the IUPUI campus and at Ivy Tech. Also, she volunteered as editor of *The Garden* publications for her church and was active with the Southeast Community Center, Habitat for Humanity, Fresh Start, the Indianapolis Press Club, the Society of Retired Executives and Money Makers Investment Club.

She loved to travel, and she wrote articles about her bike trips across France and other countries for *The Indianapolis Star* and other publications.

Survivors include her sister, Geraldine Hines; brother, Frank Benedict; seven nieces and nephews; and a host of great-nieces and nephews. Mary was preceded in death by a brother, Clement "Joe" Benedict, and a sister, Florence Benedict Cohen.

After the party and luncheon that followed her celebration of life in April 2004, at Mary's request relatives and friends toasted her with some of her favorite scotch.

Jack Dvorak
Feb. 16, 2006

Mary I. Benedict was born in Indianapolis May 24, 1922, and died in Indianapolis April 17, 2004. She earned her bachelor's degree in journalism from Butler University in 1945 and her master's degree in education from Butler in 1953. In 1972, she joined the Indiana University-Bloomington faculty as a visiting lecturer; in 1973 she became an assistant professor; and in 1978 she became an associate professor of journalism. She retired in summer 1986, after overseeing the 40th anniversary of the High School Journalism Institute, which was her 13th summer of directing HSJI activities.

This resolution will become a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

MCROBBIE: May I ask everyone to stand for a moment? Thank you all very much.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: So, agenda item #3 which is the business of the Agenda Committee. Ted?

T. MILLER: Thank you very much, Michael. I'm not quite as healthy as I would like to be as I sit before you today but I'm going to get through as much of this as I can. The first item has to do with next year's BFC; it has been elected. I'm happy to say that the election timetable that we have set in our rules of order for the BFC, I believe have been met.

KISH: Yes, they have.

T. MILLER: Yes they have been met. It is a signal accomplishment. As many of you know the first order of business will be to elect a new Nominations Committee. Those currently serving on the Nominations Committee are looking forward to that happening as soon as possible. After election of the Nominations Committee we will then elect the new officers of the Council and the new Agenda Committee for next year. My term, as you may or may not know, continues through next year. So we will be electing a new Parliamentarian, a new Secretary, and we'll be electing three additional members of the Agenda Committee. For those of you that will be continuing on the Council you will be receiving those materials soon.

Now last week there was a meeting of the University Faculty Council; some of you of course were in attendance. I just would note that the Graduate Program Guidelines that we talked about at our last meeting was approved by the UFC and there was also a Policy on Visitor Access to Labs with Hazardous Materials or Lab Animals that we have seen on several occasions here and that was also approved by the UFC at the last meeting.

IVIE: No it wasn't.

T. MILLER: It wasn't?

IVIE: It was a First Reading.

T. MILLER: Oh, a First Reading, sorry. But it was greeted with wild enthusiasm on the first reading was it not? [Laughter] So we can anticipate passage. Ok. Thank you.

Then we come to the Trustees meeting later on last week; a number of items to report to you regarding that meeting. Number one is that the Trustees approved several items that have been through our Council and/or which relate to the faculty. One, they approved the Indiana University Admissions Policy—this sort of umbrella policy that authorizes the campuses to formulate their own individual admissions. That was approved by the Trustees. They also approved the Policy on Conflicts of Interest in Research. They also approved the Guidelines for Developing Graduate Programs. And then they approved an item pertaining to the retirement program which is known as the IU SERP and I'm not sure I've got the dates quite right but this is

a program that applies to academic appointees hired between 1989-1999, roughly. Does anybody know, is that right? 1989-1999, yes. Prior to the Trustees action, if I understand this correctly, I'm going to try to describe this to you, I think I understand it, prior to the Trustees action a person covered with that program should they die before reaching age 55 they would forfeit all of their retirement accumulations. The Trustees, on Friday, approved a change to that policy or that program which basically would vest a person who dies before age 55 who has at least 10 years of service to Indiana University. So this clearly is a positive thing for the faculty and I think we can express our appreciation to the Office of Human Resources and the Trustees for doing this. For those of you who are in that program you may want to seek the detailed description of just what this is.

Now in addition to approving various items there were a number of things that were discussed. Among them were the Bloomington and the IUPUI admissions policies. And I think it's fair to say that the Trustees are feeling quite positively about the Bloomington policy and I think also about the IUPUI policy; most of the discussion was about the Bloomington policy I would say. And I did not hear anything that would lead me to think that they are thinking anything but very good thoughts about this admissions policy. I think we really that we owe Bill Wheeler, what would it be, a round of applause perhaps, really, for his yeoman's work over years now—this is three years we've been working on this policy—three years and there were times as we've gone along here that it really looked like this was going to fracture the faculty, fracture the faculty from the administration, I mean there are lots of conflict surrounding this. But in the end, I think it is fair to say that the policy that has been approved which is now before the Trustees is one that has really united support from all sides of this question and I think that we owe Bill really a great deal of gratitude. [Applause] Now I don't mean to slight John Carini; John has been the co-chair of the EPC this year and deserves also a good bit of credit. But Bill really has been the leader of this effort for three years and I really think we are in his debt.

Now we also, there was also a good bit of discussion about one of the items that is on our agenda here today—the search and screen item. And most of the discussion really was a presentation by Julie Knost and Jeanne Sept and Bill Plater were involved in this. There was a discussion about what we are currently doing with regard to academic appointments, how this process works, trying to educate the Trustees basically about how this is done. And then there was a discussion about some of the issues that the Trustees are concerned about. It seems very clear, and of course this is also something that was discussed at the UFC meeting last week, it seems very clear that with regard to the document in front of us today the section that has caught most people's attention is the section regarding appointments without a search process. And I think Kelly sent you all an email explaining the origins of that language, it comes from the University of Minnesota policy, we were kind of looking around for things, and so it's kind of in there now. It clearly was the thing that caught the attention of most people at the UFC level and I presume that a good bit of the discussion here today will focus on that. I can report to you that I think the Trustees are also concerned about this in very similar ways to the ways that we are concerned about it. I think they see that something like this has got to be possible, that there are extraordinary circumstances which might lead to an appointment without a search process, but I think they expressed also concern about how we can actually put something like that into our policy without opening such a wide door that we just see all kinds of this stuff going on. They don't want to see that. Our administrators who supervise the academic appointees don't want to

see this; nobody appears to want to see anything like that happen. And so what we're going to have to do is to work to try to get something down on paper that will provide a reasonable approach to this but an approach that can be controlled.

Another discussion item surrounds the policy on Conflict of Commitment. This is a policy that had been approved by this Council, it was approved by the University Faculty Council. It was in front of the Trustees and they could have approved it themselves on Friday but they, well they raised a few questions about it. I think they are minor questions and I'm not really sure actually—you know I put this on our agenda here today but I think we may not really do this today because what's happened is that in addition to the rather minor changes that the Trustees thought might improve the policy—I think they were truly minor—our friends in Indianapolis have now gotten into the act and are now going to consider at their Faculty Council meeting today a somewhat broader set of changes for this policy. These are changes that have been proposed by Vice Chancellor Plater and if I understand what he said, he said that he apparently hadn't paid close enough attention to this as it went through the first time but he now had some new ideas that we wanted to get into the discussion of this conflict of commitment. So I think what I'd like to do is to wait and see what they actually do up there today and then we have another meeting before the next UFC meeting and we'll come back to that item in two weeks and then we'll talk about the kinds of things that the Trustees seem to want and then we'll be able to consider whatever the Indianapolis Faculty Council has done, we'll be able to consider that as well as we go off to the UFC on the next week. Presumably this will then be back to the Trustees in early April.

Neil, I'm not sure if you would want to say anything at this point about the Capital Priorities. There was a change made in the capital priorities list for the next biennium that was approved by the Trustees on Thursday. There was a report of that in the HT on Friday but would you mind saying a few words about that? What's that about?

THEOBALD: The list that I provided you is the priorities of the campus. That then feeds into the university-wide priority setting and in the final priorities that we set for the legislature there was a Biology building added that had not been in the list that we provided to them and that was the major change.

T. MILLER: And what kind of biology...it wasn't...I was having difficulty from the HT article understanding what kind of Biology building this was going to be?

