

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
March 20, 2006
Ballantine 008
3:30 – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Alter, Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Julie Bobay, Maria Bucur-Deckard, James Capshew, John Carini, Richard Carr, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Les Coyne, Aurelian Craiutu, Luis Davila, Robert Eno, Alyce Fly, Dennis Groth, Robert Hatten, Barbara Hawkins, Amy Holtzworth- Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Laura M. Jezewksi, Elizabeth Johnson, Owen V. Johnson, Christina Kuzmych, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Grant McFann, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Paul Rohwer, Elyce Rotella, John Scott, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT: Katy Borner, Paul Elliott, Patrick Harbison, Betsy Henke, Andrew Lauck, Theresa Ochoa, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Jeanne Sept, Alex Tanford, Larry Thibos

GUESTS: Brad Wheeler, David Daleke, Brian Spegele (IDS), Robin Murphey (BFC), Kelly Kish (BFC), Roland Cote, W.T. Wright (IUSA President-Elect)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

March 6, 2007

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/03.06.07.htm>

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Theodore Miller)

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)

4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. Campus Calendar Principles-2002 Proposal [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)

(Professor Theodore Miller, BFC Agenda Committee)

Memo from Calendar Committee: <http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY02/circulars/B24-2002.htm>

Calendar Pros and Cons: <http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY02/circulars/CalendarProCon.htm>

Calendar Principles: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY02/circulars/CalendarPrinciples.htm>

6. Campus Calendar Principles- 2007 Proposal [FIRST READING] (30 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller, BFC Agenda Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B25-2007.rtf>

7. Campus Calendar Principles- Fall 2008 Labor Day Holiday [FIRST READING] (15 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller, on behalf of the Calendar and Schedule Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B23-2007.rtf>

8. Faculty Governance Representation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [FIRST READING] (15 minutes)
(Professors Kevin Hunt and Theodore Miller, co-chairs, Faculty Affairs Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B21-2007.htm>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Interim Provost McRobbie or Professor Miller should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcOFF@indiana.edu

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Maybe we could commence. First item of business is the approval of the minutes for the last meeting; the meeting of March 6. Can I have a motion to approve those please... No one is jumping to...

ROTELLA: So moved.

MCROBBIE: So moved, thank you. Can I have a second?

CARR: Second.

MCROBBIE: All in favor, [aye]. Against? We will take that as carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Next item is the Agenda Committee business. Ted.

MILLER: Thank you. I would like to remind all of you that the deadline for voting in this year's BFC election is tomorrow. So please if you have not done so make sure that you get your ballots in the mail. Shortly after the council members are elected for next year, for those of you who are continuing on the council next year and the new members, there will be an election of a new Nominations Committee. The Nominations Committee will then structure an election for the officers of the council next year and the new Agenda Committee. Hopefully that will be done in fairly short order over email after the voting deadline tomorrow. So for those of you who are continuing members of the council next year, you can expect to be hearing about this election as we go forward.

Second item, the Agenda Committee has been talking with the Provost regarding an item that was brought to us from the External Relations Committee, where there has been a discussion about Life Sciences Initiative and particularly wondering what the campus is doing or will do to evaluate the impact of Life Sciences Initiatives on the campus and so forth. So the Agenda Committee has recommended to the Provost, has discussed with the Provost the creation of some entity; a committee. I'm not sure what really the proper title would be. But it would be a group, the purpose of which would be to evaluate the impact of the Life Sciences Initiative on the Bloomington campus and sort of track those impacts and make recommendations about matters that come up in such a context.

This is something that has not been formulated. It is kind of an idea that we are interested in. It kind of plays in to another recommendation that Agenda Committee has gotten from the Long-Range Planning Committee which basically is asking the Agenda Committee to work with the administration of the campus in terms of structuring some planning activities, longer range planning activities. These things in a way kind of converge to some extent and we are trying to work our way through that particular set of issues. This is something that I think many people—well, I don't know, I'm not sure how many; it's something that came up for example in the context of the accreditation study this year. One of the questions in the accreditation study had to do with campus planning activities. I think most people, looking at the Bloomington campus and thinking about the Bloomington campus don't really see that there has been a whole lot of campus level planning that has been done here. So I think as we go forward that's one of the things that I think the Agenda Committee will continue to work with the administration on to try to structure some meaningful activities along these lines. It certainly seems to me to be something that has been lacking, as we have gone forward. You may want to make a comment about that Michael.

The third thing has to do with our final meeting of the year, scheduled for April 3. Just remind you that there is a reception scheduled following that and we are supposed to RSVP.

KISH: RSVP to me or by email.

MILLER: We certainly would like to know if you plan to attend. It is going to be held in the Federal Room of the Union following our next final meeting.

The final thing, many of you know that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education has a member who is a faculty member at one of the public institutions in the state. Currently, our colleague Fred Cate serves in that role and his term will be ending this year. So there is a process that is underway now to identify people who would like to serve in that role. There is a Nominating Committee; I am a member of the Nominating Committee this year. There are three or four other people from around the state that are members of the Nominating Committee. And what's going to happen is that we are going to solicit interests from the faculty of the institutions and Nominating Committee will make some recommendations to—I guess really the recommendations ultimately go to the Governor. The Governor appoints this particular person to the Commission.

So you will be receiving over the next couple of days or so some material about this, soliciting your interest in this, and I would encourage those of you who have interest in this to pursue it. My impression is that Fred has enjoyed this role quite a bit and it is an interesting time. It is an interesting time to be associated with the Commission for Higher Education. They are doing some important stuff right now. Thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Let me, under Agenda Item #3 make a couple of comments. Firstly, since we last met, there clearly has been a change in my life. I would like to express my gratitude to all members of the BFC for the very kind resolution you passed on the announcement of my appointment as the 18th President of the University. I am most grateful for that. It was very kind of you, and I have certainly thoroughly enjoyed support of many, many people around this room and also I have enjoyed working with many, many people around this room, which obviously I will continue to do.

Just to report briefly on my activities the last two weeks, it has been a constant blur of meetings and travels around the state. It was felt that it was necessary to visit all of our regional campuses, centers, and other facilities around the state bearing in mind the statewide reach of the University and the statewide support that we enjoy and need. I think I have given over the last two weeks, about 50 speeches and gone to about a dozen news conferences and had uncountable other meetings as well. It's all, I think, gone very well. It's been very useful in terms of framing and understanding the various issues that I've got to deal with. Looking around the room, I'm wrecked with guilt that there are some people here whose kind notes to me personally I have yet to respond. I have been overwhelmed with messages of congratulations which I am again most grateful. I'm trying to get to them incrementally and hope to have that done in the next week or so. But my delay in getting back to all of you, who I haven't got back to yet, is no comment on my gratitude for your kind comments and words as well. There are many things I have to get done before the transition on the 1st of July. Obviously these include identifying arrangements for someone to succeed me in this job. I literally haven't had a chance yet to even start discussing that with Ted and the Agenda Committee and others and that is something that I will start in the next week now that the hectic round of travel and other activities has stopped. As you can understand, there are many, many other issues in front of me.

