

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
December 4, 2007
Indiana Memorial Union State Room East
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jack Bielasiak, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Stephen Burns, James Capshew, John Carini, Angela Courtney, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Brian Horne, Kevin Hunt, Owen V. Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, David MacKay, Valerie Markley, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, John Paolillo, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Richard Shockley, Sarita Soni, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, David Waterman

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Erika Dowell (Diane Dallis), William P. Hetrick (Brian O'Donnell)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, James Biles, Andrea Ciccarelli, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, James Drummond, Pat Foster, Dennis Groth, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Matt Jarson, Csilla Kajtar, DeWitt Kilgore, Christina Kuzmych, Eric MacPhail, Mike Robinson, Paul Rohwer, Neil Theobald, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Randy Arnold (BFC Research Affairs Committee), James Boyd, Bonnie Brownlee (Journalism), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Dennis Cromwell (UITS), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Elizabeth A. Johnson (BFC Fringe Benefits Committee), Michael Hamburger (Sustainability Task Force), Robin Murphey (Faculty Council Office), Dan Rives (University Human Resources), Paul Sullivan (Sustainability Task Force), Sue Workman (UITS)

Agenda

1. Memorial Resolution for Ronald P. Carlson
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B15-2008.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Lisa Pratt)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/ReportfromtheAcademicCalendarTaskForceNovember2007.pdf>
4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(Provost Karen Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt)

5. UITS Response to BFC Questions on E-mail Migration. (5 minutes)

(Dennis Cromwell, Associate Vice President Enterprise Infrastructure and Sue Workman, Associate Vice President for User Support)

6. Relationship of IMA and Anthem [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)

(Dan Rives, Associate Vice President, University Human Resources)

7. Brief Recess (5 minutes)

8. Authorship Guidelines [SECOND READING] (20 minutes)

(Dr. Randy Arnold, Assistant Scientist Chemistry Department, co-Chair BFC Research Affairs Committee)

www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B13-2008_December_Final.pdf

9. Draft Resolution on Sustainability [FIRST READING] (20 minutes)

(Professor of Geological Sciences Michael Hamburger and Paul Sullivan, Deputy Vice President for Administration, co-Chairs Sustainability Task Force)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B16-2008.pdf>

<https://www.indiana.edu/~sustain/sustainabilityiu/report/>

10. Old Business

11. New Business

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

(Beginning of tape lost. Summary: Dean Sept was delayed in attending the meeting and was not initially present to read the memorial resolution so the Council proceeded to Agenda Item#2. President Pratt is explaining the stages for the passage of resolutions.)

PRATT: ...other cases of it, it appears that there is a lot of input into the document be it a policy or resolution item, then we'll have the second reading to make sure we've reached a consensus about the document and then we'll again wait and have the voting at a following meeting. So for today, I have six initial announcements of communications from committees with anticipation of actions coming to the BFC not in January because that, you know, we only have one BFC meeting in January and that will be the provost's state of the university address. So, here we go: We have a draft resolution from Kathleen Marrs and John Carini as co-chairs of the UFC Educational Policies Committees on transfer credit from two year institutions applied to baccalaureate degrees. This is a little bit unusual. We had a request from the Academic Leadership Council for the councils, the governance councils, to deal with this issue and so we've tried to put together a single document by the UFC co-Chairs we will then vote it in the BFC and in the UFC or in the IFC and then we'll take it to UFC. Have I got that right, John? So it's a little bit unusual path. Again, we expect to see that in February. We have a draft

recommendation from Roland Cote as chair of the task force on reviewing the academic calendar and I will leave it to Karen to talk to you about the recommendations from the task force and to decide if those recommendations in fact will trigger our asking one or more of our committees to perhaps respond to them by way of resolution. We have a draft report from the BFC Educational Policies Committee. I'm personally very excited to see this coming forward because it results from our request at the very first meeting for EPC to look at classroom usage and do an assessment of how much the classrooms are being used, how close we are to capacity, and what the impact would be of either a building program for new space or increased usage on Fridays, in particular. John tells me they are very close to having a draft. They hope to be here at the plenary session at the first meeting in February. And depending again on the reaction to that draft report, I suspect we will then have a resolution calling specifically for urgent action by faculty and the administration. We hope we'll be on top of that in February. Number four, we have a draft resolution just about ready to come to the plenary session on handling grievances by a board of review and that comes forward from Robert Terrill as chair of student academic appointees. And again, that will come as a resolution from the BFC for inclusion in the SAA handbook. Again, we expect to see that at the first meeting in February. Number five, we are anticipating an update from Laura Ginger as Chair of Nominations Committee on the review of all centers and institutes by the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. So we had a request to the Nom Com to participate with Sarita Soni's office in doing these reviews and we anticipate that we're going to need a lot of help from the BFC to staff all of those review committees. And I think when we have a little bit better picture of the order and magnitude of the request then Laura will tell us if we need some help by way of individuals volunteering with regard to particular institutes or centers where you have expertise. Number six, in the initial announcements is we are awaiting word from the Foundations Relations Committee on Sudan divestment. If you'll recall, they wished for additional time to work directly with the staff at the foundation on reviewing how a divestment resolution would impact them and how it might actually be used as a springboard for a more comprehensive educational effort. In a slightly parallel track that we're following on a number of previous policy issues passed by the BFC we find ourselves on many of these policies passed last year or that have been in progress for a year or more that we are now in the process of working on policy implementation by joint BFC-administration committees or working groups. We've been updating you about Family Leave Policy which went through this kind of action. We've been updating you about the Intellectual Property Policy which is in one of these collective committees and we think according to a communication this morning from John Applegate as liaison that they will reach a consensus IP policy ready for distribution to the independent readers by the end of this week. And that will then go to independent readers on all campuses who will come back to either the BFC or the IFC with specific recommendations for whether or not the implementable policy requires re-voting on individual items or if in fact it appears to be sufficiently in keeping with the intention of the voted policy that we don't feel that it needs to be re-voted. And finally, this is quite a new item and I'm very happy to be reporting on it. We apparently are quite close to a draft report from co-chairs Russ Hanson and Barb Bichelmeyer on the progress of the General Education Committee Task Force. I'm not sure what we actually call that group. We expect them to have information ready to bring back to us with some sort of a document in January which would then be coming to us as an action item. In February, what we're expecting at this point is a possibility that they will ask us to re-vote on the minimum grade requirement. So that's something that those of you who have been interested in Gen Ed might just have on your radar screen. John, we certainly

would expect to fly that by EPC as part of the process of bringing it as a resolution from an external joint committee through one of our BFC committees and then onto the floor. And I think that's it.

HANSON: Thanks Lisa. Any questions for Lisa right now?

AGENDA ITEM #1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR RONALD P. CARLSON

HANSON: I think we will return then to the memorial resolution for Ronald Carlson and I ask for Jeanne Sept to convey the resolution.

SEPT: To bellow from here? I apologize for being a little bit late. And once again, I'm going to read a few academic excerpts from the extended memorial resolution, and if you haven't, I encourage you to read the entire thing. Ronald P. Carlson, retired associate professor in the Department of Kinesiology, passed away at his residence in 2007 at the age of seventy. He retired from the department in 2001 after 33 years at Indiana University where he prepared generations of physical educators and coaches to continue his legacy of excellence in the classroom and commitment to mentoring the students. Ron's interest in physical education and coaching came quite naturally as a result of his success as "an ideal student athlete in high school and an NCAA All-American quarterback at the University of Wisconsin." Ron spent a number of years as a teacher and coach before doing his doctoral studies at IU. He first joined our faculty as a lecturer in 1968 in the then, Department of Physical Education for Men, and an assistant professor in 1971. He held a dual appointment in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation and the School of Education where he served as the coordinator of the physical education teacher education program and coordinator of field experiences and placement services for many years. He also served a variety of service roles at the national, regional, and state levels and particularly worked closely with school districts across the state to assist them and provide professional development presentations for the state's teachers. When not busy with department business, Ron was an avid golfer and runner. His early morning runs also served as an opportunity to find lost golf balls at the Eagle Pointe course. He collected over five hundred logo balls and was always on the lookout for more. His quick wit and smile were always available to all who play golf or all of us who stopped by his office whether it was for a chat or for student advising. Ron Carlson served his students in Indiana University with a dedication to excellence in teaching and service for many years. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues and students. Respectfully submitted by Keith Chapin, Donetta Cothran, Larry Fielding, and David Gallahue.