THEOBALD: And I don't know either.

T. MILLER: Do we have any information about that?

MCROBBIE: So, to be a little more precise as to what happened. I think it was felt that the two projects that were ranked on the university list numbers six and seven that the chances of their being funded were extremely low—I think that was reported in the HT or something like that—and that with the momentum and interest that was, from the state and the legislature in supporting the life sciences that this may be an opportunity to try to leverage that support in favor of a sixth building. The chances of that I think are still relatively low given that the history

is that normally only 3-5 buildings get funded per biennium. But nevertheless under the circumstances it seemed to be a chance worth taking given that probably anything else had very little chance of getting funded. The building is tentatively called the Systems Biology building but it is effectively a multi-disciplinary life sciences research building. The precise details of which are to be worked out over the next six months or so, well in advance of the biennium but it's in response to the research space order that was done a year or so ago that in particular highlighted a need for space in that area. Of course there are many other areas, it was just felt that pragmatically this was the best opportunity to try to maybe leverage some additional funding for space.

T. MILLER: While we're on that subject, Michael, there was also something in the HT about the area out at the bypass, 10th and the Bypass, the possibility of taking those buildings down, I'm not sure, and building or putting something else up that's not?

MCROBBIE: There was a discussion that was somewhat broad and discursive about future areas in which to build buildings in general, not anything specific in this case. The whole 10th street area where the multi-disciplinary science building II, MSB II, is going to be built was discussed. There has been a long standing discussion that's never been really advanced beyond that about the possibility of building some sort of quasi-commercial incubator type buildings out at the 10th and Bypass area there when those school buildings are eventually taken down, whenever that happens, if that happens. And I think there's quite a bit of interest in doing that but it really didn't go any further than that. I think it's unrealistic and unlikely that any academic buildings could be built out there for all the obvious reasons.

T. MILLER: Thank you. Then the final session for the Trustees dealt with university reorganization and it appears that there are a couple of more parts of the organization chart that have been filled in. There were some announcements made on Friday at the business meeting regarding that and it appears that possibly at the April meeting we'll get some of the final pieces. But one of the announcements that was made, and you may have seen this also reported, that Dick McKaig, long-time Dean of Students on the Bloomington campus, has been appointed Vice President for Student Affairs—I believe the title is –Bloomington.

MCROBBIE: Comma, Bloomington.

T. MILLER: Oh, comma, Bloomington.

MCROBBIE: There's a lot of significance there! [Laughter]

T. MILLER: Vice President for Student Affairs, Bloomington and also will retain I believe the title Dean of Students. And so what we have in terms of this organization chart at this kind of global level, we now have the president who is the chief executive officer of the Bloomington campus, and we have two officers that will report to him—Michael and Dick McKaig. And then there was also an announcement of an appointment made on Michael's staff—I'll let you talk about that I believe, Michael. So the organization chart is beginning to be filled in and I think, as I say, within the next month we'll maybe see a good bit more of what the Bloomington chart will look like. I think I'll stop there with my report.

AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: I'll just...I may leave commenting on the organizational stuff because Ted's mentioned some of it, until agenda item #9. There's not a huge amount to report that you don't already know but just to summarize where we're at because I think from my point of view, at least for the time being, I think things are now stabilized and I think given the amount of interest there has been in the BFC in the structure of the Provost's office I might just run through quickly where we stand on that but I think most of you know roughly where that is.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that the president also asked me to conduct sort of a study to put together an institutional strategic plan in matters international and global. He mentioned this at the Trustees meeting too. I want to discuss this with the Agenda Committee. This was only mentioned, or decided, last week and we meet this Thursday so we'll have a chance to have a good bit of discussion about that. I think the perception is that we're immensely strong in these areas but in terms of what the institution should be doing and the kinds of commitments institutionally we should be carrying out and how we work in a multi-campus way in this area, that that's an area where maybe we've lacked any sort of priorities and consistency there. So that's something that I've agreed to take on and I need to think that through exactly how to do that. This may be a case where there is somewhat other way of doing it then just pulling together ten people, wise and true, and asking them to think big thoughts about this, maybe a more granular approach may be necessary, but I want to talk to Ted and the Agenda Committee about that on Thursday. That's pretty much all I had to say.

AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: With that we move to the question period and I think Ted and I take questions from people.

MASON: With regard to the international and global initiative the President has proposed, I recognize that's a multi-campus idea, but we on the Bloomington campus as you probably know are conducting a self-study for the accreditation which is addressing precisely that set of issues. So while I suppose bringing ten wise individuals together to address this is one way to go it seems to me that if there was a way to dove-tail in some form what we're doing here, recognizing that it goes beyond the Bloomington campus, that might be worthwhile there. I'm coordinating that through Jeanne's office so any assistance we can provide to that I would be happy to provide.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, I think that's exactly right. We should make sure that we don't reinvent the wheel and that one process is really part of another and so on and so on, but literally I haven't had a chance, I haven't even had a chance to talk to Jeanne about it yet since this was really only announced on Friday and decided a few days before. So I need to think that through a little bit more but that's exactly right. Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Michael, Herb Terry and I would like to make a comment on behalf of the Budgetary Affairs Committee about the budget process as it's unfolding. We are in the midst of these three weeks of participating in 31—that's an unprecedented number—budget conferences and we are hearing requests from many units for very meritorious uses for provost's fund, formerly chancellor's fund monies. And for the benefit of our colleagues on the Council and the greater campus we wanted to provide at least an indication that this is going to be a particularly tough year in allocating funds; not only is the magnitude of money available somewhat constrained by commitments that were made by the outgoing chancellor totaling approximately \$1.7 million of the \$4.0 million, but there are several units whose requests if honored in total would consume the remainder of the fund. Herb?

TERRY: Bob and I have not exactly worked out the dog and pony show but he has accurately described it. We wanted you to know, we wanted everyone to know, that there are going to be many meritorious requests this year that it will be impossible or difficult to fund and express, I guess, the hope that this is something that can be improved upon next year. This is an under-funded institution and what's really happened this year is a combination of the 4.9 percent tuition cap, a reduction in legislative appropriations, a continuing adverse affect of the small freshman class we had a couple of years ago, escalating utility charges and uncertain university taxes; all combined to create a situation in which if you are hoping that requests from your school or unit will be met favorably it's going to be very hard to do that. But hopefully the case can be made by the campus that we are need of something major and with a new legislature and the new team in place I express a hope at least that we can do much better at least next year.

MCROBBIE: Well I couldn't have put it better but that gives me an opportunity—this wasn't planned either—but that gives me an opportunity to say that I think based on what I've seen so far, I've been a little concerned that maybe there's not a serious enough sense of just how difficult this year is going to be. I mean you guys know that obviously we've sat through most of this together. We are getting a lot of requests that I would think of as being more fair-weather requests than would be appropriate for the kind of situation we're in for the next year. A lot of people are not going to get what they want and I want to try to, in some of the remaining conferences that we have coming up, I want to try to make the point that especially on the assessment-funded side of the house, on the various assessment-funded units that increases there directly translate into less associate professors or pieces of equipment that could be acquired on the academic side of the house and that we have to look I think particularly sternly at all requests from assessment-funded units in this particular climate. And I want to make that sort of emphatically clear as well. This is going to be a very difficult year.

I must say though that I am optimistic for the next biennium. I think that, many of you know, among the Trustees and I think among others there is a very strong feeling that we must be much more aggressive in terms of the kind of tuition increase that we propose and also what I'm hearing informally from people from the legislature and the government would suggest that they think the next biennium is going to be significantly better than the last one as well. So I think there is a reason to be cautiously optimistic next time around but we have to weather this one wretched year I think; this is not going to be a good year and we're going to have to weather that year before I think things maybe smooth out a bit. Any other questions? Yes?

CARINI: This may be old business and our parliamentarian can come down on me but last year we passed a revised Family Leave Policy and it went to the Trustees and I think they decided to extend the old policy for a year. Is that right? Do we know what's going to happen with that now?

DALEKE: I asked Robin Gress at the Trustees meeting what happened to that policy and she said it was back in the hands of the faculty. So I'm not sure what that means.