I had a number of meetings with President Herbert early on and I will be meeting with him, I think it's this Friday, at length, to start reviewing a whole range of transition issues with him and I've had a number of preliminary meetings with President Ferguson, and I will continue to meet with him on other issues as well.

I think on a personal note I think you know my wife Laurie is going to be resigning her position to take up the first lady duties full time. She's looking forward to it as well.

I won't comment in great detail on a lot of things. The speeches I gave on the day of my announcement are on the web. There is a website there which if you are interested in some of

those formal statements, they are there plus all of the press coverage; most of it recently accurate in terms of things I've said, some of it not. But obviously I'll be starting to frame issues that will be priorities to me. I think many of you know what they are or what some of those will be anyway and I have flagged or foreshadowed those in various places before; including a speech I gave to the Rotary a few months ago and other places. Many of the items that discussed and raised as initiatives in my State of Academic Affairs speech in September will become heightened in their importance to me in the new role. People on this campus can be certainly rest assured of that.

I will comment on one thing though since Ted raised it. Those of you who followed the things I tried to do as VP for Research with planning in the University and know that we made some progress on that that is something that I think that we can now elevate to a new level. That is certainly something that's going to get a lot of priority and that picks up the point that Ted made. I think we're overdue for more substantial thinking as to how we plan for things like Life Sciences Initiatives and many other initiatives. That is something I will be giving pretty high priority to as well.

That is all I really want to say. I am prepared to take some questions but forgive me but I hope you understand that it's been just a blur of speeches and travel in the last two weeks and many of the issues about which you have questions, though I have given them in some thought, are probably not matters that I have definitive views yet. I do want to announce that, I think many of you already know that we have appointed a new Dean of HPER, Dr. Bob Goodman from School of Public Health at the University of Pittsburg has accepted that position. Bob is a very distinguished researcher in public health and related areas that will bring great academic standing to—his great academic standing to HPER as it really starts to chart its course in the future as well.

We are very close, extremely close to finalizing an agreement with a new Dean for Informatics. But that is not quite done yet. I hope to be able to announce that very soon as well. With the exception of the Library, that will be all of the deanships done that I had vacant to fill when I took on the provost position. That one hopefully we can get at least close to done before I take up my new position.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: So it's not quite presiding officer's business but I know the next agenda item is question and answer. I would happy to take any questions you might have for me about the presidential transition and of course about other matters. Although any questions you have for Ted too. Yes?

HAWKINS: Michael, I just want to make public my thanks to you for putting a high priority on the HPER Dean search and supporting the committee as you did. I'm very excited about our new Dean. I think he is going to really lead us to an exciting future. So thank you for putting that kind of priority on our school.

MCROBBIE: I'm very pleased with the choice. I think he's a very good man. Other questions from anybody? No other questions? Well, good. Let's move on. Oh, Ted has a question.

MILLER: I have a question that was sent to me. This has to do with the resolution that BFC approved last time regarding domestic partner benefits. This is a note that comes from Peter Burkholder. Basically the note says that he is grateful for the BFC's action in this regard. However, he is not convinced, and I've heard from at least one other person who does not seem to be convinced that the language of this marriage amendment is—that the analysis that we were discussing last time about the language of that amendment, Peter is not convinced and there are others also who clearly are not convinced that this is an amendment which really would not threaten domestic partner benefits. Basically Peter's question here is whether the BFC is going to do anything to oppose the marriage amendment specifically as opposed to the action that we took last time.

My response to this is that the Agenda Committee did discuss various actions that might be taken by the BFC with regard to these matters and recommended the action that we did take last time, feeling that that was an appropriate concern of the Bloomington Faculty Council. The Agenda Committee really does not feel that making political gestures is an appropriate role for the Bloomington Faculty Council. Now there are no doubt are people who would disagree with that view but that really summarizes the rationale for why we decided to act or recommended that we act in the way that we did the last time, as opposed to doing something else. So to the question is the BFC planning to do something else more directly related to marriage amendment, my response is that the Agenda Committee is not planning such an action.

MCROBBIE: Any other questions?

SPEGELE: In reviewing your new contract compared to President Herbert's old contract, one of the biggest differences that I've noticed is that annually there will be a review of your performance. Could you please elaborate little more on what the process will be on that and what exactly that means?

MCROBBIE: Well, is this a question to ask me; I don't mind commenting publicly? You're from the IDS correct?

STUDENT GUEST: Yes, that's correct.

MCROBBIE: Why don't we have this discussion later, I don't mind but I can comment publicly that the details are yet to be worked out between me and the Trustees frankly. Performance reviews at senior levels in institutions are a little understood and what goes into that. So it will be no different at what happens with performance reviews for other CEOs of other universities.

STUDENT GUEST: Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEMS #5, #6, #7: CAMPUS CALENDAR PRINCIPLES

MCROBBIE: Okay, there being no other questions, why don't we move on to agenda item #5.

MILLER: Thank you. Yes, well you can see that a fair amount of our agenda this week concerns the campus calendar; item 5, 6, 7. We are desperately looking for something that the council can approve with regard to the calendar. I would like to start by trying to sketch the context of this discussion and try to put the various items here into that context so we all have a common understanding hopefully of what it is we're talking about today.

You have in front of you Circular B24-2002. We looked at this last at the last meeting. This is a report from the Calendar Committee in 2002 regarding the campus calendar. It is, I think, the most comprehensive report of calendar issues that has been produced by the Calendar Committee. This document was discussed briefly in the BFC meeting toward the end of that year of 2002, and that I guess technically it was sort of tabled. The time for the meeting ran out, this item was under discussion and the item never did come back onto the council agenda. So in a way the Agenda Committee is sort of resurrecting this item as an item for discussion because we really do feel that this discussion of the issue surrounding the academic calendar is the best one that's available.