HANSON: I'd ask you to stand for a moment of silence. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: Okay, my first order of business is indeed the report that was mandated by the faculty council in last year's session April 3, 2007, when you passed a resolution asking me or someone very much like me to convene a group of administrators to consider whether there were certain possibilities for the calendar. You have it in front of you. We also have a web address so that everybody can see this. The report of the committee that was convened which also notes the

committee was Kathy Larson, Gene O'Brien, (Kathy from the College of Arts and Science, Gene O'Brien from the Jacobs School of Music), Gerry Pugh from Academic Affairs, Mike Beam from summer sessions and intensive freshman seminars, Jack Rhodes from enrollment management and orientation, Dick McKaig, Dean of Students, Tom Swaford space management, Pat Connor from the residential programs and services, and Roland Cote who chaired the committee. You asked as they note to explore an academic calendar that included symmetrical fall and spring semester calendars, Labor Day and Martin Luther King Day as holidays, fall and spring breaks of five weekdays each, a summer session that accommodated the academic units, and a free week prior, not the free week where students aren't assigned things, but a free week prior to the start of the fall semester to clean out the dorms, to engage in some of the necessary maintenance of the classrooms and various other features that go on in free week. The committee, as I from time to time sometimes nudged them to find out what was going on, and the committee neatly broke into people who believed this was possible and people who believed this was impossible. In the end, you'll see that there's a fine account of the various difficulties with each of the elements each of the desiderata that were listed in the resolution. And you'll see that the conclusion is that this is sort of impossible. (laughter) It's not utterly impossible, and there's a P.S. from Roland which I will share with you. It's a very clear report showing what the issues are with respect to each of the desired outcomes mentioned in the resolution. Starting the semester earlier is difficult because of various kinds of research projects that go on in the summer and schedules related to the academic missions of the various schools you'll find details under the larger report on each of the conflicting goals. But it has to do with performance schedules in some of the summer research programs in some of the other schools. There are problems with revenue shortfalls and which might be anticipated if summer sessions are adjusted in various ways. There are also pedagogical obstacles which were strongly articulated by the college in particular. There are issues about degree completion if summer sessions are, there are some units that say they will not be able to offer summer sessions in a reconfigured shortened calendar and that will have implications for students completing degrees in a timely fashion. There, we cannot eliminate the free week because of the need to repair and maintain classrooms. See the last point is that we can't lengthen the Gregorian calendar. You may have questions about the report. Roland did not expect to be called to this session, but he's happy to come and talk about the report, it would have to be at a later session, he had a conflict today. He notes that it had occurred to him at least that another proposal could have been included in the report that might have been received with more support. Everything else could be accommodated if the requirement of symmetry were removed. You could have a fall semester that's one full week shorter (69 days) than spring. And that would meet the requirements we have for instructional minutes, and everything else could be met. But that option wasn't really discussed, well it was discussed by the committee, but it wasn't something it reported on because it wasn't one of the things that was mandated in the resolution that came from the BFC. So this is an information item for you. You required that it be brought, that the report of the administrators be brought back to you before the end of this semester, so here it is. If you would like Roland to come in and discuss it as the chair of the committee he'd be happy to, and if you would just like to take their considerations forward to your own Calendar Committee that would be fine too. Along with that addendum that there is some way of accomplishing everything else that was asked for in the resolution if you would give up the requirement of symmetry. Any questions about that?

TERRY: I think at the April meeting last year what became apparent was that no constituent group would be happy with all changes, and the recommendation was that the provost present his or her recommendations on the summer session principle at this meeting. So I'm wondering, what we recognized was that this thing was a very complex mess, and the only way for change would be the provost to grab a hold of it and say, 'These are the changes that seem good to me and these are others.' Otherwise we get this kind of a report where each administrative group comes in defending their turf and concludes that change is impossible. I'm wondering when we can expect your recommendations.

HANSON: I would actually like to hear from you folks about whether or not you think any, I think that without a full cost accounting of what would happen in summer sessions I'm not prepared to recommend a change in the summer session calendar. I don't know how strongly people feel about the symmetry issue. I guess I'd like to hear from the council about whether or not...

HORNE: I've got two questions, please. First of all, when it says establish a fall break of five weekdays to correspond to the five day spring break, does that, is that including the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday Thanksgiving week? So it would actually just be adding two days...

HANSON: Two more days, yeah.

HORNE: ...somewhere but not necessarily those two days.

HANSON: Right.

HORNE: Secondly, if I may, I am certainly not offering a recommendation of any sort but when you say that everything, you summarized, and forgive me, I haven't had a chance to just kind of read through the whole thing. But when you say that symmetry that would be the one thing that couldn't be reached, you mean, it couldn't be reached making the fall match the spring, but it could be reached by matching the spring to what the fall currently is, could it not?

HANSON: By shortening it further? Yes, it could.

HORNE: I mean, I'm not offering that as a recommendation, but to say symmetry can't be achieved isn't quite accurate. It can't be achieved by bumping up the fall, if I understood you correctly. It could be achieved by pulling back the spring a bit.

HANSON: That's true. It seems to me given what I've seen of the report. It would put us at a very low number of instructional minutes for the entire academic year though in a way that might make us stand out compared to other institutions in the state. I guess you have a table there on page 4 of the report. Particularly if you want to look at Purdue as we always do. I'm not sure actually, this is something else we'd have to think about whether the, you know, mandated hours, I mean mandated instructional minutes, if it were shortened to 69 instructional days in both I'm not sure where we'd end up. This is actually something as I say, they did not consider. We'd be one day short of compliance with the calendar length requirement, sorry they did. Look at the

top of page 4. So we could get symmetry that way, but we'd be short on compliance. Yeah, Kevin?

HUNT: Three of the Big Ten institutions of the nine that have semesters, so a third of them, have symmetrical calendars. I haven't been able to read the whole thing, but from talking to Roland do you know what is different at those institutions that allows that that won't allow us to do it?

HANSON: No, it's probably the configuration of summer sessions. John?

CARINI: Purdue uses this highly rational approach. Because symmetry, I hate that.

HUNT: Me too.

CARINI: And Illinois actually starts midweek in the fall in order to get their 72 days in.

HANSON: We've done that in the past though, haven't we?

CARINI: Like, the week before we do, just a couple of days.

HUNT: I'm told that there was a time when, I think Ken talked about this a couple of years ago, when the whole week of Thanksgiving was given as a break and local businesses complained that it hurt their profits and one thing led to another and it only lasted a year if I remember right.

HANSON: Bob?

ENO: I just want to add, there was more to it than that. (laughter) It is the problem to say that we would share that problem if we shortened the fall term in any way because it was the dissatisfaction on the part of the legislature that we were giving ourselves days off was the way it was perceived without providing a compensatory value in terms of services provided.

CARINI: But that's also we went from 45 minutes periods to 50 to make up for the shorter semester and we never went back.

HANSON: Any further discussion of this? I mean as I say Roland has an addendum on it of having a fairly substantial lack of symmetry as one possibility where you could otherwise meet these other considerations. And I think absent a detailed study of the revenue and time to degree effects of changing the summer session schedule. I wouldn't be prepared to recommend that.

PRATT: Well I think we'll certainly take this back to the Agenda Com and have a discussion there and see if we want to have one of the committees take another look at this or make a decision about how to move forward. I don't, unless somebody advocates very strongly to bring Roland in, I think some internal discussion before we bring this back is appropriate.

HANSON: Ok, any other questions or comments on this or other matters? Bob?

ENO: Just to clarify where we stand. We voted last year that this coming year Labor Day would be a holiday. And that there would be the option provided for instructors to reschedule courses on a Saturday that the substitution formula that was primarily directed at science lab issues. I haven't looked at this in advance. It looks to me as if Labor Day is not counted, Labor Day as a day off is not counted in this formula this table that's 72 days schedule in the fall that takes Wednesday, Thursday, Friday of Thanksgiving off of the two weeks but not for Labor Day. So next year we will actually have 71 days with one optional day in position. Is that—I just want to make sure of where we now stand.

HANSON: This is an '05-06 calendar.

ENO: Yeah, correct. So what I can't recall and I guess my question is what did we decide to do after next year? Did we decide to do anything about Labor Day after next year? Was it a permanent change or a one year change?

HUNT: I remember that it was a one year change and I think that the intention was that this committee would solve this problem so we wouldn't have to face it again.

ENO: So one way or another we're going to have to solve this and by this end of this year in order to __ for the next what we do with Labor Day after this.

HANSON: Alex?

TANFORD: There also was last year as I recall a contingent proposal to simply to make Labor Day a permanent holiday to be brought in the event that no greater change in the calendar was possible. I don't remember the status of where that sits tabled somewhere, but...