T. MILLER: Well, it is, I guess it is correct to say that it's back in the hands of the faculty and that's because the Trustees made it very clear that they simply would not approve the proposal that was given to them. So we are, you know, we're either going to have to ask them to continue the old program forward or we are going to have to figure out some new approach to this that is going to appeal to them. We're working on the latter but I'm not sure that we have any necessarily really great ideas at this point. Now Julie Knost, are you here, Julie has been involved in this if you would like to say something about this please feel free.

KNOST: Well I think you are accurate that the Trustees were not satisfied with the proposal that came out of the two faculty councils. However, since then I think it's taken a back burner and I don't know that any work has been done on it. At the beginning of the semester we met and tried to put some data together and talked about revisions to the policy but then it's basically taken a complete back burner to every other issue. So at this point I don't foresee that it's even possible to do anything other than probably extend it into another year or some time period. Because if we do a revised policy there's no possible way to get it through the...

T. MILLER: No, I think that's probably right. Our option for next year is to have them extend it for another year I think.

KNOST: I have to say that I think it's too bad that we've dropped it and I think that's what has happened is that it's become a null priority. And I know Elizabeth Johnson has worked on it and isn't that your sense is that's become?

JOHNSON: Well it's not a no-priority from the point of view of the committee or the council but it seems to be that the Trustees are not interested in what we presented to them and I know the Indianapolis committee is also discussing this issue, their equivalent of the Fringe Benefits Committee, and what the Bloomington and Indianapolis committees have looked at are ways to improve what we have that would be relatively cost-neutral at the same time pointing out to the Trustees that there is at Indiana University an employee group that does not have the same kind of benefit that the other two large employee groups have and that is that faculty and academic appointees with their six weeks of sick leave they cannot take that leave for any other person except themselves. And that's not true for the professional/administrative staff or the appointed staff. So that's where we are with trying to streamline a proposal that would be cost-neutral and ask for an extension but at the same time at least point out that this is a problem for people.

MCROBBIE: David?

DALEKE: I think this is an oversimplification of some of their concerns but I think there were two major concerns that the Trustees had with that policy. One is that it afforded some benefits to the faculty that other groups did not get and so this idea of equity that Elizabeth is talking about I think is a major point for the Trustees. The second is that they asked us for a full cost analysis of this proposal and I don't think we've begun that and I'm not sure how we would do that but that's one of the things they would like to see. Is there more information on that?

KNOST: Well that's exactly, after that Trustees meeting, we followed up and got information and met with various people and got listings and so forth so the cost analysis was sort of underway at one point.

DALEKE: I think that would go a long way in helping get this policy through is to show the Trustees how it could be made affordable or is affordable.

KNOST: I think the other major issue that's going to come up is attrition of faculty and that is that the bottom line is that we're not competing, once again, it's not just salaries but on benefits. And that point has not been well made when we're talking about cost assessment it's not being calculated in there.

JOHNSON: I think they are also looking for university administrators to support it because what they saw was it coming from the Council but they didn't hear deans asking for it, they didn't the chancellor asking for it, so they want to hear that. They want to hear it's a problem with recruiting because we don't have this in place.

SEPT: One thing we may be able to add into the mix is that during this past spring with Julie's help our office applied for a grant program out of the ACE/Sloan for recruiting and retaining faculty with sort of diverse career options. As part of that proposal we should get data back on what the sort of typical practices are of other research universities and institutions and we may be able to use that and fold it into the documentation for a revised proposal.

MCROBBIE: In the interest of time is there any other discussion on this or can we move on to the next agenda item. Any other questions? We're probably at our limit so we might leave it there unless anybody has a pressing question.

AGENDA ITEM #6: SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

MCROBBIE: So maybe we could move to agenda item #6. Ted?

T. MILLER: Yes, Search and Screen Procedures for Senior Administrators. This is a draft, early draft perhaps. I think the focal point that I would like, at least I hope we can have some discussion surrounding, the section "Hiring a Senior Administrator Without A Search" beginning on line 64 going through line 92.

In previous discussions of this that I've heard you know it seems that one of the concerns is that this particular section occupies a fairly large amount of the policy and it leads one to think that maybe this is something that's going to happen more often than others, I don't know. But I think one of the things that's going to be very important for us to get this particular section right. And I'm hoping that some of you have ideas about how we might do that. I have been, myself, trying to think about what we could put into this that would allow something like this to happen but yet contain it within the limits that most of us would find acceptable. And well I've come up with one idea so I'll just kind of lay my idea out there in front of you; maybe you have alternate ideas about things that could be done as well.

It seems to me that one thing we could do in this section would be to say that if an appointment is going to be made without a search that the appointing officer, that is to say the person that is going to make such an appointment, will have to first of all get the approval of their immediate supervisor. Right? The person to whom they report. That would be one step that would have to be taken. Then subsequently the person who makes the appointment and the person who approved the appointment would have to notify their faculty advisory committee that such an appointment had been made. So let's take a case. Let's suppose that Michael wanted to make an appointment without a search. He would have to get the president's approval to do that, he would also have to notify the BFC Agenda Committee that that had been done; Adam would have to notify the UFC Agenda Committee that that had been done. And then this record of appointments is something that there is a record of and that this is something that can be taken into account as people sit down and review the performance of a person in their job; that is to say in the review process surrounding these positions. This is a factor that could be taken into account. As part of managing the academic appointment process, or the appointment process generally, how that's being conducted, there would be a record of how this is done and so forth. So that's something that we could build into this that might tend to contain this to some extent.

BRADLEY: Well it seems to me that if a search is desirable, I mean if we carefully define those positions for which a search is desirable then I really see no reason for circumventing the search. If there's an emergency, you make an interim appointment. It's as simple as that. So I would simply eliminate the second and third paragraphs and mention, as to interim appointments, that these could be used in the case of emergencies. And that would solve the problem it seems to me.

MCROBBIE: Discussion? Bob?

KRAVCHUK: The default position clearly is that we want to have a normal search process for the positions for which a search is appropriate and designated elsewhere in the policy.

T. MILLER: As I said earlier I think that is a position that everybody supports on all sides of this question everybody thinks that is what we should do normally.

KRAVCHUK: On the other hand we do take note of exceptions where due to an unusual opportunity or an emergency, which I think are really the two contingencies that this section of the policy deals with, it would require us to move expeditiously in the best interest of the institution without being constrained by a policy that would operate under more normal circumstances. So it wouldn't stand in the way of responding to an emergency or hiring

somebody who is truly exceptional. In both cases, however, doesn't it make sense that the incumbent then would be regarded as an interim for practical purposes? And then when conditions had returned to normal or the emergency had passed or we got to the stage where we could consider this appointment under more normal circumstances that that person were appropriated vetted in the context of a larger search in which the individual could perhaps emerge as the preferred candidate and therefore and appointed on a permanent basis.

BRADLEY: By incumbent you mean the new person.

KRAVCHUK: The new person, right. So we have three sections that deal with Exceptional Hires, Emergency Hires, and Interim Appointments. It seems to me that Exceptional and Emergency hires ought to both be considered interim if the default position is to have a search. Or am I mistaken?

T. MILLER: Well I think the idea that an Exceptional Hire and an Emergency Hire is not necessarily a term-limited appointment. I mean it could be a permanent appointment the way...

KRAVCHUK: The way it's written.

T. MILLER: Yes, the way it's written it could be a permanent appointment. And so that separates it from the Interim appointment which is really a temporary sort of thing.

KRAVCHUK: How permanent can an emergency be?

T. MILLER: Well but an appointment could be made under emergency conditions that would be a permanent appointment. I think a number of people would describe the appointment of John Ryan as president of the university as being somewhat like that. I've heard people describe it that way.

WATSON: I wanted to say something I said in the UFC meeting is I find this whole notion of Exceptional Hires to be exceptionally ambiguous. We have this problem, and I think Jeanne will know, that with tenure there are provisions for exceptional cases. And the question is is the circumstance that's exceptional or is it the individual that's exceptional that leads to an exceptional hire. I guess if the case is exceptional than it must be similar to the emergency hire. If it's the individual that's exceptional I think exceptional is in the mind of the beholder which is why we have search committees. And to have one or two people being able to determine that someone is exceptional based on their criteria I think circumvents the whole notion of collective search and judgment. So I mean for all those reasons I think both, sort of mechanical, I think the term Exceptional Hires is exceptionally ambiguous and because I think the notion of exceptional leads to circumstances that at least disturb me I also would support the notion of striking it.