Now, you also have a—do we have the calendar principles? We have a document that is titled Calendar Principles. This is Circular B25-2007; I guess is the current title of this. The basic thing about the Calendar Principles is that this is the way the BFC acts with regard to the campus calendar. It acts with regard to the Calendar Principles. As many of you know who have served on the council over the years, we do not each year approve a new specific calendar for the next year or for the next three years or whatever. That is not the way the BFC operates with regard to the calendar. What we do is approve and maintain a set of Calendar Principles. In 2002, the Calendar Committee basically recommended certain changes in the Calendar Principles as a way to implement their recommendations growing out of this report. The changes that were recommended at that time, were number one: to make the fall semester symmetric with the spring semester calendar in terms of the number of instructional days. Number two: was to designate Labor Day as an official holiday of the University and number three: was to designate the entire week of Thanksgiving as a break week. Those are essentially the three actions recommended by the Calendar Committee that pertain to the regular academic calendar. That is to say the fall and spring semester academic calendar. These were recommended to bring symmetry to the fall and the spring calendars.

Now, in order to accomplish that, the Calendar Committee recommended a change in the Calendar Principles; a calendar principle that bears on something outside of the fall and spring semester calendars. Basically what they recommended was that the free week, which is the week between the end of the second summer session and the orientation week, if you think about it that way; there is a week in the calendar that is free, there are no activities scheduled. It's a free week from the point of the university calendar. The Calendar Committee recommended that that free week be eliminated. That was necessary in order to basically make the fall semester calendar symmetrical with the spring semester calendar.

The other part of the recommendation from the Calendar Committee which is really sort of a non-recommendation if you will, the Calendar Committee in 2002 recommended that the

summer session calendar be maintained as it was. Now, the Calendar Committee has of course been, since the BFC did not act on this proposal in 2002, the Calendar Committee has over the ensuing years been continuing to discuss the calendar issues including up to this current year's Calendar Committee.

The Calendar Committee, this year, basically provided us with the recommendation that is listed here as item number 7 on the agenda. This is a very specific recommendation regarding the Labor Day holiday in the Fall of 2008. This is the next time that Labor Day will be the first day of classes in Bloomington. So the Calendar Committee this year made a recommendation about how to deal with that particular date in that particular year. We'll come to that.

One of the implications of this recommendation that we have from the Calendar Committee this year is that the current Calendar Committee was unwilling to re-recommend the recommendation that the 2002 Calendar Committee made. Indeed I think it's fair to say that none of the Calendar Committees following the year 2002 have been willing to remake the recommendation that the Calendar Committee made in 2002. It is not that these issues have not been discussed. They have been discussed quite thoroughly but the Calendar Committee has not been willing to sort of re-up this proposal.

I would like to talk a little bit about what happened this year in the Calendar Committee, although actually it really started last year. When I went into this term as President of the BFC, one of the things that I did was to try and encourage the Calendar Committee to go back to these calendar issues which are kind of out there lingering. I encouraged them to try to deal with them in the context of their business last year and this year. What happened last year was that the Calendar Committee—I really do not think that the members of the Calendar Committee have problems with the academic year recommendations that were made by the Calendar Committee in 2002, that is to say, having the same number of instructional days in the fall as the spring. I don't think the Calendar Committee has a problem with that principle. Having the Labor Day holiday, I don't think the Calendar Committee has a problem with that principle. Having a week off at Thanksgiving, I don't think the Calendar Committee has a problem with that principle. The problems arise when you think of the implications of that for the rest of the calendar year. This idea about the free week for example appears to be something that there is a lot of resistance to eliminating the free week. There are lots of tasks, apparently anyway, there are lots of tasks that have to be done in the university that are really not very easy to accomplish when there are students running around and so forth. So having a free week turns out to be something that a lot of people think is almost mandatory to get done the stuff that has to be done on the campus.

So the Calendar Committee then said well alright—this was last year, if we want to have this new calendar, symmetric calendar, if we want to maintain the free week then clearly what we have to do is to change the summer session calendar. So last year the Calendar Committee asked Les Coyne who was the—are you here Les, yes—asked Les Coyne to investigate the possibility of changing the summer calendar so that the first summer session would be a five week session and the second session would still be an eight week session. So in other words you would reduce the summer session calendar by one week which would allow for a free week plus the thirteen week summer session. So Les did study that. He consulted with colleagues around the country in terms of people who had five week summer sessions; does this work, blah blah? He came back to

the Calendar Committee this year, basically said that he thought that a five week summer session was something that does work elsewhere, it could work here. So the Calendar Committee then sort of said “alright, so could we then go forward with a proposal that would shorten the summer session”. Final meeting of the Calendar Committee took this question up and basically we heard from The College administration that a five week summer session would simply not be acceptable to The College. That they did not think that the five weeks was a long enough period to offer quality courses, something along those lines. There was strong, strong, strong opposition from The College administration about changing the length of the first summer session. The second summer session seemed a little less problematic to the College administration. So they basically said if you’re going to mess with the summer schedule, don’t mess with the first summer session. Do the second summer session.

So that then brought us to our discussion last time and the Agenda Committee then had a meeting where we tried to work our way through these issues and tried to decide exactly what would be useful for the council to try to do. Basically what you have in front of you in terms of this Circular B25-2007 is what the Agenda Committee put together as a proposal to the BFC and essentially what this proposal says, if you look at principle number two for example, it says that there will be a break of one week between the end of the second summer session and the beginning of orientation. We are basically including that in our calendar proposal. Principle number three is a principle that was formulated by the 2002 Calendar Committee. It basically says that there are going to be the same number of instructional days in the fall and in the spring. Labor Day is in number twelve. That was also a recommendation made by the 2002 Committee; that Labor Day would be a holiday.

Now, number eleven is the one that the Agenda Committee has basically punted on. It is...

MCROBBIE: You’ve done it again!

MILLER: It really does seem, given the history of this calendar issue, that the Calendar Committee and the faculty council really just cannot deal with this summer session issue. There are things about this summer sessions that people feel very, very strongly about, for reasons that are not clear. I’ve set in all kinds of these calendar discussions, and it’s just not clear to me why people feel so strongly about this. But it is very clear that the summer session issue is the key to resolving these other calendar issues. So basically what we are proposing here is to ask the Provost to convene a discussion of the deans or some process involving the academic administration of the campus, to try to figure out something that can be done with regard to the summer sessions that will allow us to have a symmetric calendar in the fall and the spring, will allow us to have a free week and will still allow us to do what needs to be done in the summer sessions. We are hopeful that such a resolution is possible. Really what we’re saying in this proposal is that if it is not possible, if the summer session issues are so deep that there simply is no way to change them, then we are proposing to just go on with the calendar that we have now. But we really think that we need to have a—to give it a shot. To get people who seem to feel extremely strongly about summer session issues, get them in the same room, and see if we can’t break through this somehow. The fact is that our summer session calendar, Kelly has of course been doing the research on this; our summer session calendar is unique, as far as we can tell. Most of our peer institutions do not have a fourteen week summer session. They have a twelve

week summer session typically. So just why we are inextricably wedded to a fourteen week framework is just not clear to us, to the Agenda Committee. We really think that this is an issue that probably can be resolved if the right people get in the room at the same time and talk about what's really going on.