PRATT: Again, I think I'll take this back to the Agenda Com and we'll draw on some of the historical figures in this like you Bob and try to figure out (laughter)... and try to figure out how we want to push this because I think at this point the information is clear, and we'll then see if we can work with Karen to come up with the appropriate solution.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

HANSON: We are running just a little bit behind schedule but if you have any questions? No questions came in antecedently, are there other questions or comments people want to raise on other topics? Otherwise I think we should move along, don't you?

PRATT: Yes.

AGENDA ITEM #5: UITS RESPONSE TO BFC QUESTIONS ON E-MAIL MIGRATION

PRATT: Yes, I think we should ask Dennis and Sue to come up front where we can get them next to a microphone.

HANSON: Okay, Dennis Cromwell, Associate Vice President for Enterprise and Infrastructure and Sue Workman, Associate Vice President for User Support, to answer questions on email migration.

PRATT: Would the two of you like to just open with a sort of comment about what's happened in the past two weeks and sort of your views on the magnitude of the problem and then respond to questions?

CROMWELL: Yes, that's exactly our plan, thank you.

WORKMAN: Thank you.

CROMWELL: Thank you Provost Hanson and the faculty council members. We'll take, I'm Dennis Cromwell, I am the Associate Vice President for Enterprise and Infrastructure and the infrastructure for email falls in my portfolio for the Office of the Vice President. I thought I'd spend about a minute and just talk about what the project entailed and then Sue is going to talk a little bit about the problems that came in the migration and things and items since then. This project was planned in the spring, kicked off in the summer, most of the infrastructure work done through August and September and the mailbox migrations occurring in October. When I say mailbox migrations, we have nine servers that run the Exchange infrastructure environment. So the 37,000 accounts are randomly spread across the nine servers. The technical requirement of the project was really to move one server at a time, complete that process and all of those accounts and then move to the next server. The process was planned to do in October. It took a little bit longer to complete that process. It was really wrapped up primarily through the mid of November although new accounts actually were still being allocated in the old environment up until last weekend and then those were effectively moved. So in that process we did successfully migrate from the Exchange 2003 environment, which was where the servers were running before to the 2007 environment, all of 37,000 mailboxes and there is a structure difference between those technologies which means actually the email files had to be read, translated and moved into the new servers. And that was one of the technology aspects of running through those pieces as well as some other infrastructure items that were identified with that. I think I'll in the essence of time turn over to Sue to really talk about issues that came up in her area.

WORKMAN: I'm Sue Workman. I'm Associate Vice President of Support and one of the things we like to do is kind of look at the total picture and reassess you know where it is that we are during September 30th to the 10th of November which is the time of this migration which is forty-two days our support center had 17,000 contacts to it. Of those 17,000 about 1,000 were about Exchange itself. So we keep statistics and look back a year ago usually it's a very close pattern to a year ago in the academic year during that same period of time we had 415 contacts. So we think that the migration probably created another 600 or so contacts to us. Of that, only twenty-seven were actually escalated to our second tier support which is also in my division so we had just 27 problems that people could not solve in the very front line that we had to do extra work on. In that same period of time we had 443 total email, which is not just Exchange, but email in general, second-tier support escalation. So you can kind of get an idea of 27 out of 443 during that time period for Exchange. There were three main issues that accounted for 178 of the contacts. We had a VPN issue on one of the mailboxes that kept any kind of connections from

happening to that mailbox. That created about 60 contacts before it was found and fixed. We had an issue that's been escalated to Microsoft. This is for Outlook Web Access returned a handling too many requests for Mailbox '03. This is still an open issue with Microsoft, and they're still trying to figure out what that is. And then we had several contacts where people had actually bookmarked an Exchange URL that no longer would work. We did have about 6 other issues that have impacted us, one was another Microsoft problem that was escalated to them. They did apply a patch, and it was applied on November 15th but it did cause 3 known, I guess, very severe...

(end of tape side A – comments lost)

...we had a few issues that often made the problem look like it was an Exchange problem, we had some network issues, we had some firewall issues, we had some active directory server issues during that time and it could mask itself as an Exchange problem, but these were the exact Exchange problems. So that's pretty much where we stand at this point. I think most issues that are, the actual migration is complete and most issues are addressed.

PRATT: Questions and comments for Dennis and Sue?

CARINI: Does mail through the Oncourse accounts go through the Exchange servers?

WORKMAN: No.

TERRY: Do you update on complaints or problems that may have been addressed at a school level, groups like CITO rather than to you?

WORKMAN: I don't have that data. At least I don't have that gathered at this point, no. I do know that there were problems that were addressed at the department or school level as well, but typically if it does in fact require action on the part of our administrators or anybody in UITS it will come to our second-tier support and would be counted in one of those 27.

HUNT: Why is it that it's just slower? It's longer to open a message, longer when you, you know, save new messages. It takes longer, grinds away a little bit before it opens up. Everything is slower.

CROMWELL: I can't answer that question. I haven't really experienced that myself, but I can certainly take that back as an item, and I'm in Exchange almost every day.

HUNT: Has anybody else had or noticed...?

TANFORD: Mine, yeah. Mine's the same, it is definitely slow, and this is a brand new computer.

BIELASIAK: I guess I have a question about this handling of the support staff, of providing them with information about dealing with clients. I was one of the people who had VPN problems and had several contacts with support staff, and every time I got a different, you know,

response in terms of what to do about it. And it seemed to me finally I reached somebody who actually knew what seemed to be the problem, but it seemed to me a kind of random thing. I just happened to queue into somebody who actually knew something about this issue. So my question is: Once such a problem is encountered, I guess, how do you provide information to your support staff on what that problem is so everybody is in tune and it seemed to me that it wasn't in place at that time.

WORKMAN: Yeah, we have a really well honed, I think, way to provide information to our staff and it's certainly not by word of mouth or email. We don't want to use email for that kind of delivery. But what we have, you may be familiar with, is the IU Knowledge Base and we have an internal section of that Knowledge Base that we communicate these things so that right away they do have information. Now Jack, I can go back and look at your contacts and see if there was anything that actually did not occur that should have during that time, but often it may have been you just happened on the person, but most likely it was that we figured out what it was during that period of time and then were really able to nail it down versus something that was masking it. Because it did take for the VPN issue, it did take us...

CROMWELL: Six days.

WORKMAN: Was it six days...?

CROMWELL: Yeah, six days. It was a real subtle, it was a real subtle issue that took a while to diagnose.

WORKMAN: ...to figure that out.

CROMWELL: It was one of those things that was simple to fix, very hard to find. Let me ask the question for the folks that talked about things being deathly slow. Have you noticed differences since Thanksgiving or is it still in this situation?

TANFORD: I want to clarify mine. You can use it either, from my office I'm directly into it, when I'm at home I'm going to the web based version. The web based version, I can go get a cup of coffee and come back before it has done something like reply, will bring up a reply. My office version occasionally seems to be slowed down by heavy traffic, but I haven't noticed much difference. But it's particularly on the web version online that it's very slow.

CROMWELL: Okay.

HUNT: I get on the web version from my office and I have a Macintosh and Entourage doesn't really work, so that's how I do it.

CROMWELL: Okay.

HUNT: And another issue I've had, let me say this in fifteen seconds, is I can only look at the day that I'm on in my calendar, I can't look at the whole week at one time.

BURNS: I guess I just have a comment that I'd use caution in interpreting the extent of a problem based on the statistics, because some of us are just used to maintaining our own system and so I spent about four hours recovering because I was switched when I was out of town and there were __ issues and it's not really something for action item it's just, don't always assume just because you've got logs you understand the full impact of the issue.

WORKMAN: We don't, and we do understand that an impact to one person is an impact. It's not just, you know, a small count. It's just one indicator, I guess, of what we have that we can deal with. Sarita?

SONI: The question that I heard quite a bit about was why were we just given such short notice? Could we not have been told at least a week or two, three days ahead of time? Is there a reason for that Dennis?

CROMWELL: Well I, actually you know, I think that individual notifications to users were short, but the communications themselves on the project started in early fall through a number of channels; local support providers being one of the primary channels as well as the general pieces. But an amount of that has to do with the scheduled week that that server was scheduled to run, how well we were doing with the previous service. As I mentioned we had to do those servers in sequence and couldn't get to one before the other one was complete so that was one of the cases. We also know that the impact is really different depending on where your client is coming from. Outlook 2007 on Windows devices probably saw nothing. In fact, I couldn't even tell you the day my account moved, because that's my primary interface even at home. As you move to other areas, obviously one of the big impacts is the Outlook Web Access environment is significantly different than it was in the other system and that's very much a user interface issue.