JAGODZINSKI: My concern about the paragraph on Emergency Hires is that it fails to define what an emergency is unlike the previous paragraph or the paragraph following. Are we talking about death, fire, what would cause one to require an emergency hire? I don't expect you to answer, I just expect the document to eventually say what that should be. [End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost]

MCROBBIE: Bill?

WHEELER: Thank you, Cecile. I have exactly the same concern, what constitutes an emergency and the one thought that occurred to me for example what we hear in the media about the possibility of a bird flu pandemic and that businesses are beginning to develop emergency plans to deal with the situation in which a large number of employees might be stricken. And perhaps to make progress on this it would be good to have a committee or someone enumerate these types of emergencies. For example, on the issue of saying that it was temporary and that person, someone else...in the case of such a pandemic it is entirely possible that large segments of the administration might be struck down over in Bryan Hall in short order if that were to happen! [Laughter] So it's possible in some scenarios to imagine the need on an emergency basis to make a permanent appointment because the appointing officers might not be there much longer themselves. So it might be helpful, as Cecile proposed, to clarify what the word emergency might mean.

HAWKINS: We'd have a chain of interims, that's all.

WHEELER: Yes.

MCFADDEN: I'm looking at line 68 and it says "careful documentation of position information." My question is when it says "as well as the consultative and approval process used" is that consulting on the position information or about the decision for this administrator hiring without a search. If it's about making a decision itself I think that's more important than position information so it should be put first in the sentence. It's buried in there. So Ted is it about the initial decision?

T. MILLER: I'm not sure actually what it's about. But I think it's a good idea to make that point clear.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

KNOST: Can I just offer a little bit of information and Jeanne can pop in here too. You know you do have faculty procedures now that allow for waivers in searches at the faculty level and it addresses some of these things. So what is an exceptional person? Distinguished rank...you know when Andre Watts was hired into the School of Music he was hired in without a search. So that's the exceptional person situation. You have rules about interim appointments and so you might want to start by looking at some of the ways those are defined in that context rather than simply looking at administrative appointments. My second thing is that these are administrative appointments and so you have to remember, and I don't know if everyone understands this, but administrative appointments—you mentioned Ted, I think you said it's a permanent appointment—administrative appointments almost always have term contract. Now you are talking about a difference between an interim appointment that generally would run a year or a maximum of two versus generally a "permanent" appointment would run four to five years. So there are some distinctions there that you have to think through.

ROHWER: Two quick practical concerns. One, I don't see a mention in here of internal versus external search and in one case I think that's happening now. The second is of course on behalf of students we feel that, for example, the selection process for nominees needs to be further expanded upon. In particular how the process is actually done. And then in the case where there are smaller committees there are constituents that are left out and how to deal with that from the procedure of the search committee. So those are two quick things.

TERRY: First of all I rather, I may be a dissonant voice here, but I rather like the idea if we can put it within reasonable restraints, of the idea of this Exceptional Hiring opportunity. As the Trustees have reminded us I think we need to be a nimble institution and should the opportunity arise to find a new dean perhaps who truly meets these categories I don't mind appointing it as long as that process is to some extent transparent. To me one the deficiencies of this thing at the moment is while these consultations must take place there is no report produced by anybody saying hey this was an exceptional hire, here's who I consulted with, here are the reasons that I believe this was an appropriate thing to go forward with. And then we can hold that person, whoever it is that prepares that report, accountable. So I would think that some reporting requirement attached to this would help make it less frequently used, but when it's used, used appropriately.

CARINI: Well I think there would have to be a report because the positions we're talking about here would almost certainly have to be approved by the trustees and the trustees would presumably want to make sure that they were exercising their due diligence. And I don't see how they could possibly go along without that.

TERRY: I'd like to see in some instances, with regard to this campus, a report to this body.

MCROBBIE: Julie?

BOBAY: I was thinking about what is it about a search process that we value and in what cases are we willing to put that aside for what other value? And I was thinking about the issue of nimbleness and for me it is not necessarily true that a search process is the opposite or necessarily contrary—a search process can be pretty quick. And what a search process does from my point of view is ensure openness and many voices. And it just seems to me that those are, for me, such high values that I think I'll go back to Craig's point that having this section at all, other than the provision for interim appointments, I find very troubling.

BINGHAM: In response to the point about exceptional hires, I think that there's a fundamental difference between the role of an administrator and the role of a faculty member. An administrator is appointed to lead the rest of us which requires that we have a certain confidence in that leadership. This institution is not like a corporation, it's not strictly hierarchical, we are in a situation where people are constantly trying to herd cats. To get the support of the cats is an essential thing and the search process is the mechanism through which the faculty voice is heard. So I do not believe that the exceptional hire notion, the example of Andre Watts for example, I don't need to follow him anywhere. He's a wonderful addition to the campus but he's not someone to whom I'll be reporting. He's a peer. And that makes for a fundamental distinction. So I would like to move Craig's proposed amendment which is that we take the two paragraphs,

Exceptional Hires and Emergency Hires, and we make them subcategories of Interim Appointments so that it is clear that any appointment in an administrative line needs eventually to go through a search process so that the faculty governance role can be played out.

MCROBBIE: Well procedurally we don't have a motion in front of us to which...

HAWKINS: She just made a motion.

MCROBBIE: So that is the motion. Discussion on that motion?

KRAVCHUK: I think that motion fully satisfies the concerns that I had about just which is a subcategory of what. I think you clarified it really well Lisa, you and Craig both. That we're really talking about subcategories of an interim hire; this also I think, I don't want to put words in your mouth but I think this also meets your values as well.

WATSON: Yes.

MCROBBIE: Other discussion?

T. MILLER: Let me just say one thing. I got an email several days ago from a person on the campus who expressed some concern about interim hires. And the concern seems to be—and we're talking here about interim appointments for academic administrators, possibly high level academic administrators. The concern seems to be that if there was an interim appointment with a rather fuzzy idea about how long the appointment was going to be in place that there may be some negative consequences to that as other positions down below are being filled or are attempted to be filled. People aren't sure who their leadership is and how long their leadership is going to be in place and so forth and so on. I guess I'm kind of wondering whether our current approach—I'm not arguing against your motion Lisa—I'm just wondering whether our current approach to this interim appointment perhaps should be reconsidered as well to try to make these things a little less fuzzy than they are now possibly. Just an idea.

MCROBBIE: We do have a motion in front of us. Is there any other discussion?

MCFADDEN: I just have a quick question. Ted who wrote this document?

T. MILLER: This document was prepared by a subcommittee of three people appointed by the UFC Agenda Committee. One of them was me, one of them was Mary Fisher from Indianapolis, and one was Ron Finkbine from Southeast. And so we took the existing university policies and kind of put them together and we were looking around at other peer institutions to see what they had; this particular language came out of the University of Minnesota policy, it was just kind of taken out and pasted in because we knew that this was an issue that we wanted to talk about and this provided a vehicle for doing that. It's not something we're wedded to in any particular sense.

MCROBBIE: Herb?

TERRY: Just a clarification, what basically we would do then is take much of the language of the exceptional hire and emergency hire paragraphs and insert it following the first sentence of the interim appointments saying something like “this may include exceptional hires.” It’s your intent however to still incorporate that exceptional hire idea as something that could be made on an interim basis.

BINGHAM: Correct.

MCROBBIE: I think over here.

IVIE: I’m wondering if I understood your point Ted about the interim appointments, but under interim appointments, it says that an interim appointment must not exceed a period of one academic year. So if we move the instances of exceptional and emergency hires under interim appointment then all of these would be restricted by that line of one year and it seems to me that your concern was that an interim appointment can go on and on and on. But as is written, this would be a pretty rigid restriction for any kind of hire that is undertaken with that actual search. So, I don’t know if it’s a good idea for us to be passing, isn’t this a talking document at this point?

T. MILLER: Well I mean it’s ok. We can prepare the document in accord with this amendment and then we can change it next time.

MCCORMICK: My question is a question of clarification but as we look at this change then it would imply that interim appointment is the only possibility without a search.