So that's kind of the background of this. Now, I should say that changing the calendar is like some of the other things that we've been doing over the last couple of years. It takes time to change the calendar. We can't announce today that we're going to have a new calendar in the fall. There is some lead time that is required. Just how long that lead time is, is not particularly clear to me, but it really does appear that with regard to this Labor Day issue in 2008, there really is no way, given the way we are proposing to approach this, there is no way that we can have a new calendar in place in the fall of 2008. So because of that we are bringing to you the proposal of the campus Calendar Committee this year, regarding the Fall of 2008 which basically says that in the Fall of 2008 we are going to have a holiday on Labor Day. It is a very specific calendar recommendation and we can talk about that as we get further into this. There is a little more to it than that in terms of what the Calendar Committee had to say. But that is the essence of it. It would be a special case to deal with what a lot of people see as an important problem that would get us past that year and allow us to then have a more general calendar change take effect beyond that.

So that's my introduction to this.

MCROBBIE: Well how do you wish to proceed, Ted, with discussion on this?

MILLER: Well, we can have discussion...let me just one other thing. Bob mentioned last time that in 2002 it was the view of the Agenda Committee, although I don't know if the BFC voted on this proposition or not at that point, I don't recall that, but really the BFC should not itself act on the calendar. That it should be sent to the faculty as a whole for a vote of the faculty. I'll just have to say that the current Agenda Committee is not sympathetic to that view at all. It seems to me—it seems to us, not just me, it seems to us that really the reason we have a Bloomington Faculty Council, we are the elected representatives of the faculty and it's really our job to do this kind of stuff. So we are not very sympathetic to this idea of a campus wide vote on the calendar issue.

MCROBBIE: Discussion.

ALTER: Let me see if I understand what's being proposed here. It sounds to me like there are three issues before us. The first is short range thing about Labor Day of 2008 which is separate from the overall things?

MILLER: Correct.

ALTER: And then there's the issue of the principles which has two big things, one of which is making the two semesters symmetrical and the second one is finding a solution for the summer session. Is that a fair summary; there are really two different documents that we have?

MILLER: That's correct.

ALTER: Can I ask you a question about the summer session issue? I have never taught summer sessions here although I did once to 4-week course at a different place. Why are the summer sessions two different lengths? Do students use them differently? Do students take more courses in the eight week session that they do in the six week session? It would seem to me that the most obvious solution would be to go to different—if a colleague doesn't like a five week session, maybe to go to two six week sessions with a possibility of even having student take one 12-week session, which would overlap with the two. So it would be natural for three summer sessions? Is the eight week session used differently than a six week session?

MILLER: Les indicated this morning that he would be willing to be an information resource here today. So perhaps this is a question we can address to Les.

COYNE: Let me start by commenting that the two sessions are relatively the same size. The six week has grown larger than eight. Ten years ago it was reverse. But by and large they are equally used. There are a significant number of students, approximately 4500 that use both sessions; that will show up for both sessions. The six week session has worked very well over many, many years as a chance for students to take a six week summer school course or two and then go on with the rest of their summer; jobs etc. That's been very successful here in serving student needs and it's been very successful elsewhere in the country.

The eight week session is basically lined up for those students who want to use the summer as a full semester and that's been successful. You can get an equivalent of a semester's worth of work done. In fact the business school does use the summer as a fourteen week semester with the I-Core, which they can do. The summer's calendar was originally designed thirty years ago when some changes were made to be as flexible as possible. I think that's about the extent of the difference in the rationale. We can get into a lot of details with specific program needs etc, but the general overwriting idea is the term where students can take courses and move on and have a significant descent summer or provide a summer calendar that can accommodate a full work load. What's interesting is that over the years, the summers maintained a fairly steady enrollment pattern for the last twenty years. It's just amazing. Summer is important to our students. We did some work a few years ago that showed that every student, statistically, will take at least one summer course with our summer term. We are one of the larger in the Big Ten in terms of summer enrollments for being a.) not an urban campus and not being an all time mission campus, i.e., having a med, engineering on this campus. We still come in sometimes larger than Wisconsin. So we are roughly about third or fourth in the Big Ten enrollment which says that students use our summer as part of their year round planning. It's always been one of my tasks to facilitate and encourage summer being used as a year round part—being used as part of the year round planning process for students and that is pretty much the case now. There's your background or summary in general here.

MILLER: Now, George, it seems to me that one of the points that you're trying to make here is that there probably are, and I think it's true that there probably are a lot of different ways that the summer sessions could be structured, including the proposal that Bill Wheeler presented to us two weeks ago, which was kind of a very detailed kind of tweaking of the kind of the current

schedule, which would basically preserve the free week and have the summer session lengths be almost what they are now. So there are lots of possibilities. But there also seems to be a lot of very sort individualistic objections to change and that's why [End of Tape 1, Side A] I think that really what we need is a process that kind of gets out beyond our faculty consideration of this and allow the provost and the deans to kind of sit down and think about what's really important and what isn't and just kind of get something together that will work for us.

DAVILA: Ted, may I ask Les a question? Is the plausibility of the way we work with study abroad programs in the summer come into play with regard to the calendar other than students being able to pause between the end of the regular academic year and then going off to France or other locations.

COYNE: There is no connection other than what you suggest, the semester's guide study abroad more than the summer. Registration process for study abroad has been somehow worked so it fits in the normal registration parameters for summer. So those kinds of details have all been handled. Not sometimes elegantly but handled.

DAVILA: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

ROTELLA: Just a simple question, I think. In Circular 23, Ted you talk about this being a one shot deal for Fall 2008 but the language in some places says beginning in the Fall of 2008, which implies that this is a change that will continue after 2008. I mean, if we're going to pass something, may be we don't want it to have that language. It's in the preamble and in the beginning of part six.

MILLER: This I guess was the—well, is that right?

KISH: I believe so because, again, this was the only thing that came. So they assume that you will do this indefinitely.

BUCUR-DECKARD: But you just presented to us the one time?