WORKMAN: Right, and just to add to that too, as those mailboxes move what we try to do or what the messaging team did here is they did it during a timeframe not necessarily until they got done that night. So you don't always know. You could estimate how far along they're going to be and that's what they did to get the 24 hour, but it really had, it took a...

SONI: Well the concern was that you got the message at six o'clock and you've got your office computer on and then you have to rush back and turn it off or do something.

HANSON: Please, we are trying to keep on schedule. Maybe one more question?

TERRY: Could you describe when you plan something like this, how do you pre-test for it, how do you determine what the impact is going to be out there in the actual university environment, and how you predict the cost of these kinds of upgrades below your level, what's it going to cost the schools to do something, how much time are they likely to have to devote to it, and going one step further how much time faculty, staff and students are going to have to spend?

WORKMAN: What was it? I'm sorry, what was the very first question? How do we...did you say pre-test?

TERRY: How do you determine? Yeah.

WORKMAN: What it's going to be?

CROMWELL: Yeah, I mean there's a lot of items in there. In terms of pre-testing generally and exactly what the Exchange environment did, we went through pilot migrations and so they're a set of primarily technology related staff that are given, that are migrated, and that was done in September. Really they were using the system a month and moved a month in advance, and probably in some of those cases moved multiple times just to validate that the process works. In terms of looking at that, the overall project and impact in schools and other areas part of that depends on the project. You know the driver for doing an Exchange 2007 upgrade has much to do with the fact that at some point in time we need to move in that direction anyway. Some of it has to be, we needed to move to the support for 64 bit so we can increase mailbox quotas. They went up to 500 megabytes. So part of that was what are the benefits of going through there. Cost is really a matter of interacting with the LSP staff for a project like this which is generally considered an at-some-point-in-time-we-have-to-move-anyway project.

HANSON: Is this on the same topic or...?

BINGHAM: Yeah, I just wanted to thank these folks because I've visited another university that was supposed to be great last semester, and we have such great support in terms of our email and IT and everything else and 400 additional contacts during a migration of this magnitude, and I know a lot of the things I thought about calling I realized ultimately were my own stupidity because I wasn't looking closely enough at the new interface. So I just think overall, I recognize some people had some really significant problems, but if you look at the big picture, I mean I think this went pretty smoothly.

HANSON: This is a very good note on which to... (laughter)

CROMWELL: I guess I will thank you very much for that and thanks for letting us come here. And you know please feel free to follow up with any of us on this.

PRATT: Thank you so much.

HANSON: Thanks a lot.

AGENDA ITEM #6: RELATIONSHIP OF IMA AND ANTHEM

HANSON: Next agenda item, we'll ask Dan Rives the Associate Vice President for University Human Resources to talk with us and I guess answer questions on the relationship of IMA and Anthem.

PRATT: Would you like to open with just a few minutes because we'd like to use most of the time to...

RIVES: For discussion. I like that.

PRATT: ...to have you respond.

RIVES: May I provide a handout of an update?

PRATT: Why don't you let one of us do the handout so you can...? We'll do this for you.

RIVES: We sent out an email just a couple of hours ago. My name is Dan Rives, I'm the Associate Vice President of Administration over at Human Resources which includes the benefit plans and specifically health care. And I noticed it says twenty minutes I don't know if I should feel privileged about that or, it's the five minutes recess following that I was concerned about, but I'm glad to be here and look forward to the discussion. I believe the discussion is focused on the relationship of IMA, that is, the Internal Medicine Associates, which is a company in town of physicians about 60% of the physicians in town primary care, internal and specialty care, and their relationship, or more importantly their contract, with the preferred provider organization that we use for our health care plans and that being Anthem and WellPoint. This is, I mean I'd like to tell you that it's all settled and that there's a new contract. I cannot tell you that. I can give you an update though in a second of something that will be somewhat pleasant. All of our health care plans use preferred provider agreements. We want a third party to do the credentialing, look for malpractice. We never want to pay full bill charges, no one ever pays bill charges. You want to pay some discounted amounts. We want preferential treatment in terms of referrals to other preferred providers. We want claims processing and no balance billing of our membership and there's a variety of other contractual provisions that go along with these PPO arrangements. These facilities and providers, physicians contract with the Anthems and the Cignas and all the various national companies typically with an evergreen contract and when they want to renegotiate their contract they have to give notice and say 'I'm withdrawing' or 'I'm ceasing.' In the state of Indiana there's a requirement that says you have to do that within a certain time period. Most times that's 90 days, many times that's 120 days, and so what IMA has done is said to Anthem 'I am ceasing membership in your contract and I wish to re-open the negotiations.' And if you'll allow me to just make reference to the handout, and again we just sent this out a couple hours ago, not because of this meeting, because we had some new information. I wanted to head this off, head the discussion, but no, there's a new termination date that has recently become known to us, and actually Anthem and IMA have been talking about that termination date for about ten days just agreeing on what date it should be. And this morning they reached agreement and so I'll get there in a second, but this is an email, we sent this out to all faculty and staff who reside in Bloomington who are part of these health care plans. And a little recap, Anthem has indicated they wish to renegotiate the contract and IMA did that, and IMA asked for a 23% increase in their payments, Anthem said that's not reasonable. Anthem has said 'You already get as much or more than your peers in Ohio and Kentucky, and by the way you get the same reimbursement rate across all of Indiana.' So the physicians are not on an individually negotiated schedule. The physicians basically get a standard reimbursement rate across the entire state, there are a couple of exceptions to it. Anthem said to IMA, 'We will improve your payment based on some quality measures,' and it's the same program they've offered to most physicians across the state. I believe IMA's response to that was 'We would like that, but we also would like the 23% increase,' and let's be real clear though, Anthem isn't paying the bill. Indiana University and IU is paying the bill. We are 100% self funded and what does that mean? I don't buy insurance from Anthem, we pay Anthem a fixed amount per

employee per month to access their contract. We pay Anthem a fixed dollar amount per employee per month to adjudicate claims. We don't buy insurance anymore, not even stop-loss if you're familiar with those terms, we're too big for that, and we keep our own reserves. We don't count on Anthem for any of that, so every week we are up to \$127 million dollars of costs for health care, that's just IU cost, employees pay part of it and we collect it through payroll deduction. So something like \$137 million is what we pay this pipeline and so when Anthem writes a check to IMA or Bloomington Hospital or IU Med Center we are reimbursing them before the check clears. My office has wire transfers that are going on, several million dollars per week to Anthem to reimburse for the claims actually paid. So IMA's actually asking us and the county government and the school system, we're all self funded, for an increase in reimbursement, and just to put it all out there; what's changed, what's announced in the newspapers was that the contract would cease on December the 28th that's no longer the case. It now is January the 25th and what is that all about? Well if you look at the agreements there's actually a 120 day notice not a 90 notice and as a result of that review of the agreements Anthem went back to Anthem and said 'Wait a minute, it's okay for you to say that you're going to cease participation but it has to be in January not December.' So the contract now has been extended to January the 25th of 2008 and that's the background. That's where we are today. I would say that this is very typical. Bloomington Hospital was in this process last year. The year before that it was either the radiology or the anesthesiologists, the year before that was the other group. Our own Med Center goes through the same process in negotiating with Anthem. St. Vincent health care system, one of four large systems, last year negotiated and reached their agreement like December the 30th and thereabouts, and so it's a typical process. We would like IMA to stay in the Anthem network. We need IMA to stay in the Anthem network. I do not need, and we do not need, a 23% increase in reimbursements. So, you know, and if Anthem were to give IMA an increase reimbursement that would just surely apply across the entire state. You can see the dilemma, the two opposing arguments, if you will.

HANSON: Questions?

BINGHAM: Well one question I've had for a while is just based on anecdote and perception, we seem to have a shortage of primary care physicians in Bloomington, and as long as there aren't enough of them to go around and they can all close their practices and say they're not taking any new patients then from a negotiating standpoint they have more bargaining power than we do. And so if the university is self funded, I guess my question is what are we doing to improve the environment for primary care in Bloomington?

RIVES: Well you're very accurate. In Bloomington, Indiana today we've had primary physicians retire, a few switched to only self pay and not taking any insurance or even Medicare, and there is today for new faculty coming into Bloomington and new staff, for that matter, it's terribly difficult for those families to find accessible primary care and not have to wait months and months for a visit. Pediatrics are a little different, there's Southern Indiana Ped's, they seem to be much, they're very well organized or accessible. It's, irregardless of this contract issue, that's an issue. We have talked about how we could engage our own Med Center and have internal medicine from our Med Center, have physicians in town, we've talked about even establishing our own ambulatory care center that would be staffed with physicians from Indianapolis. As you know there's lots of priorities right now for the university especially in the

research arena for building projects so that ambulatory care center's on hold at the moment. I think that is one solution we have to look for no matter what else transpires, but other than that I don't have good answers. I think your comments are excellent.