BINGHAM: Correct.

MCCORMICK: That no other appointment except for an interim appointment is possible without a search.

T. MILLER: Well, an exceptional hire or an emergency hire would be viewed as an interim appointment.

MCCORMICK: Well that basically changes this section that without search an interim appointment is the only possible appointment.

MASON: One of the practical consequences of that I think would then of course be that all interim searches and appointments would then be internal and not external because it’s highly unlikely that anyone would move from somewhere else to Bloomington on a one year kind of situation. I mean, it’s not a written policy but it certainly would be a consequence for all practical purposes.

HAWKINS: I see these as two different things; the exceptional hires kind of links back to a document where they talked about equal access to potential opportunities for advancement and that would be an internal search for exceptional hires internally and it would be open and transparent. So there is some language in this Council document of 1995 that could be put in

there and that's different than interim. And that the only one of these two paragraphs that is truly an example of interim is emergency hires. So in that light what I would do is I would strike those two sections and rewrite exceptional hires as the opportunity for potential advancement of exceptional individuals to move into administrative appointments. I would amend the motion to just strike these two and give to the Faculty Affairs Committee the interim appointments in this document to rework in light of the some comments that are here.

The amendment is to take these two paragraphs out completely. Don't try and work any of this down into interims. The only one of these two that's interim is emergency, and use that as an example. And then have the Faculty Affairs Committee—and then what you need is you need to replace this exceptional hires with an internal opportunity for exceptional hires that's open and transparent.

MCROBBIE: So the discussion now is on the amendment.

CARR: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so seconded. So now it's the discussion, Bill.

WHEELER: Well I guess I speak in favor of this amendment because I share the concern that if you're looking an out that the exceptional hire would be an outside person, I don't think that an exceptional person offered an interim position would come. If one were truly trying to recruit an outside person, if the case is that it was an exceptional person to hire, that person is going to have lots of other opportunities. I remember our experience with the Dean of the Graduate School position where we hired what I thought was a person who was an outstanding candidate and he was an outstanding person while he was here, but his entire term here—almost the entire term he was here was overshadowed by the fact that the state of the Graduate School was up in the air and therefore his position was up in the air. Looking back at our experience there, I would think that it would be unrealistic to think that if a person truly was exceptional, that person would even consider coming for an interim appointment because that would say that he might be reviewed and then might not get the appointment in which case he would leave the appointment. So I speak in favor of Barbara's amendment that the exceptional paragraph should not be put under interim but should be rewritten.

KRAVCHUK: I also want to support Barbara's amendment but I want to do it for somewhat different reasons than are being expressed here. I want to top what Bill just said on 10, that person might be marginally exceptional because a truly exceptional person wouldn't care if they were interim or not. They've got opportunities and if it doesn't work out here then they'll go somewhere else. If they came here, it's because they want to be here. If Bill Clinton wanted an appointment at SPEA he would get one tomorrow and we'd figure out a way to pay for it. He's exceptional, alright. Somebody else might be less exceptional, they'd really would be worried about getting appointed permanently but he wouldn't care. That's a truly exceptional person. But I do want to agree with you that it should not be considered the category of interim. If truly it is an exceptional person, we need to have some escape clause, some ability to get that person. And I think that that's a very good reason. I do not think however that by focusing on emergency in interim would limit us to—would be the limiting factor in the sense that we would only hire into

such positions, internal people. I think that the fact that that's going to happen if for some reason an external search has failed, I think one of the reasons that we're in the position that we are—I feel a little uncomfortable speaking about this in the presence of Michael but the fact is that the situation that we were in at the end of the chancellor's search argued for a person knew us well and could fill the shoes immediately. That to me was akin to an emergency situation and I wouldn't want to do anything that would hamper our ability to do that again if it was necessary; and in this case it was. So de facto if we're talking about an interim appointment it's because for some reason we haven't been able to find an external person or someone else on the faculty who would pass muster in the normal search process. It had gotten to the stage where an interim appointment was necessary.

WATSON: Well I want to agree largely with what Bob said. I think there are two issues here. One is whether we want to make permanent appointments without searches, whether it be an exceptional individual or an unusual circumstance or emergency. And I think we need a mechanism to make short term appointments at least for unusual circumstances.

Exceptional individuals, it still disturbs me, bypassing in general a search process and I was thinking I had a Bill Clinton example but I'll come up with my more ludicrous one. Let's say Donald Trump is staking out or spying out French Lick, decides he thinks South Central Indiana is real life sweet and he goes to the Board of Trustees and says, "Hey I've never done a university before" and our university decides this is an exceptional opportunity to get somebody who's walked into a situation. What do we do then? What I'm trying to understand is what is the meaning of exceptional and who makes the decision? And that's what disturbs me; the exceptional clause. I have no problems with the internal need for an emergency—response to emergency situations, but I do have issues with this whole notion and the meaning of exceptional and who makes the decision. And I do think that we need to be flexible.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

BINGHAM: My understanding though, it seems like there's a drift in the discussion because Donald Trump at least to the last of my knowledge would not be an internal hire. Correct?

WATSON: Well I'm saying I don't think the interim hires would particularly be internal, I mean the exceptional hires...

BINGHAM: So the amendment that's been proposed has to do with internal hires and yet it's tied to this notion of transparency and openness. Well, the only mechanism I'm aware of for transparency and openness is a search committee. Why are we inventing a new mechanism when one exists? I mean, when we have the possibility for a lateral appointment and someone who's senior who's coming in who wants tenure, it seems to me that the university has a proven track record of being able to get that tenure decision through the college and university tenure committees very quickly. So if we had an internal candidate, it would seem to me that we could appoint them very quickly on an interim basis if they were exceptional, do a pretty quick scan of the external environment with a committee we set up that's transparent and open and be done nimbly and at the same time honor faculty governance. So I guess what I'm saying is I speak against the amendment and still think that if—the issue is that one year as an interim

appointment is too short a time and it seems to me a one year period actually has strengths because it forces us to go through that search process fast. But there's no reason why we couldn't propose that our interim appointments be limited to two years for example if people felt they needed a longer period of time or the incoming candidate needed a period of job security.

MCROBBIE: There was someone also, who is it, sorry, I think it was—was it Bill?

WHEELER: I have a point of order. This document actually is a UFC document and my question is do we, does the Bloomington Faculty Council have standing to pass any amendment on it or whether what we're really doing is providing advice to our president to carry back to the UFC?

T. MILLER: Well having a vote of the Council, that provides a clear signal for what that advice should be though.

MCROBBIE: Greg?

KITZMILLER: Well for those of you who don't know me I'm Greg Kitzmiller from the School of Business and I'm sitting in an alternate for David MacKay so I can put his name tag up as well. And David said if I felt like saying something I should, so I shall.

I want to go back to this idea of nimbleness because I'm sitting here hearing the entire discussion, hearing a lot of good ideas, but I'm also thinking, if we had a need and if we found a truly exceptional person, couldn't we get ten people to get together on a search committee and say, wow, we've got the chance to get and you fill in the blank as to whoever you're currently thinking is an exceptional person and then not agree on that. And if they don't agree on that quickly, then somebody probably is going to ask us, well, how is that person exceptional that you couldn't get up to ten people to agree that they were exceptional. And I could say the same thing I think, using the word emergency. If it's an emergency it's something that we need to do; we don't need to take a long time exploring a search committee and spend a lot of time looking at it and hearing it here unless we need to fill the position, but can't you do that quickly is my question.

MCROBBIE: Well speaking of nimble, after this discussion maybe we can get this to a vote. I don't have to force the issue of course but if there's not any other discussion, maybe we could put the amendment to the motion, which is basically as I understand it, to strike those second and third paragraphs entirely. Barb?

HAWKINS: I just want to make a quick comment that it was somewhat tunneling to the Faculty Affairs Committee that we didn't have an opportunity to generate something that represents the thinking of this Council. We're studying all these documents now and it sounds like it's too late. There are other pieces in this proposal that need to be carefully thought about. So that's one point I want to make and I think the other point is that we need to be very careful about—just in response to Greg's comment that those ten people who are put together aren't selected with the ultimate goal of not being transparent and I think the search and screening process, whether it's done internally or externally, particularly for administrators, ensures that it could go back all way

back—we have somebody that we're willing to get behind as our leader. And if we don't do that process I think we open pandora's box for a lot of inappropriate hires or appointments.