MILLER: Yeah, well, actually that was my impression coming out of the Calendar Committee. That is why I really thought what we were talking about was making sure that we didn't have this problem in 2008 and I guess my sense was that there was some hope that we could resolve this before the next time Labor Day would be the first day of the semester. This came from the Calendar Committee?

KISH: Bill and Les, that's the language that we had the last time as well.

MILLER: Well, okay. We can take this to be a more general thing in terms number eight. I'm sorry, in terms of number seven on the agenda. I guess the proposal that's actually in front of you is kind of a permanent holiday on Labor Day.

SHAKESPEARE: Are we discussing all the principles or just on Labor Day right now?

MILLER: We might as well talk about it all.

SHAKESPEARE: Following Bill's presentation last week, we had a follow up conversation. He indeed did identify some of the cons of his recommendation. Particularly one of them that I'm sensitive to is some of the needs in the arts, particularly where the theory of our classroom is balanced with applied experience. Applied experiences often take place in summer seasons; festivals, internships, all which typically end somewhere around the closure of most persons summers which is the Labor Day weekend. The proposal in its worst case situation by beginning classes a week earlier would mean that orientation, I believe would fall on August 9th in its first phase and the first day of classes would be on August 16th. I believe that to be particularly problematic with at least in my own department in Theatre. I begun that conversation, there hasn't been much time because of the break to really create a rowdy front, but I raise it.

I followed up with a short naïve note to Roland and I said "Roland what happens if for example, trying to be creative about change, if we add 5 minutes to an hour class, 50 minutes or 55 minutes? What is the ramification to the schedule whereas 14 weeks would still have the same amount of contact time?" I discovered, as probably many of you knew but new to me, that once upon a time we had 15 weeks and they were 45 minutes sessions. For a few years we compressed it to 14 weeks and added 5 minutes, making them 50 minutes sessions. Now we are proposing expanding and adding another week and retaining the same length of contact time. I just hope that this flexibility that can be looked at in multiple places and without challenging the integrity of our academic mission, why not also look at culling a week off of spring. So I would simply just leave that. I hope the conversation can be an open one that can look at more than simply focusing on moving September into Mid-August or whatever in the worst case situation.

O. JOHNSON: George mentioned there are really three issues here and I think the one that can most easily be resolved is Labor Day and I would even suggest that perhaps that can be done today. We talk about wanting to get this done as soon as possible if it's going to go into effect and I think it can be done today. I looked at the Big Ten, two of the schools are on quarter system, two of them are recreation states, which means they don't start until after Labor Day but it is interesting that they start the day after Labor Day. I'm talking about Wisconsin and Michigan. The other 6 all have Labor Day off, even the University of Chicago; former member of the Big Ten on a quarter system does not have Labor Day.

So right now we're the only one. In the spring Martin Luther King Day is off. So we're missing one Monday and everybody has somehow adjusted to it and curiously enough, we had a snow day this year and things haven't fallen apart. We've managed to adjust even though we missed classes on one day. If Labor Day does anything, it demonstrates to the faculty how important the staff is in getting things done, particularly at the beginning of the semester. Students want to change schedules or there things coming up and there is not staff there and we realize how important they are.

Really it's a shame that we don't honor the working people and take Labor Day off. I really think it is time today to vote to take Labor Day as a holiday.

MCROBBIE: Bill.

WHEELER: Thank you. So I did have a conversation with Bob. It was a very valuable conversation and I'll say more about that in just a moment. First of all I should mention that the dates were not quite as early as Rob mentioned they are. I was trying to accomplish the—perhaps on that occasion I was doing computationally that—but the issue is that we need a start and perhaps that will pertain to not only what I was suggesting but also to any proposal we would start of the fall semester earlier into August by one week. An earlier start date if we started a week earlier would be August 20th for the first day of classes and the earlier Monday 20th is the earliest day I believe for registration I believe would be August 13th. I think in my own mind, especially after talking with Rob, that we do have to recognize that any ruling to start early in August is going to have a significant impact on a number of people; the Admissions, the people in Theatre and also the School of Music and it was brought to my attention today when I read the memorandum B24-2002 that it also pertains to my own department. That department has a three week jump start program for graduate students. No longer a bigger program but starts the first full week of August that would fall to the first week of July. So trying to move it ahead will also have a negative impact on people and that is significant. For that reason it really is not to be taken lightly.

Now, you may recall that last time I proposed having a fall mid-term break and it was observed that that two day break be also observed at Thanksgiving. The Purdue calendar does have a fall mid-term break. The only difference between with it and what I suggested last time is whether that is in the 8th week or the 9th week and that is because they do their mid-term grades in a different way. In talking to my colleague we would teach large freshmen classes. We were all in agreement that having a mid-term break would significantly improve the fall semester experience for freshman that really the November period, the period from the first week in November to Thanksgiving, is very difficult for freshmen. So we felt from an academic prospective that we did think during the mid-term break would improve the learning situation. After, in a way, that having a week at Thanksgiving would not. If we were to start the fall semester a week earlier, and still not having a break at Thanksgiving, then that would actually put an additional week of fatigue on our students and we felt like that, at least for freshmen is a negative thing. So that's why after my conversation with Rob, I said well that because of the impact on the theatre department, on the music, on perhaps, I'm told perhaps the sciences and sociology tend to have there have their freshmen meetings during the last week, till the end of August, people that frequent European conferences at that time. I could support moving it ahead, that's from the math department's point of view, my colleagues at the math department, I could support moving the start of the semester to one week earlier in August, if those days were used to provide a fall mid-term break which we e felt it would be academically or for many, many students especially the freshmen, but if moving it ahead by a full week was going to be used to extend the Thanksgiving break by a full week, we in the math department actually do have fairly good attendance in our classes, we don't cancel our classes during Thanksgiving week, we do have fairly good attendance. So as a representative for my department I actually know that we could support moving it ahead if we have a fall mid-term break but, we would not be able to support it if the purpose was just to extend the Thanksgiving break.

MCROBBIE: Maria?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I just had a question for Owen actually and your research regarding the Big Ten. Does anybody have this policy of make-up classes on Saturday at the discretion of the instructor?

O. JOHNSON: No.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other questions?

MCFANN: Yes. Not a question, I would just like the council to note that the newly elected student body vice president Joe DeJean was here to show his support for a Labor Day holiday. It was one of his ticket to platform issues that received resounding support from the electrets. I don't know if he is able to comment on what the student perspective might be, but just that recognize that he is here in support of the break as a holiday and a vacation day.