MASON: In the second to last paragraph of the email you sent out you say "The university remains hopeful that IMA will rejoin Anthem's preferred provider networks." How hopeful? (laughter) I'm not being facetious, but is there any break to this log jam, in other words is IMA going to back down? I mean from what we just heard they may have no incentive to do so...

RIVES: Well, you know we've met, I meet, weekly with both parties trying to understand where they are and what they're doing and we have brought them on campus to say you need to work in good faith, we expect an outcome. But we can't say to Anthem, 'Pay IMA more,' and what are we going to say to IMA? IMA is a friend of the university. Most of them graduated from the IU med school, they contribute to medical education in Bloomington in a collaborative way with IU. So they are good partners. They have a business need and they're looking for more revenue, and I don't know the needs or reasons, but they are. Well we're very hopeful, the Anthem business in Bloomington for IMA is about 30% of their business and so I think it would be difficult, I think it would be easy to, on a subjective level, to say if they lost 30% of their business or even 10% of their business that would be a strain on their financials and so they're hopeful too that Anthem will, something will, the log jam will get broken here. We're very, very hopeful. That doesn't make it happen, but Anthem has given IMA some quantitative figures if they will participate in the quality improvements and this is looking at immunization rates, outcomes for diabetes, cv and so forth. And I'm a lay person at this so there's more, there's better, there's individuals who are more suited to describing all these various outcome measures but there are nationally recognized outcome measures trying to help IMA understand what would be the improvement in their revenue coming in. That's happening between IMA and Anthem and we are, it's interesting, I actually feel awkward about it because we're the ones buying access to Anthem's network. Anthem's negotiating with Bloomington Hospital and the physicians, but in those contracts are provisions that don't allow Anthem to give the contract to me or the school system or the county government, we're all self funded, or the state of Indiana. And so as a principle purchaser of access to contracts, I don't get access to the contracts literally, and I feel like disadvantaged by that.

HANSON: Alex?

TANFORD: I have two things. One is a pragmatic question and the other, actually I suppose they're both pragmatic questions. One is for the reason you've been pointing out, none of us can on short term change doctors. So if negotiations are still ongoing on January 25th and I get sick on January 26th the first question is; I have an employment contract with the university that says I have health insurance, do you have a contingency plan for making sure that those of us who need medical care, in what might be a short term period between one system and the resumption of another, how do we get reimbursed? And the second question is; since this seems to happen year after year with Anthem why don't we use a different provider?

RIVES: Well the answer to the second question first: it doesn't matter if it's Anthem or Cigna or Aetna they all do the same process. This is not an Anthem provider issue.

TANFORD: The last few years in Bloomington it has only been, at least from what you read in the paper, it has only been the dispute, Anthem is the one that has precipitated these fights with local providers where the other providers cave in or negotiate settlements more readily so...

RIVES: The other provider networks may pay more to the providers, or we would pay more to the providers and so Anthem is the largest network and provides Indiana University, the state of Indiana, Ivy Tech, the school system, I'm just trying to give you the population, the ability to not pay as much for health care. We think of it as being more efficient. And in answer to the first question, the health care plans still exist. The health care plans then, if IMA is out of network, then the health care plan has provisions.

TANFORD: I'm not talking about the health care plan. I'm talking about the university, what the university is going to do to make up the difference between what we would normally pay in our co-pay if it were in network and what we would have to pay if all of a sudden they become out of network because our agent, Anthem, didn't reach a settlement. I mean is your only answer that we pay more and the university has no other plan?

RIVES: You know for me to say that we'll make up the difference or do something otherwise sort of falls into what Anthem, what IMA really wants us to do.

TANFORD: I didn't ask specifically.

RIVES: I know.

TANFORD: Are you working on a contingency plan?

RIVES: Not as you're describing it. Our hope is that IMA and Anthem will reach an agreement. As we've experienced in the past, sometimes the agreement even won't be reached until after the resignation, the termination date of the contract and then things are retroactive to the date that they originally ceased, if that makes sense. That's what has with anesthesiology and radiology. I think Bloomington Hospital settled before the date. That's not to say that we would not do something, but you asked me a very specific question; do I have a plan at this moment that I could tell you and articulate. I do not.

HUNT: Just to give us some perspective in years past when IMA and Anthem or whoever our negotiator has reached an impasse; how much has IMA asked, for what percentage of increase and what ultimately was the increase that was provided? Do you remember that?

RIVES: Right, good question. I don't. You know the last contract I believe with IMA was done three years ago, and many of these contracts are negotiated on multi-year basis. Thank goodness! Because we certainly wouldn't want this any more frequent than it actually occurs. And the contracts may actually have inflationary clauses in them, again I'm not provided, nor are any of the employers actually provided the agreements. Most times it's the providers who insist, but not always that we're not given the specific reimbursement rates. Part of that is because if Anthem, I mean this is a state wide schedule, so you know part of the rationale with hospitals is

if they give us, if they give out the reimbursement rate, every hospital that was given less would automatically want what the other hospital was getting. But I do not know the actual increase from three years ago.

HUNT: But it doesn't seem like they asked for 20% and got 10% it seems like it must have been less than that.

RIVES: You know I'm more familiar with the Bloomington Hospital arrangements since that's more recent and Bloomington Hospital was requesting something in the neighborhood of 25-20%, but they got something about a third of that.

HANSON: We need to stay on schedule here, maybe one more question, John?

CARINI: Alright, so but there's really a triple whammy here. So first of all, assuming they don't come to an agreement you're paying out of network prices. Then, you know, Anthem will only give you credit on your deductible for usual and customary charges which you know you pay the bulk of that anyway and the third thing is, is it not true there are now two deductibles, two separate deductibles, one for in network and one for out of network, which is new I believe?

RIVES: Right, right.

CARINI: So our costs are likely to double...(tape ends – comments lost)

RIVES: ...the way that IMA would get reimbursed they'll still get only reimbursed at what the current reimbursement schedule is, and so IMA did not get any additional monies unfortunately the hardship falls to the membership population and that there is now an additional co-pay or out of pocket expense just as you were describing. When we put in the extra second deductible, so they in the past, let me back up, in the past there was only one deductible so you could go to an out of network provider and an out of network provider could be very, very expensive and that would accumulate toward the single deductible, the single \$900 deductible, and this year we instituted a separate deductible, a separate budget if you will if you go outside the network. Well that was done way before IMA ceased their participation so one plan would be to remove that for the year coming up and modify that if there's no agreement, but hopefully IMA and Anthem, I know I'm being redundant and I apologize, but we would not want our employees to incur additional expenses.

HANSON: Okay, I think we've got to stay on track because we have guests coming for the other...

PRATT: I think that we'll be, however, asking the Fringe Benefits Committee to watch this very closely and if need be we'll hold an extra meeting, I mean if need be we'll hold a meeting later in January in which this could be discussed again if it looks like this is urgent business so just, Elizabeth I see you back there if you can...

HANSON: And Richard's here too.

PRATT: And Richard's here too. Great, you guys can just keep a close eye on this.

WATERMAN: I just want to, I'm unclear about what the BFC would do. I mean we're renegotiating with IMA on something and you're raising a broader issue here which is the incentive system seems misaligned in terms of the university's interest and Anthem's interest and where the consequences of a breakdown in negotiation fall. And so a broader question is whether there should be some other kind of relationship between the university and the health care providers and the insurance, because I just had the impression from the discussion that you come here and basically say, 'We're warning you that you're going to be paying more money soon if we don't reach a deal,' but it's unclear how it goes beyond that.

PRATT: I think we're going to get, let's defer this to committee and ask the committee to keep us apprised and maybe we're at a position where we have to have a call for some different kind of action. Thanks Dan.

HANSON: Let's take a very, very short break and then get right back on those last two items.

AGENDA ITEM #7: BRIEF RECESS

HANSON: Let's get started again. This is the second reading of the Authorship Guidelines and Randy Arnold is here again to discuss them with Robert.