IVIE: Could we restate this motion?

BRADLEY: The motion which Lisa Bingham made as I understand it is to strike the second and third paragraphs and include discussion of exceptional and emergency hires under interim appointments. The amendment on the other hand is to also strike the second and third paragraphs but to create a new second paragraph relating to exceptional hires in some way that would not be interim. So we need to vote on the amendment first which would allow exceptional hires that would not be interim under some new policy that would have to be formulated.

BINGHAM: Point of clarification, I understood the amendment to apply to limit exceptional hires only to internal candidates.

HAWKINS: I was using that as an example.

MCCORMICK: Just as a quick clarification however, this section actually addresses the issue of hiring without a search, not without a screen. And it's a distinction that I think is one that may be a major and important distinction. This is hiring without a search, it's not necessarily hiring without any screening criteria at all.

MCROBBIE: Well, is the motion—I know this isn't written out in precise legalese—but is the motion and the amendment to it clear enough to people to be able to vote on? Is it clear enough to everybody? Alright then, unless there's any objection I'd like...

T. MILLER: It's particularly good because Barbara's committee appears to want to work on this. So, she understands what she's ...

HAWKINS: Before you go ahead and take this back to the UFC, do we have time?

T. MILLER: Well, it isn't clear to me that we're going to act on this. We're in a hurry up mode but if we have important business that we need to talk about then we'll do it.

MCROBBIE: See I was going to suggest, but far be it for me to do so, that another alternative way to go might be for you to take all of these comments to the committee, come back with a sort of revised version on those points and all the other points as well, which is another way to go but if people seem to want to vote. Bill and ...

WHEELER: So I take Barbara's suggestion as she may be wishing to propose a motion to refer the original motion and amendment and adoption to her committee, is that what you would like to do Barbara?

HAWKINS: Well I think if you clear the table of these particular motions and then follow it, we might be able to work with it. You've got to close out the current motions.

MCROBBIE: Which means to close out, I mean to clear it, do you mean to vote on them?

HAWKINS: We need to vote on them and get them off the table.

BRADLEY: Well, you could withdraw your motion.

HAWKINS: Ok. I'll withdraw my motion.

BRADLEY: Okay, so instead...

HAWKINS: My amendment, my amendment.

MCROBBIE: So instead your proposed amendment is to refer this to the committee?

HAWKINS: Well that would come after the motion is handled. I think the best is if it's withdrawn.

MCROBBIE: So you're withdrawing your amendment?

HAWKINS: And then the original one has to be—the original motion has to be withdrawn and we have to generate a new motion.

MCROBBIE: Ok, so then we're back to the original motion. Does Lisa want to withdraw that?

BINGHAM: Not particularly.

MCROBBIE: So then we're back to the original motion which is really to take those two paragraphs and to make them subparagraphs under interim appointment in some form. Any other discussion on that, bearing in mind what Barbara would like to do, but any other discussion on that? Okay, can I put that all those in favor of—with a show of hands please, all those in favor? And those against. I would say that that would be a loss but we could do it well it's close. Should we do a count? Okay, can I have those in favor again please, all those in favor keep your hands up please? Could we have all those in favor please, Kelly could you count again?

KISH: I have 20.

MCROBBIE: 20. And those against please? [22] So the motion is lost, 20 to 22. So, now, Barbara, do you want to move that motion?

HAWKINS: I think that Bill should go ahead.

WHEELER: I'd like to move to refer this to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

MCROBBIE: Second to that motion?

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion?

HAWKINS: I call the question.

MCROBBIE: The question is called so all those in favor of referring it? Against? It is carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #10: REPORT FROM THE BFC LIBRARY COMMITTEE

MCROBBIE: I'd like to propose, I think we've now finished the discussion, it's being referred. I'd like to propose that we move straight to Agenda Item #10 bearing in mind the time since there's 30 minutes allocated for that, unless there's any objection to doing that. Unless there's any objection? Let's move straight to agenda item 10 and that's the report from the BFC Library Committee. Pat, is Pat here, or there she is.

STEELE: Yes and I'm Interim, not Emergency [Laughter].

T. MILLER: But Pat is it true that your interim appointment has a fixed term associated with it?

STEELE: Yes, it does and goes until 2010 [Laughter]. It's June 30, 2007, at which time I can be legally declared old. I think it happened now but we won't go there.

MCROBBIE: Harold?

OGREN: Let me start this with just a comment. Last fall when Dean Pat Steele became the interim dean of the Library, she was asked to begin an internal review of the future of all of the libraries at the university. We all know that the availability of information on the web and web searches and wholesale digitization of information is really having a profound effect and will continue to have profound effect on our libraries and so the library is carrying out this review but it wants and needs the input from the faculty on these issues. So the members of the Bloomington Faculty Council committee volunteered--the Library Committee have volunteered to help with this review by extending this discussion about the future of the libraries to the entire Bloomington faculty and we hope to get information in two different forms. First sort of a snapshot of the present library use by a department but more importantly really to find out what the research needs and teaching needs are of our faculty for library services and facilities in the future.

So this conversation and this discussion will start taking place in a number of different ways in the next month starting really after spring break; first with direct contact at faculty meetings and then a questionnaire on library use and then online surveys will also be available. We'll be contacting the heads of departments and schools and encouraging them to facilitate this discussion within each of our departments and I hope that the members of this Bloomington Faculty Council will respond to those requests and will encourage your colleagues in this rather

unique opportunity to begin to add their thoughts to what the library of the future will be. So with that I would like to welcome Dean Pat Steele, Interim Dean of the Library.

STEELE: I'm not carrying any plague with me today I don't think, thank you Harold. This really is a welcome opportunity to talk to you about the library and how you can inform our transition in the digital world. You may have heard that it's not business as usual on the Bloomington campus and that's true for the libraries as well as the rest of you out there. We need to find a way within the libraries to take a zero-based approach to the library services and operations that we currently have in the context of both traditional investments and our digital future and how projects, as Harold mentioned, such as Google and the promise of mass digitization across the world eventually will affect libraries is a very important and critical question; that's really what we're all about in our work.

Jerry Campbell who's the CIO and Dean of Libraries at USC has written speculating on the future of academic libraries in the context of this digital world coming about. He projects that in the light of Google and such, that we're in the midst of probably a ten-year transition period in academic libraries in which we're going to see the traditional legacy services of the libraries respond to the realities of this digital world and that's why I'm very pleased with what Harold and the BFC-LC is doing in terms of going out and taking to departments and to talking to you individually and through surveys to get your input because it's critical as we make these changes that user input and our attachment to the academic mission of the university stays in place. In the libraries we're doing a number of things. Some of you may have been selected for Live Call recently. That's a national, very genetic assessment tool that we're using to get some input from users and we're starting to get some interesting input.

The positives, I'd like to think there's some good things that are in; sometimes you think everybody that fills out a survey just has an agenda and we have heard good things about librarians as experts and about their rich collections particularly and aside from parking, people are very concerned in the libraries about the stacks, the situations in the stacks, whether the elevators feel very safe to them, how the students at the desk are treating them and that sort of thing. So we'll respond to those kinds of comments and also have an assessment program of bringing more input in on the future.

Michael McRobbie and I have talked a little bit about bringing some experts to the campus to help us see if the library is positioned well to take on some of the roles that we have in the future. I won't go into some of the other things we're doing. He has also helped us with a New Frontiers Grant that will be begin to establish dialogue on campus regarding the issues around scholarly communication. So this fall we have already been able to get the commitment of James Hilton who's the Associate Provost for Academic Information and Instructional Technology and the Interim University Librarian and Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan, soon to move to the University of Virginia, to come this far and participate as a keynote speaker and a participant during the day with faculty from the Bloomington campus and from Indianapolis, related particularly in the humanities to be able to begin these kinds of discussions, so, a lot of chance for discussion and input about the future.