MILLER: I'd like to say that the students of course have representation on the Campus Calendar Committee. The representation this year with regard to the start date of the semester, the student representative, I think it was Andrew Lauck is the person this year. Basically what he said was that he did not feel that the students would object to an earlier start date, because all the other public institutions in the state do have an earlier start date. In many cases their friends are going off to Purdue a week earlier, and their kind of, there at home twiddling their thumbs, with all their pals gone. He just didn't think it would be an issue from a student point of view. Whether that's a general student perspective I don't know but, that's certainly was what Andrew said in the Calendar Committee meeting this year. The earlier start date is something that is done at our sister institutions. They have the same kind of issues that we have heard about here. It's pretty clear I think, given the fact that this issue has not been resolved over a period of years, that there are issues here. There are some issues. What I would really like to do is to have the Faculty Council resolve this, one way or another. Move it off the table. Say alright this is what we want to do. Right now were sort of in limbo. We've got calendar proposals that we haven't acted on. I think we should act on something. Get it over with. Move on.

ROTELLA: In my time here, there were three years when we had a full week of at Thanksgiving. I don't remember exactly when that was but, in my memory and we went away from that. We did engage in an experiment. There must be some data, and some reason why we gave up doing that. Surely we have some useful information somewhere.

TERRY: I gave some of that at the last council meeting and actually I'm going to ask to add to this. In the first place the important thing to remember is that we did not as a council go away from it. It was sort of decided by the administration for a variety of reasons that I started to share, and I can also share that it was not sustainable. No I think it's worth knowing because this is one of the options that we could have brought to you and we didn't. Anything beside what I said last week.

COTE: The two of the issues together it was at that time when the Thanksgiving week was in fact a no class week, a break. That was the time when we switched classes from 45 minutes to 50 minutes and reduced the semester to 14 weeks. Unfortunately, even though instructional time actually increased during that period, because of the 5 minute, it was viewed as, the legislature viewed it very, very poorly; as the institution is not meeting its responsibilities and is shorting its instructional schedule and parents were upset because they didn't know what to do with their students. They are not in school, what do we do now? Those were two factors that we were trying to deal with. As I understand it the pressure from the legislature was actually very, very heavy.

ROTELLA: I remember there was also pressure there was also pressure from the local business community.

COTE: That's another issue by keeping the students away.

TERRY: My recollection is that when it was changed there were a number of faculty members that had been here a long time who were all set. Who actually liked the symmetrical semester calendars and who actually thought that the Thanksgiving week off was a good idea and would have liked to continue with it.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? I'm not certain there's any action to be taken since these are disseminated of the first readings and the first one was discussion.

O. JOHNSON: I would like to propose that we indeed vote on the Labor Day item because it wasn't on the agenda last time as a first reading, so that we would have authority to go ahead. That way when we come back next time we've only got, according to George's counting, two issues.... So I would like to move that we vote on the Labor Day.

MCROBBIE: Can you give us an idea of a specific motion. Is it just...

O. JOHNSON: I move that we adopt Circular B23.

MCROBBIE: That's the motion. Is there a second there, for that motion?

ROHWER: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay discussion.

SHAKESPEARE: Can I confer that B23 is what we are currently practicing, with the simple change of Labor Day becoming a holiday.

MCROBBIE: Discussion. Yes, Bill.

WHEELER: If we are actually going to vote on B23 I need to move a couple technical corrections to it. In item number three, which refers to 72 class days, with items six Labor Day being a holiday that will drop to 71. So if you look over on the other proposal what was before us

you could see the corrections there I believe. So if we vote on B23 2007 standing alone then I need to replace item 3 the 72 class days with 71, and the 75 class days which is currently not our situation needs to be reduced to 74 because of the Martin Luther King holiday.

MCROBBIE: Can I take that as a friendly amendment without further discussion. Good. Consider that as amended. Any further discussion?

ENO: Just to be clear we are doing all of this motion is to do B23 as is, including the Saturday option.

MCROBBIE: I believe it is as is with those two changes that Bill made.

ENO: As long as that's, I'm concerned about voting on something that was publicized to the Faculty as fist reading on an issue that we don't care about. Although it's very possible that the science departments have had a reservation about shortening the weekend and as long we provide the Saturday off then probably won't be problematic.

MCROBBIE: By the Saturday option Bob you mean what is in number six.

ENO: But when I had understood from the earlier conversation, that wasn't going to be part of the proposal. So I wanted to make sure.

MCROBBIE: Some of you...

CAPSHAW: I just wanted to point out some sort of credible issue that might not be relevant but, most of the principles are actually principles but this is really a specific case. The only other ones are Memorial Day and the Fourth of July. We also notice is the MLK day is not listed here as a principal to be symmetrical.

ENO: It probably should be included as a principal. We didn't do that so it never got put in as a principal....

TERRY: If I can add something, the MLK day was not something the council created. The trustee's stepped in and mandated that MLK would be a day off. That's why it's never been in any principles that we have adopted but you could certainly add it now.

MCROBBIE: Is there a wish to do that ... no descent from that, I don't know exactly what the form of words would be called.

ENO: MLK day shall be observed as a holiday at Indiana University Bloomington. Just add it to number six. Put it before beginning fall 2007.

MCROBBIE: I think we can clean it up later. Is there a sense of that clearing up to everybody? Ok, will take those and put them in the amendment as well. Other discussion?

HATTEN: Are we going to take out the word “Beginning” or leave it in for this It seems to me we should take it out and vote on this since it’s a one time issue.

MILLER: Well the fall 2007 is between here and there and we are not intending that we start this coming fall. I think I agree this is the way to go.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Is it a one-time deal.

O. JOHNSON: Another way to address it would simply to take out beginning in fall 2008 and make a separate clause these Calendar Principles will go into effect in fall 2008.

ALTER: It’s the same thing.

O. JOHNSON: Same thing but that way well, whatever.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Bob

ENO: Is Labor Day scheduled as the first day of classes next fall.

STERN: Just a friendly technical amendment. Back on item number three it says first semester shall contain 14 weeks and two days of instructions. That should probably be one day right of instruction. And then on the third line the second semester shall contain 15 weeks of instruction that should be 14 weeks of instruction. 14 weeks and 4 days.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Bob?

ENO: One more question about what we do now. Do we still have a substantial number of Monday, Wednesday classes scheduled? I know the registrar’s always...

COTE: Unfortunately, yes.

ENO: Ok, it would be good if we addressed other calendar issues as rapidly as possible then. We really are creating for classes scheduled on Monday and Wednesday we now really have a significant disequilibrium between the two semesters. And it will be difficult for the registrar to manage the scheduling of classrooms I would expect on Saturday as an option.