AGENDA ITEM #8: AUTHORSHIP GUIDELINES

ARNOLD: Yeah, Robert volunteered to come up here with me. So we're here today for a second reading and those of you who were here last time may remember that the reason we're here discussing authorship at all is that last spring due to some changes in federal guidelines on the definition of research misconduct. And so these federal definitions now do not include the issue of authorship so therefore the policy that was passed for Indiana University regarding research misconduct also does not include a statement or any verbiage at all about the principles of authorship. But at the time that that policy was drafted and approved it was suggested strongly into the Research Affairs Committee especially that we look at the issue of authorship and devise a statement that could be approved through the faculty and accepted through the university. So I don't want to spend too much time just in the introduction, one thing I do want to point out is that compared to the last draft that came before this committee I believe there was a bullet point that brought some questions and it was the second one in the list, but it's now deleted. That said, "Acquisition of funding, collection of data or general supervision of the research group alone may not justify authorship unless the team agrees," and after looking at that again we felt that really didn't add any value to the overall statement so we just deleted that bullet point. I think now when you read through it, it's a little more fluid and there's not the conflict that there was before. In addition, we went through a little bit more detail about how a dispute would be mediated and so we changed slightly from what was written before and basically still expect that it would go through several levels and hopefully be resolved as early as possible, hopefully at the level of the discipline, either at the chair level or maybe a center director level, and at that level it would really be a mediation where basically it's the hope that in resolving a miscommunication you can actually resolve the dispute over authorship. From that

level if no agreement is reached it would go to the deans of the appropriate schools if there's more than one and then from there it would go to the Vice Provost for Research or the Vice Chancellor if it's accepted in Indianapolis. And from there the Vice Provost would have the option to again mediate between the disputing parties or if necessary call a committee of peers to help resolve the dispute. So that's sort of where this stands at this point.

HANSON: Any discussion? Bob?

ENO: I'll just take a minute. I'm very pleased you added a paragraph on the arbitration mechanism. That brings us much closer to policy status and that would be useful in the case if something doesn't work.

HANSON: Sarita?

SONI: There was a question posed as it could find out whether there were any regulatory need for this particular guideline or policy. There is no federal regulatory need for such a policy. I just want to clarify that.

ARNOLD: That's correct, yeah.

BINGHAM: Yeah, I recognize there's no federal regulatory need, but the National Institute's of Health ombudsman has been developing similar sorts of guidelines and essentially a workshop on how to help scientists cooperate because of the dramatic growth in co-authored work. And I'm just wondering if part of this, whether we could recommend some sort of a training opportunity or workshop opportunity to counsel particularly senior faculty who might have been acculturated in a different environment on implementation.

HANSON: James, yes?

CAPSHAW: I got a question about the committee and things. I'm wondering, my understanding is that the Research Misconduct Committee has ad hoc committees to investigate is that right? And I'm wondering if it's a similar kind of a proposal that you are putting forward? I'm just wondering.

ARNOLD: Yes, that's correct. There is such a requirement in the research misconduct policy and I don't know how parallel this is to that or how similar the make up of those two committees would be but this was just drafted as something as something that seemed equitable and reasonable for...

CAPSHAW: I'm thinking in terms of efficiency to maybe use that process in an analogous way to authorship rather than sort of create a new, you know, procedure.

SONI: May I suggest we have a misconduct committee and a new one?

CAPSHAW: I'm just wondering...

ARNOLD: Yeah, I think the research misconduct required two different levels and I'm forgetting how they were described but it would actually be an inquiry committee and then if it was found that there was research misconduct then it was a separate committee that actually evaluated the misconduct and so it's a much more involved process and this seemed like it wouldn't require such an involved process.

SONI: There's a standing misconduct committee...

ARNOLD: Right.

SONI: ...that actually takes, after the inquiry, after it goes to the Research Misconduct Committee, and I would suggest that we stay away from that procedure, because that seems like a pretty harsh way to go.

EVANS: I wanted to raise the concern that I raised last time about this for those collaborations that already have authorship criteria that are spelled out in order to have -- I think that it would be very useful to put in some wording in this that precludes the possibility that of this providing a back door for people that disagree with those policies. So in my cursory reading of this it appears that if a person disagrees with the policy of a large collaboration on authorship they could take that all the way up to the provost of the university who would then in effect tell an international collaboration how they should run their experiment.

ARNOLD: Well yeah, and I'm not sure if the very last statement addresses that issue fully or not. It tries to.

EVANS: Which is the..?

ARNOLD: So the very last paragraph on the back of the page says "this statement shall not supersede any contract or negotiated agreement."

EVANS: Okay, I understand now, sorry. Thank you.

PRATT: You may notice there are quite a number of substantial changes between this document and the first reading. There has been an enormous amount of email traffic and other communication on this. It really is considerably evolved.

HANSON: Any additional questions or discussion?

TERRY: I'd like to ask again what I asked the last time. What happens if there is an international let's say, or just a multi-institutional research project and there isn't a pre-agreement? They get into a dispute and the standards or procedures at university X are different than ours. What does this say about that, if anything?

ARNOLD: Yeah I guess, yeah, by omission I think maybe that then gets handled by the senior administration of all the institutions that are involved. So I don't think that this would be intended to address an authorship dispute that would involve multiple institutions.

TERRY: Maybe we should say that that's all we're establishing; guidelines on authorship when disputes arise among Indiana University affiliated authors or something like that and leave the other issue for the future or something?

HANSON: Bob?

ENO: I think it's useful to have this document as framed as it is with these types of occurrences in the event administrators can point to explicitly what our internal criteria policies are.

TERRY: Yeah, I agree.

ENO: Without a document like this there's documentary basis for administrators to do that and so I think that this is crafted appropriately for just the type of situations that you're thinking of where we don't have the authority to exercise ____

HANSON: Herb, were you wanting to get a motion?

TERRY: No.

SCOTT: I have a couple minor questions. One, I notice at the end it says, "While not required, schools and departments are highly encouraged to adopt" these policies that you seem to sort of think that the school or department, I guess, should it be stated in here what the intent is or what is the intent about this guideline superseding or those policies having to comply with this or would the department itself have the authority to say how things should be if they think it should be a little different from... Basically where does that final authority ride if they're going to come up with their own policies in the department?

HATTEN: Well the document's flexible enough to say that the accepted norms for what counts as authorship, not the policies for disputing. This handles the policy for disputes and what we are asking them to do is to come up with what the norms are in their area so that their faculty know, because it's different from discipline to discipline.

HANSON: Additional questions or did you want to respond?

SCOTT: Well I guess there's just another one. It's actually even a smaller point but I thought I'd get some clarification. Regarding the committee when it does go to the provost level, I understand this is the vast minority of cases, but it says it should have no fewer than two students, which I think is great, and it says at least one of whom on the committee should be outside of the discipline; it may be a common sense sort of thing, but should it be explicitly stated that somebody should be from inside the discipline, too?

HATTEN: I think it's implied by the at least one of whom is outside, yeah.

SCOTT: Well I figured it was a common sense case, but just to detail. Nothing more then.

PAOLILLO: It's at least one, it could be both of them.

HANSON: Pardon me?

HATTEN: But you see you could have more students if needed you could have more than five or six on the committee. So, I mean, this is just the language to make it flexible enough so that the committee could be organized in such a way that seems rational for the particular problem.

HANSON: Paul?

EISENBERG: Yeah, I wonder whether a slight addition would be helpful. In addition to the penultimate paragraph, you've got, "and publish," or some words tantamount to publish. I would hate to have a situation arise in which somebody, some graduate student in particular says, 'I didn't know those were policies,' and a senior person would say 'Oh yes, those have been the policies of the department for years, odd that you didn't know about it.' Right, in other words, it should be the case that any potential co-author or actual co-author you would have had relatively easy access to the statement of those policies.

ARNOLD: So are you saying in that next to last paragraph to add something like adopt and widely distribute or...?

EISENBERG: Something.

ARNOLD: ...something along those lines.

HANSON: Is that...? Any other questions? Sarita?

SONI: Randy, I'd suggest that in the last bullet point paragraph second from the end instead of saying adopt policies, why don't you suggest policies or guidelines? It would be great to get policies but since we're calling this guidelines, let's not ask the schools and departments to develop policies.

PRATT: I think we can take another comment in just a moment, our process for this item is that we will ask the committee to take what they've heard and reflect on it and see it in the final version which we will anticipate as a votable action item at the first meeting in February. So if there is an additional comment or two, that's great, otherwise you can communicate directly with the co-Chairs.

HANSON: Bob?

ENO: Just very quickly picking up on what Sarita just said, I suggest that this be a policy and that the policy be an additional portion under the guidelines, specified as guidelines on authorship, and that the policy is the adjudication procedures.

HANSON: Other...yes?

PAOLILLO: If this is going to be voted in the first February meeting, when will we see the final version because we would like to be able to share it with colleagues in our units to be able to solicit their views? This is something that's going to affect them so I don't want to misrepresent their views.

PRATT: My preference would be to see it at the time of the January meeting which gives people a month more or less to circulate it.

ARNOLD: If we can set a deadline for comments then we could then return very quickly, but....