I'll just real briefly talk about some of the things that we're doing right now in terms of providing services to you and then talk a little bit about what you might do for us in this arena. We're doing a lot of work to try to make traditional collections easier to use. All of you are aware of the shift that we're making to electronic and we buy everything that we can that's available electronically for you but there are inter- and sub-disciplines that are still very much bound to the traditional print world and I don't want to see you disadvantaged. One of the advantages of being in this position even in an interim time is that you can do some things that you wanted to do and I've always wanted to use our existing inter-library loan infrastructure, something that has to exist, to provide article delivery to faculty and graduate students and students that are outside of the digital arena so to speak. So we have started request article delivery and you will get a—and I hope some of you have used it, you can request a journal article that's available only in print and we will scan it and deliver it to you electronically and that so far has been very popular and as I said, it's built on an existing infrastructure so it's the kind of thing I think we should support and we do support.

Another thing I want to mention, because this relates to the real commitment that staff have to giving the best service they can. Out of the ALF, that's our offsite Auxiliary Library Facility, we knew from the beginning that when we get a critical mass of materials in that building, we would start providing Saturday services and augmenting the services. Before we ever got to that critical mass, we started having some word from scholars who come here on the weekends who couldn't get to materials and our staff out at the ALF got together and proposed Saturday service without asking for any more money. They rotated their own schedules and found a way to provide that service and I think I just want to point to that as something that I find very meaningful because they really just wanted to provide the best service they can and they didn't say we need another staff person to do Saturday service or anything else.

We also—Julie Bobay is in the room, she has taken the lead in a new service that we're launching this month in fact called IU ScholarWorks. This is a digital repository for scholarly materials produced at Indiana University. She has already identified a number of communities including ones in African Studies, Biology, Folklore and Ethnomusicology and others. I hope, if you haven't had a chance to have a conversation with Julie or some of her team, that you will participate and think seriously about this because this is the kind initiative that can change the way we do business over the long run within the academy and something that the libraries are very interested in supporting.

Another little thing that I want to just point out to you as we talk about being flexible and service minded, with the new students particularly, we really have to be aware of what technologies they're using and making sure that we're on the forefront of those. We were one of the first if not the first library in the country that started email reference. It's the biggest in the country and remains at that. But the students also are doing as you know IM and everything else. So we have recently started and an "ask a librarian" through instant messaging and that's resonating very well with the students. We also need to be where they are with our resources and that's why we've been working with Brad Wheeler and others at UITS to integrate the library resources into the Oncourse CL pages so that we can add value and bring the resources directly to the courses at course level information and resources for the students and we are starting that kind of work as well.

Pretty soon, this year, we'll be talking with the IU Press about providing print on demand from our digital collections. We have over 30,000 volumes digitized now and we get people requesting some print from that and we're going to use the infrastructure of the IU Press in order to provide that service fairly soon. I want to just talk a little bit about what we're doing with space. We have a nice big central building on campus and a number of branch libraries as you all know. Ted asked me to talk to you just a little bit about the recent shift in the library's renovation on the priorities list, and I was called by a reporter at the Herald Times and he thought I was going to say "this is just horrible, look what they've done to the library", but I don't feel that way at all. I think that I had already initiated conversations on campus about the way that the library renovation was broken up into very large components of...the first one was about \$30 million dollars and the others weren't probably going to be any smaller. So what I felt is that having something so large was just an apple that nobody what going to be able to take a bite of and we needed to find a way to break it up into components that really we could get support for, and I think it's going to break out into two areas: the infrastructure kinds of things that have to happen with a building that's as old as the main library or the Wells Library is and the kinds of projects that we can go out and probably get some support for. Particularly with the naming of Wells, there's an opportunity for us now to look at some targeted projects that allow us to make some more changes in the library. To build upon the success of the Information Commons and the kinds of changes we've been able to make in the west tower.

So coming up, we've been working with the architects on re-envisioning of the old reference reading room into a fine scholars' reading room with nice light, quiet, good furniture, and accoutrements that make it easy for a researcher to come in and use the library and someone—I don't know if Dick Rubinger is in here, but he's on the BFC-LC and pointed out at our first meeting this fall was, there's no such animal in the library as a quiet reading space. We have a quiet technology space now on the second floor of the west tower, but we will have this and I think we can do it with private money. So that's something you can look forward to.

Also when we're talking about space, I'm going to mention to you that in this time of change, we're going to be looking at space in a very directed way and that means space in the branch libraries. We aren't going to be able to afford to do all the things that we have traditionally done and that probably leads me to what you can do to help in this time of change. We're going to start doing some things with our resources or shifting things in a way that's not going to be always comfortable for people and I don't need to do a dissertation on change, I can be just as uncomfortable with things [End of Tape 1, Side B; some comments lost] ...that I've always given to people about libraries. It's very easy to accept libraries in any state and say they're wonderful. Now I think the library survey is going to show us that some people are willing to say you aren't so wonderful. But I do want to challenge you to challenge us and to make high expectations of us and I think we're ready to respond to those.

I hope that you'll work with librarians to integrate library resources and information literacy skills into your courses, into your classes, so that the resources that are out there the students start learning which ones are valid and which ones they need to concentrate on and which they do not. And obviously the libraries are not the only place they come and it will be less and less so, so how we kind of manage that help for them in the future is going to be important.

Provide your input in all the ways that I've talked about and other opportunities that you'll have for deciding and helping us define our future. And be prepared for the results or the necessary change and I'll give you some examples. I mentioned the ALF earlier. That has created among faculty, particularly those who use the Wells Library, a very disconcerting situation. That is, you go to the shelf now and the line up of materials is no longer there in the way it was before. In some cases you have to ask for it. And yes we can try and deliver it back to you in a day and we'll start delivering digitally from there very soon too. But nevertheless it's a very different experience than you've been able to have in the past and it's going to be more different in the future. We have another million to take out of that building and I'm already lobbying with Michael for ALF II and ALF III. So we, to keep things, to look at the campus collections—not only the library collections, we're going to need more of those kind of animals in the future.

We do special things for our users. That is, we do special cataloging and all that pulls collections in ways that standardized cataloging does not do. When we do that kind of find work, to pull certain things together for your browsing, we have stepped outside of standardized work and that means we can't then use efficient things like ordering books to be ready for the shelf when they come. And we're going to have to start doing that. So that again is a conversation. We'll talk to you as much as we can and make sure that it's understood that when we have to make these kinds of decisions to save money and to be able to shift positions to other kinds of activities in the libraries then I'll hope that you'll trust us enough and that we've had enough communication up front that you can accept these kinds of changes.

I mentioned the branches. We are getting statistics now on the use of some of the branches and in this environment when some of the disciplines have moved so far toward being able to depend upon electronic resources rather than traditional print collections and some of the kinds of services that we had around, we're going to have to look very seriously at some of the branches that haven't got the same level of use that they used to have in the past. We have at the very minimum, for even the smallest campus library, we have a commitment of a half a librarian and a full-time support staff and a good amount of hourly money. When you put that together across a number of branch libraries it's a significant investment for the libraries in something that could move into another area.

Also let me talk a little bit about the collections and the collections budget. The collections budget has always been very well supported at Indiana University and it's one of the reasons that we're 12th in size in the academic libraries in North America. It's one of the reasons that we have one of the top five interlibrary loan offices in the United States—because we have rich collections and we give good service related to that and it brings in about a \$250,000 per year, trading upon those collections. But we're going to start using that collection money in different ways in a digital environment. One of the real roles that we see for libraries in the future is not just to purchase materials from outside, whether they are paper or digital, but also to create digital artifacts and digital copies of materials that we have. Cecile is here, she's our director of collections development. She's pulling together some guidelines for how we can start doing more of our own digitizing. We did some modest work last year and it was very successful but we have to get to something that's much broader and much more operationally efficient. The libraries are now engaged in a study with the CIC and some other colleagues across the country

to look at our collections vis-à-vis these other large collections in the country. And what we'll end up with is the list of unique materials for Indiana University. That seems to me a good target for our initial large-scale digitizing in the future. This is going to make a shift happen. It may end up that we don't end up buying as many physical volumes of things in the future. So the number may go down and I don't know who I need to warn about that; among librarians that number, that ARL ranking, is not as important I think as it used to be because it doesn't engage, it doesn't pull in all of the factors that I think make a difference in good service in this environment. The trouble is, I was talking to Brad Wheeler the other day, right now it's the only number we have to play with and the libraries are struggling with getting to a new factor for describing what good service is. Before when everyone came to the library a rich collection said everything; it hasn't gone away and it's still important, it's still part of our future, but it's only part of that future. So I encourage you to help us as we move with that kind of transition because I think in the long run moving into that kind of digital world where we have more and more available for you that way—and if you think about the CIC doing this together if each of us identifies our unique collections and these are things that the Google project is not going to touch, it will be presented in different contexts and I think we'll be much richer in the long run for our academic users. So I will close then just to encourage you again to communicate with us and to be part of the communications link as we move on. I'd be happy to take questions if we have time.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Pat. Questions?