COTE: I don’t see why is should be any problem. That would be a question of cost associated with physical plant keeping the buildings open, the classrooms up and everything. There may be some costs associated with that, but basically the question is announcing it to the students. Are they going to realize that they have to come to class on Saturday and go to the same classrooms.

MCROBBIE: Any other discussion?

MILLER: Let me just say that I really actually I am not enthusiastic about acting on this item today, out of the context of a broader consideration of the calendar issues and voting on these broader issues as well. I just think that the University, I believe, could be damaged somewhat by

the publicity surrounding this particular action. Even though our intention might be in two weeks time to do something which would rather than shorten the fall semester calendar to do something that might have the opposite effect. But in the intervening time I'm just not excited about doing this specifically right now.

ALTER: Are you moving that we table this until the next meeting.

MILLER: I'm just expressing a view. I'm a little concerned about this.

MCROBBIE: Bob and then Bill?

ENO: I'd like to second Ted's view. 5 years ago I was very much in favor of moving right away and getting this done although we were planning to have a campus vote. It's been very frustrating thinking the issue had died and it's very tempting to do it today. But I feel the same unease that Ted feels. I'd like to think that we could come back in two weeks with the same ideas in our heads as we have now, have a chance to think things through more thoroughly about the other elements and do the packets that we think we can do it best this term. We weren't going to do that we probably would have regretted at that point having acted at this point.

MCROBBIE: Could I just make a comment from the chair that given what Ted said, there may be the possibility for this to be construed in a negative way. As you say there are going to be things that will be done that if you like almost counter balance it for doing the two together in particular given that the legislative process of it is under way at the moment. If we are making these changes it might be best if we presented them all together so this could be seen in its best light. That would just be my suggestion from the chair. Everything we do is rather visible at the moment. Yes, Bill.

WHEELER: Well I want to support that view also because I think the technical records that we talked about in between B23 2007 were not already on this page were as we do see corresponding technical corrections on the B25 2007. Suggested that this was really viewed as a first reading and there hadn't been an attempt to polish it to the form that one could actually vote on. We kind of developed a general form of this document really should be. I think there have been enough changes there that I personally would actually like to see it before I vote on it. So I am wondering whether it should moved for an immediate vote might be willing to retract this motion.

O. JOHNSON: From publicity standpoint how this plays depends on how we play it. We've had one of the things, as Malcolm mentioned, faculty who have had children at home. Known that on Labor Day it's difficult to figure out ways to take care of the children figure out if both spouses are working, or if you have one spouse who has Labor Day off in fact it turns into child care. As I say it is something of an embarrassment that we don't honor the working people of the United States or the State of Indiana by taking this as a holiday. All I was suggesting was that this would, I would argue, would get the process underway and it would not hinder any changes that would be made or adopted in two weeks from now. If the legislature is going to be watching that closely and be saying, oh my goodness we're dropping, what is it, 1.5% of the instruction from maybe 40% of the classes. I do not think that is the problem. If it is the will of this body not to

vote on it today I'm not going to stand in the way of that. I don't think the problems that have been specified the technical factors are really an issue I would look at, I'm not on the Calendar Committee, but I would look at the proposal for the Labor Day a holiday was not cleaned up in all of it's details because the idea was to get this thing as a separate and individual decision.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Alice. Sorry Bill, Bill, Alice first.

FLY: I'm kind of in agreement with Bill and Ted on this. Our policy making body met the Friday before spring break and no one has really gotten back to me on this issue at all. I'd feel very uncomfortable I'm not sure what the implications of Saturday classes are. I don't know if that would work well for our classes or not. I just haven't had any feedback yet for my school so I'm uncomfortable voting today.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Bill.

WHEELER: Alice also serves on the Calendar Committee. The Calendar Committee this year did not actually look at the full document. It only looked at the amendment number 6. So the Calendar Committee never did actually look through this document to give you a polished document. So that it's unpolished does not reflect an urgency on the sense of the Calendar Committee to get this directed to you. In saying that I don't want to leave you with this impression that the Calendar Committee doesn't want to see action taken on this. The Calendar Committee certainly but asking this item number six as this appears in this Circular fully hoped that the council would take action on item six this year and it assumed presumable that all other technical adjustments would be made. It didn't anticipate I think that the entire set of principles as a document was going to come before this council for adoption. So one should not draw inferences about the lack of tap or direction as to the urgency that the Calendar Committee felt that they should be adopted at the very earliest date. So I would like to move to table this vote until next time please.

ENO: Second.

DAVILA: I should like to second.

MCROBBIE: You indicated you would be willing I think to leave it is that, cause that would simplify this procedure rather than...

O. JOHNSON: Okay

MCROBBIE: Okay, so then the motion is withdrawn and we will take our list together and try and try hopefully sort this out is one package at the next BFC meeting. Thank you.

TERRY: I'd like to take a suggestion to the Council. I hope we do take this up at the next meeting.

MCROBBIE: I think we just committed to this.

TERRY: What that means I hope is that we talk to our policy committees and others about these principles, about the effects of moving a week earlier and come back prepared. To fish or cut bait on this.

MCROBBIE: Yes, I think that's exactly right we can't use these as excuses next time. We need to make some decisions. Yes, Robert.

SHAKESPEARE: Just a final comment, I guess then. This campus in its differentiation mission statement certainly did identify the uniqueness and the strength of the arts and its presence on this campus. I hope that I don't know if a week or two is adequate to really look at the detailed ramifications of the complete proposal of these Calendar Principles. It's a large portion of this campus. So I hope we can continue the conversation more than perhaps the few arts representatives of this table can get involved with discovering the true depth of positive or negative to moving it back a week.

MCROBBIE: Kevin?

HUNT: Rob I wonder if I could charge you with investigating our other Big Ten institutions that since all these other institutions, so many other institutions, start a week early. I wonder if you could have a look and see how their theatre departments cope and maybe focus on your colleagues at other institutions and find out exactly how severe the implications are of starting a week early.

SHAKESPEARE: This is within the next thirteen days.

HUNT: Yes

SHAKESPEARE: I could begin that process.

MCROBBIE: Ok, maybe we can move on. There's agenda item #8 to go. Then there there's a couple of standing committees who want to make reports. So if we could move on to agenda item #8.

AGENDA ITEM #8: FACULTY GOVERNANCE REPRESENTATION FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

MCROBBIE: This is Kevin and Ted. Who is going to open the bag?