HANSON: It would obviously be useful for you to bring this draft and some of the comments that have made to your colleagues right now and to communicate them if they have concerns.

PRATT: But otherwise can I ask you to bring this, have this ready for distribution as an electronic document on the date of the next plenary session which is...

TERRY: January 15th.

PRATT: ...January 15th and then we will bring it to the floor for a vote at the first meeting in February.

HANSON: Any other comments or questions?

AGENDA ITEM #9: DRAFT RESOLUTION ON SUSTAINABILITY

HANSON: First reading now on another item, a draft resolution on sustainability and we have with us Professor of Geological Sciences and Associate Dean of Faculties, Michael Hamburger and Paul Sullivan, Deputy Vice President for Administration who are co-Chairs of the Sustainability Task Force.

PRATT: Again the process here is a little bit unusual in that Michael was here and gave us a long introduction... (laughter)

HAMBURGER: A very long introduction.

PRATT: ...you'll recall that he didn't have his watch on and we cut him off so since that time the draft report has been posted electronically. Many people have received bound copies, and so I have asked Michael and Paul to actually be here today not to introduce this again, but to respond to questions and comments from the representatives. I will say, however, there was some additional word crafting of the document that was going on even today, so you might take a pretty careful look particularly under, below "Therefore," the first sentence on the creation on item number one has been modified so if you looked at the document early in the day, this is subtly different. And I think you would be pleased to hear questions and comments from the representatives.

HANSON: In case people haven't had a chance to look at this in detail, do you want to just say briefly what you're asking for?

HAMBURGER: Yeah, let me just say a word about where we are with this. At the meeting four weeks ago we introduced the executive summary of the report. The report itself came out on November 19th. We're in a period of, kind of, consultation and review. We're soliciting comments from everybody in the community through December 15th we're planning on revising it and preparing a final report by the end of the year. If you haven't had a chance to look at it or if you do, it's a pretty substantive piece of work, over a hundred pages with a lot of detailed recommendations on some very specific issues related to campus energy use, transportation and so on... We wanted to kind of walk a fine line between getting into all the details of every aspect of the report and giving a chance to comment on kind of the overarching goals of the report. So this proposal here kind of identifies four critical elements of the critical recommendations of the report; one, the creation of a campus-wide office of sustainability that would help support the initiatives that are contained in here; second the development of new academic, interdisciplinary and cross school academic initiatives in support of sustainability; third a kind of general statement in support of administrative and financial support for kind of the specific types of projects that are proposed in here. And finally, perhaps the most controversial one, is formalizing an institutional commitment to sustainability either by signing on to one of the nationally recognized agreements on sustainability and climate change or putting together some kind of formal institutional statement on sustainability.

HANSON: Yes?

BURNS: On item three, it's sort of formatted differently. You say "Continued financial administrative support," are you foreseeing actually an increase in efforts on sustainability and recommending them or just status quo?

HAMBURGER: Well, we'd like to see all of these things be augmented. I think we wanted to recognize the fact that we're not completely starting from scratch; that there are substantive efforts going on in a variety of operational and academic units and that since the creation of the task force, the Office of the Provost, and the vice president for administration have provided some fairly substantial support to get this project underway. So the "Continued" has the sense of, you know, moving forward from here. I guess I would like to see a positive slope myself and I'd like to see that encouraged.

CARINI: So in "2" here, I think "b" has to come first or else you can't really sustain "a" and "c" in any significant way. So I'd like to see them re-ordered.

HAMBURGER: Yeah, I think that's a friendly amendment.

TERRY: I'd like to explore the reporting line for the office of sustainability. In your report, pages 12 and 13, you leave it open. You express a preference for option one, that this thing would report to the president as the CEO of the campus, but I would actually be more comfortable with your option two that they report both to the president and the provost because this involves academic initiatives and other sorts of things that I think are the province of...

HAMBURGER: Could I just clarify one point? Option two is a joint reporting to the vice president for administration and the provost, and that's the way it is handled on some campuses that...

TERRY: Okay, that's right. Yeah, but in any event, you know, what I guess I would say is if I vote for this resolution I am voting I hope for the ambiguity in your report as to where this thing ultimately reports and not really endorsing your preference for option one. I wonder if you have comments on what we're voting for when we buy into the creation of a centralized office of sustainability, kind of, for the record so we know what we're endorsing...

HAMBURGER: Well I guess I can give my perspective on it. I think we have tried to avoid making very specific administrative recommendations because some of these decisions about the financing and the exact organization and the reporting structure are really in the purview of the campus administrators to decide and so we discussed them and examined and made our preferences part of the report. But really the most important thing is that there be a fully functional office that has some opportunities to cut across both operational and academic issues and it could be, there are many different ways that it could be organized and partly it depends on the contributions and collaboration of each of the administrative units.

HUNT: Michael can you talk a little bit about, I was impressed in our brief conversation about this, about your research and how it is implemented at other institutions, can you talk a little bit about that and what we might expect if this comes through, you know, from examples from other universities?

HAMBURGER: I can say a little about it, Paul you may want to add some too. First of all this is new territory for a lot of institutions. It's a very crosscutting kind of process that really cuts across where there's some strong traditional boundaries in universities and many institutions like ours are exploring ways to do this. In some institutions the office is really part of the operational structure they may be under the campus engineering office or something like that. In others, there are two parallel offices; one that focuses on operational issues, and one that focuses on academic issues. I think from our perspective, if I'm speaking for the committee, one of the real goals of this is to really make as much as we can a seamless link across the operational and academic sides of the, and residential, you know, to affect the students' residential lives as well. And many institutions have found ways where they can have a single office, but with multiple reporting lines, multiple finance lines. I know Michigan State, for example, had three, the office had reporting, dashed reporting lines to three vice presidents at their level to ensure close collaboration. So it's a, I think, it basically has to be done within the environment of our institution. We have to find a way to work it out most successfully. I don't know if Karen you want to address that issue.

HANSON: Well I can't, I mean, I don't think the other question was addressed to me, but what have you found so far, and what do you want in the record about this resolution.

SULLIVAN: One other aspect to keep in mind, is we talk about having an office and we were kind of vague on the reporting lines because we wanted to leave it open, but the other thing that

we recommended was some sort of steering group or advisory board which is key to making this work. That would be patterned more or less after the task force now, where we have half about administrative and half faculty and students just to make that they're staying on the right path and they're, you know, addressing the correct issues. So that's another critical piece to take into account.

HUNT: Provost Hanson if you have anything I didn't mean to exclude you, if you have any comments on how you think it should be implemented I'd be interested to hear.

HANSON: Well I do think that the academic initiatives should be lodged in the Office of the Provost. I think that it's, Michael and I talked a little bit about this and I do understand what motivations there could be for a variety of different models and any of them might be successful in appropriate circumstances and no matter what there has to be close collaboration. I think everybody agrees on that, but this proposal has been modified in certain ways to take into account certain kinds of concerns one might have about how directives would come and be implemented. You know, whether or not one person in an office of sustainability, vice president for sustainability or something, would be appropriate head of an office that is taking, you know, is implementing things in the building infrastructure and in developing academic programs and courses and research centers. I think that it's just a little hard to envision how that would work. The advisory board in various ways would be helpful, I think, no matter how this is created, but I do think that there are some issues that could clearly fall out on the academic side and some would fall out on the operational side. Yes?

MASON: Has any thought go into projections of cost for this, because as I notice that there's clearly some things that are going to have price tags, and by the way I'm not suggesting that we should put a price tag on something that is as morally defensible as sustainability, but on the other hand that the realities are such that you have to think about those things.

HAMBURGER: Well we have pretty assiduously tried not to put any dollar lines on any of these things. (laughter) Some of them are incredibly expensive, some of them are cost neutral and some of them actually will generate revenue, especially with the rising cost of energy for example. Energy conservation efforts may end up providing funding at levels of millions of dollars and some of it involves some creative ways to put long term investments into revolving funds that then can use revenue that's generated...(end of tape – comments lost) ...on it, I think we're thinking quite ambitiously that this for example could involve some substantial commitment to new faculty hires for example to creation of some new research center or institutes that might again require some resources to sustain them and some long term commitments. On the other hand, there are big costs if we don't invest in some of these things now, in the form of opportunity costs.

PRATT: I would like to say from my position as President that I think it's important that we listen carefully and that we give this serious consideration because all of us who were involved with the task force were, I think, quite stunned at the number of activities that had already been initiated by staff, by students, by faculty members and that when over the course of the summer all of these efforts began to be looked at collectively it was clear that we were already deeply engaged in sustainability and that there was an enormous commitment from many individuals to

do the right thing with or without institutional recognition and I think for me that really made it clear that we were the one organization on the campus that could speak to this and could really help organize it and bring it as a centerpiece for the university because not much has been invented in the past four months. It was really a matter of ferreting out the remarkable activities that were already in progress and now finding a way to sort of get them out in the open and get them acknowledged both in print and on the web because so many students now when they're looking at where they'll go to school or what group they want to be a part of need to be able to see that and want those explicit recognitions of the institutional commitment.