WATERMAN: Yes, you mentioned you have 30,000 digitized volumes now. Can you say a little bit more about that collection and how you decide on this? At least, as I understand it or I got the impression, these are books that you acquire in digitized form?

STEELE: Or collections.

WATERMAN: Are they books that are basically unique or do you buy the books in print form and digitized...can you say a bit more about that?

STEELE: These are collections that are in paper form. They are either books or they are photographs in some cases, the...I never get it right but there's someone from Lilly and she'll know...

JOHNSON: The Hohenberger

STEELE: The Hohenberger Collection of photographs is one of them. We've got at this in a very ad hoc way; where can we get, where do we have a strong special collection, where can we get a grant to do it? So a lot of the work initially has been that kind of work. Last year on our own working with faculty members we digitized the Andrew Wylie papers, some monographs that were related to natural history in Indiana, there were a couple of others that we did, something with the UN monthly reports and I can't remember the fourth one. But they've been very targeted to how a particular individual faculty member may want to conduct their instruction or research in the context of a certain collection. Or really it's been more where you have grant opportunities. And we can't live in that kind of ad hoc world; it really has to be much more. And that's why the plan that Cecile is coming up with will be one that really guides us to

be very proactive at looking at the collections we have and then converting them into digital formats.

CARR: A very naïve question, between the digital versus the print is there a significant difference in price? Is the library saving by going digital?

STEELE: Libraries never save. They always find out how to get the money out of us no matter what they do. I mean you know one thing, that's why the scholarly communication is very important to participate in because you know we could do our rabble rousing take back the academy, let's take back the scholarly materials you are producing, I mean you know the old story. We're giving them away and then the publishers are charging us back for them, and we're their main business model. We're the ones who buy it and so we are at their mercy and in a way they are at ours. But in this way it's more uneven at this point. They can raise their prices pretty much the way they want at this point and they are doing it and I think Cecile can probably speak to this much better than I. It's something that used to be just in the sciences—we had to worry every year what's the inflation rate going to be for the science journals. Well now it's hit the humanities and the social sciences so we all get to play equally in this game. They have found ways in the digital environment to put conglomerates of titles together—you may not even want, we may not even want half of them. But because this is the only way you can play the game here and you know there have been discussions among academic librarians well maybe we just need to put the stops on this, we're all going to strike and so forth, well if everyone doesn't play that game then it doesn't work. So I do think that using the open source and looking at different ways for us to share the scholarly output of our academics in the university environment is where we're going to be able to make a difference in the long run in that spiral because it's not going in our favor. Now the things that we digitize we keep control and even Google, what they are digitizing say at the University of Michigan, Michigan is keeping control of those digital objects so they will have it. There's a cost obviously to storing them and to doing the work and to providing the organizational context for it but it's where we need to be. So don't give away anymore journals see Julie.

MCROBBIE: I should comment, by the way, I was in Washington yesterday—I think the last time we met I had just gotten back from Washington too, I don't know if there's a pattern. But I was at a meeting that Bruce Cole, the chairman of the National Endowment of the Humanities had called, there were about fifteen of us, on the digital humanities. I believe, I don't think he's made any public announcement yet, I think following that very successful meeting the NEH will be announcing some kind of initiative in the digital humanities and I think the scale and scope of that could be quite considerable since there are so many people from the humanities here you might want to keep an eye out for that one coming, especially in the context of the kinds of things that Pat has mentioned. But any other questions for Pat? Any other discussion?

STEELE: Thanks, you so much.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Pat. Thanks, Hal.

AGENDA ITEM #9: UNIVERSITY REORGANIZATION UPDATES

MCROBBIE: Jumping around on the agenda again I am mindful that it might be useful, especially since we've got Dick McKaig here and we've got about ten minutes to go, if we could come to agenda item #9. Unless there's any objection to doing that I'll jump straight to that and make a few comments. And I'll make some comments and maybe Ted will want to add to them. Is Dick still there I can't see him? Alright, good.

So basically what the President has decided that the two units—one headed by Dick and the other headed by Bruce Jacobs—that used to report to the chancellor will now both report to him. I believe that Bruce will report to Dick and Dick has acquired the new title that was mentioned before. I think as you know from a previous meeting, IT will report through Brad Wheeler, who is in the back, as an Acting CIO to me as Provost. And then it was agreed that research on the Bloomington campus—and the three components of that are: research development (which includes things like the FRSP Program and New Frontiers and a number of other programs), research administration on this campus, and the centers and institutes will report to a vice provost. And I think I announced last Friday that that is effectively what Sarita was doing now so Sarita Soni will take on that role. Research Compliance will remain a university-wide function for the time being; I believe still reporting to me but Ann Gellis will be heavily involved. There's a review underway that Dottie Frapwell is running of that, hopefully to be sorted out in the next 2-3 maybe 3-4 months and there may be some changes in the reporting lines for research compliance which includes things like IRBs and the animal care and things like that. I think the only other changes that, I'm trying to remember, Julie Knost will report jointly to the President and to me. And the President also is endeavoring to get a sort of comprehensive view of the total Bloomington budget so Neil will also report jointly to the president and me. To me for matters concerning the budget of the provost's office but to the president I think concerning the whole of the campus including all components which I think will be a very interesting exercise as well. So that's pretty much it. I don't think the final details of that are being promulgated yet but that's where I believe we are and I think that all of the components of what will or won't report to me are now clear. I'm pretty happy with how that's ended up. I think it's going to enable a lot more resources maybe to be brought to bear on some of the issues of this campus. There's a lot of things to be done; a lot of searches, a lot of committees and so on to be established and got underway but I think we can now focus on that now that the organizational matters are out of the way. Ted do you want to make any comments?

T. MILLER: Well I just wanted to say that this Council is on record as recommending that the administration consult with the BFC Agenda Committee over these matters and I just wanted to report that there has been such consultation. And I think the Agenda Committee is also quite comfortable with the way this is going and I think that as the situation regarding the budget end of the situation clarifies I think we will be more than just comfortable, I believe we will be rather enthusiastic about the change that is being discussed here. Now I appreciate Dick McKaig being here today. Dick, we just have a minute or two, I thought if you would like to say a few words about your new responsibilities. I recognize that you probably don't have a lot to say but anything you'd like to say we welcome you to your new role.

MCROBBIE: Watch that clock, Dick. When it's 5:30 you turn into a pumpkin.

MCKAIG: Very good, well. I actually don't think I have anything necessarily to say. It's been well described. I'm more focused on the work I do rather than where all these lines go quite honestly. I'm sorry that's just the way I work. I do think there may be some efficiencies and some effective collaborations that will come about. I obviously feel it's very important that I work very closely with Michael regardless of reporting relationships because the business is about the business of students on the Bloomington campus. I am happy to do what I'm doing and continue to do it unless anyone has any questions I don't have anything additional to say.

T. MILLER: Well I have just one question. I don't know if you know the answer to this question or not. At present, Bruce Jacobs, there are a number of different units that report to Bruce Jacobs, are all of those going to stay with him do you know or is the idea to split those up in some yet undetermined way?

MCKAIG: As I understood the President's comment to the Board in the meeting last week that reporting lines in the auxiliaries, he indicated before the change into the area that I'm heading takes place, they need to look at outsourcing potential, efficiencies, and contributions that can be made to the university from those units. So the exact resolution of which units move isn't entirely certain at this point in time because outsourcing might change the nature of the unit. So I think that was the description. So in one sense I think this is evolving still and I may not know entirely what's involved.

T. MILLER: Very good. Thank you, Dick.

MCROBBIE: Questions? No questions. In that case I would propose we adjourn about three minutes early. We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:27 pm.