MILLER: This is an item that we discussed last time also. We have this on the agenda also as a first reading our attempts would be to have a vote on this at the last meeting of the year. In the interim since our last meeting, Kelly has sent information about this item to the faculty on the campus who would be affected by this. We did contact all of the research scientists, research scholars, all of the clinical appointees, all of the lecturers told them what we were considering doing here we did get back 5, 6, 7, 8, messages from people. All of which were positive and thought this would be certainly something that would be worth the doing to bring these voices into the Bloomington Faculty Council. We haven't heard anybody who thought this would be a

bad idea. So I'm not sure that we need to have a great deal of discussion about this today. I think the one point that we should keep in mind here is that there really are two dimensions to this situation. One of which is focused on the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty. Basically what we're proposing here is structuring a new election unit. That would involve the non-tenure track campus faculty. The Constitution is not the place where there is a detailed description of how the election within the election units gets done. So in other words, we as a matter of principle could approve a change in the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty that we want to have a new election unit, we want to elect people, representatives from this group of faculty to serve on the council and the question about just how that election will be done really is something that is viewed or could be viewed as a by-laws issue something that doesn't meet the approval of the full campus faculty etc. So there's a little more flexibility and maybe a little more time to think about how the elections should be done. Some of our elections actually turn out not to be described anywhere. The procedures underlying some of the elections that we do really aren't codified in any document; we just kind of have done them over the years. So that part of the question which in part was under discussion last time, just how it should be done those I think are less pressing issues for us, as compared to the first issue. The council did act earlier in the year, I don't recall, we approved a constitutional change regarding who the presiding officer of the council would be. Now that is a constitutional change that has yet to be submitted to the faculty for ratification. This would be a second thing that we could kind of add to a ballot that could be sent out at the end of the year. Get that done and then we could turn to just exactly how these elections should be done as another item.

MCROBBIE: Ok, this is a first reading too but discussion on this item on this document.

E. JOHNSON: There's just one small area in the By-Laws part in section 6. Lines 3 and 4 would have to be rewritten as they have been up above in section 2. Would the list of all persons eligible to vote organize by whatever, it would need to include the academic appointment category. So it would be parallel. Because just knowing whether or not someone's tenured or not tenured isn't gonna to help when we have added these other categories. So it needs to be rewritten, because you've rewritten it up above.

KISH: The reason why I rewrote above, I'm glad you pointed that out again Elizabeth, because I forgot about this. This paragraph 6 actually applies to the campus faculty election. So this paragraph doesn't govern the Emeritus election and we've structured the NTT representatives on basically on a similar way as the Emeritus election. So we actually need to write a new paragraph that's going to apply specifically to that election. So for example one of the recommendations that one of your colleagues sent back to us was he thought it would be a good idea for the whole faculty, yourselves included, to nominate people into the NTT positions, but that the election would be done by those colleagues themselves. So anybody could nominate, this was one recommendation, and so it seems like the procedures might in fact be different than how we do it for so for right now you all get that big document the yellow document with everybody's name listed. The document for this group would be different, it wouldn't be the same structure and so paragraph 6 really applies just to the campus election, what I call the campus election, we have a different Emeritus election. They get a separate ballot, with a separate list of the Emeritus faculty, but that actually isn't in the by laws anywhere.

E. JOHNSON: But the whole faculty doesn't nominate from the Emeritus list.

KISH: That's right, at present you don't.

MILLER: So the By-Laws the wording to the by laws is something really that does need some more work, you are exactly right Elizabeth. The point I'm trying to make is that's a separable issue.

GROTH: Under A-1 the faculty election units, the School of Informatics was omitted.

KISH: You're right because that's the constitutional that's the other amendment we made in the last year, is to create a School of Informatics voting unit. I was just testing you with that.

MILLER: We weren't quite sure about you.

MCROBBIE: Other comments, any other comments? So this comes back to the next meeting. Alright, so we'll see this again.

AGENDA ITEM #9: STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MCROBBIE: Finally we have a number of standing committee reports that we need to talk about.

KISH: Two Research and Fringe Benefits.

MCROBBIE: George do you want to start.

ALTER: There's an issue that the Research Affairs Committee has been looking at, which is a revision of the Policies and Procedures regarding Research Misconduct. The reason we need to revise our policies and procedures is that NIH came out with a new set of guidelines, which changes a few things. I think the major changes seem to be that NIH wants to remove the issue of disputes over authorship from the research policy and we're looking at developing a separate statement on authorship disputes. What's happening there are a couple of things happening as I understand it after discussing this with the Research Affairs Committee it doesn't look like these changes will be very controversial for this campus, but this is a policy that has to go from the BFC to the UFC. The procedures in Indianapolis are somewhat different and it might be more complicated there.

So Kelly and I and Randy have made contact with our counterpart at the IUPUI campus and they're considering it. So we wanted to alert people on this committee that we do have a policy drafted which is being defined. There are two possible things that might happen. One is there is still time to bring it here and pass it and then send it on to the UFC. The other alternative which Kelly suggested might work is that we might bring it as an interim policy to the agenda committee and get an interim approval and then bring it to the BFC in the fall when there would be more time. We think that, that might be a good way to satisfy NIH in the short run and even if

there were feedback from NIH about the policy we could refine it in the fall before it's formally adopted. So we just wanted to let people know that that's going on.

MCROBBIE: Who's the other one?

MILLER: Elizabeth Johnson or Elyce.

ROTELLA: I'm going to do it. The Fringe Benefits Committee again we just wanted to let you know about something that we hope we'll be able to take up next time and should be short and not controversial. Currently the Tax Deferred Annuity Plan that we have is one in which you have to opt in, that is you have to tell human resources (End of tape 1 side B..... some comments may be lost) that you want to participate. We would like to have an opt out policy, a policy in which people would be automatically enrolled in a tax deferred annuity. Then they have the option of telling human resources that they don't want to contribute to a tax deferred annuity and human resources is proposing with the very strong support of your Fringe Benefits Committee, to go to an opt out system beginning in of January 2008. We were hoping the Fringe Benefit's Committee is very supportive of this, the difference in participation is astronomical there's enough research out now to know that inertia is such that if you automatically enroll people about 90% stay in, but if people have to ask to participate enrollment levels are down to about 20-25%. Since people don't save enough for their retirement we are very supportive of moving to an opt out system of course always a system in which people can opt out or can change the provisions and there will need to be a lot of information given to people about how to opt out. We're hoping that the Faculty Council will endorse this so that when it comes online from human resources that it will be clear that it has the support of the faculty.

MCROBBIE: Thank you. Any comments on either of those reports from anybody. There being no other comments we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08pm.