HANSON: I might add that Michael could say a little bit more about what has happened in Michigan recently, but I checked with the provosts of the relevant schools there and that was coming from the schools. It was not something that was coming out of new funding from the state, or any redirecting.

HAMBURGER: So many of our peer institutions are moving into this in a big way. I've forgotten a number we heard, but the state of Michigan collectively between three institutions is planning on hiring something like forty faculty or something like that?

HANSON: And they made a joint announcement of this as sort of a centerpiece of the kind of commitment they were making.

HAMBURGER: University of Michigan, Michigan State and Michigan Tech together are moving into some major initiatives. The University of Michigan has a new joint program between the business school and the school of forestry, that I think has gotten a lot of attention nationally. So I think it's an area where a lot of our peer institutions are moving and partly it's a matter of coordinating and packaging things that we're already doing quite successfully.

HANSON: Yes?

PAOLILLO: I want to first applaud the efforts of the task force and to thank them for bringing attention to this sort of issue. Sustainability and the importance of it is something that, you know, we're all seeing become a more important part of our thoughts in our daily life, I think, all of us. When it comes to the notion of establishing an office, I'm not sure that a persuasive argument has really been made and I think that there needs to be a more complete explanation somehow. I mean it's one thing to come to this with a feeling of enthusiasm that there are many more good things that could be done in some way, but it seems to me that there needs to be a compelling argument that and for this a special office in the university is made. That puts it on a certain kind of par with other kinds of offices and can say what is its articulation with those offices and these are things that I find difficult to comprehend right now. So I'm wondering if you can briefly respond to that or...?

HAMBURGER: Yep. I think it's a very challenging question and of course nobody likes to see yet another administrative office set up that requires more care and feeding and more finances that might be going to some other valuable pursuit. I think several items come to mind, again Paul may want to add to this, I think a key thing is coordination that there are a lot of these disparate efforts, both in the academic side and the operational side that are going on often with

considerable overlap and sometimes competition for resources and lack of coordination so some kind of centralized office to help facilitate and coordinate cooperation. For me one of the key issues is when we talk about long range planning where the campus and university as a whole is going through a major strategic planning process, this is the time when it's critical that the issues surrounding sustainability are infused into our kind of large scale thinking. Right now I don't think that's happening at least not to the level it should be, just because these efforts are kind of divided up into a multitude of smaller initiatives and don't make it to the level of kind of centralized decision making. And for me it's also partly symbolic, this represents what maybe we should be taking on as a major aspirational goal of our institution, the same way we've embraced diversity, for example, or social equity, that this is a representation of our institutional commitment and contribution to address these issues. And without that things continue to go along, but they don't necessarily receive the attention they deserve.

SULLIVAN: From a pragmatic point of view, when we started this process I wasn't sure that I thought we needed an office either. I thought that we could manage this internally on the operational side. After we got into it, the two biggest or three biggest things that are lacking right now are coordination between all the different operational areas. I'm in the middle of a couple projects now that I'm finding that that's more difficult than I thought it would be. Publicity is a big issue. We've done a lot of things, but nobody's really talked about it and trying to get the word out is key and we don't really have anybody focused to do that. But the third thing that was eye-opening to me is the student interest, and trying to keep the students involved and coordinated is something that we have to have some focused area that can manage that and we haven't got that identified very well yet. The student interest in this is just phenomenal and we want to engage them on the operational side as well as on the academic side and just try to keep that process going.

HANSON: Other questions or comments or discussion on this topic? We are almost at time...

PRATT: Let me touch on process again for this particular document. We have listed this as a first reading, I am sensing that there is not so much criticism or word crafting being required right now so I would like to say that when we bring this back we will be bringing it back for a second reading and vote. Because I'm not hearing a lot of commentary, but that would give us a period of time now, and so what I'd like to just do is ask for a straw vote that this is a sufficiently mature proposal to on the next reading call it an action item asking for vote. So if you can just, those in support of bringing this forward for a vote at the next presentation please give me an 'aye.' ("Aye") And those opposed who would like to hear a second reading? Alright, just in terms of feedback so the next time you see this we will try handle this the same way with the authorship guideline. If at all possible I'd like to see this at the time of the meeting in January coming up as an electronic document. That gives everybody a chance to really look at it in its final form, recommend any last polishes, but I don't want to see word crafting on the day that we bring it forward to the vote. So that's how we'll handle that. I think that's the last item for the day. Well we have one...

HANSON: One more...Paul?

EISENBERG: I was going to hold back because I realize it's a big document and I haven't had a chance to look at it, but since we've now seemed to have almost been limiting it to the vote, I want right now to raise a couple of questions if I may in the absence of having read your full report. One, is there anything that you want to add to the resolution that would call for cooperation with other Bloomington or county or statewide groups or agencies? This sounds like a wonderful effort, but as it's stated it just concerns the university and it doesn't involve outreach at all

HAMBURGER: That's certainly embedded in the report and I encourage you to look at those sections and offer some suggestions and contributions. Of course there's the Bloomington Commission on Sustainability and many of the focuses on service learning and outreach focus on connections between campus and community. I think it's critical. I don't know whether it's critical to put it in the resolution, but it's certainly a critical part of the report, and I guess if you feel that it's a critical part of the resolution, I guess I would welcome that. It's just a question of what part deserves to be highlighted in the resolution.

EISENBERG: And my second question, I guess I have to read the whole report, concerns the fact that while this looks really upbeat, one has to anticipate with this matter as with every matter that some people will, shall we say drag their feet or even be deliberately non-helpful, is there anything in the report that...

HAMBURGER: You thinking about anybody in particular? (laughter)

EISENBERG: Yes, but I won't name names at the moment. Is there anything in the full report that puts teeth into all of this with regards to non-cooperation in the way that we've considered for what will happen when the smoking decree goes into effect and some people will go on smoking. There has to be some kind of power behind all of this, or it's just going to ____

HAMBURGER: I'd say we haven't gotten into the punitive stage of this process (laughter) We would like to. You know one of the key things for example, when we talk about energy use is developing some clear metrics so that we can define, for example how much energy your building is using and so we can perhaps find some ways to share responsibility for use of resources, for example and actually put some incentives, I think should be the nicer way to put it, to encourage moving in a positive direction.

PRATT: You can individually turn the lights off in your office, yeah.

GINGER: The heat!

PRATT: The heat!

HAMBURGER: So most of these are in the form of general recommendations of directions to move and benchmarks that we might move to, put in place to assess how we're moving in that direction, but we haven't to my knowledge really suggested any formal actions to take to...

SULLIVAN: I mean I think what we're looking for is just continued progress toward these goals. I guess I had envisioned that we would be issuing a report card of some sort, some sort of report annually to say how we're doing, but we hadn't really envisioned punitive measures.

HANSON: I guess I would like you to look again everybody closely though at that first recommendation. I mean this in some sense raises some of the things that I think are new. You've left deliberately non-specific here if this office is to have power, again I think that we do have to think hard about how it could be organized so that it, especially if it's thought to have power on a variety sides of the house, for a variety of these activities. I mean we can talk about dotted reporting lines and so on, but sometimes that just means there's nothing going on there in terms of actual enforcement power or even an ability to persuade certain units to do things. So I think that is something that needs to be thought about hard, how that office would be constructed and what its relation would be to an advisory board, which is also something that you might think of instead of that.

PRATT: Or you may need to bring back alternate items for us to vote in and as we...

HAMBURGER: You know, I think as you're aware, I think we've tried to divide, to separate kind of the long term goals from a kind of implementation plan which would specify exactly how the office is set up and what the reporting lines might be and the finances and so on and of course there's a lot of nitty gritty stuff to be worked out.

HANSON: Yeah, we are just about at time, but one other comment?

BURNS: Yeah, I was just going to agree that on Item 1 for me what we're talking about, a lot of the discussion is a coordinating office not a centralized office and I think it's wordsmithing, but I think you'll create a whole new administrative structure, because sustainability ultimately should be central according to the report and so you don't, I think, want to do that. You want to coordinate it through ___ as part of the existing structure.

HANSON: Well we are at time so if you have additional comments, please convey them to Paul and Michael and thank you.

PRATT: Thank you. We will see you back after the winter break.

Meeting Adjourned 5:31 pm