

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**March 24, 2009**  
**IMU State Room East**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, Leslie Blaha, Julie Bobay, Purnima Bose, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, James Capshaw, Nick Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Erika Dowell, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Julia Fox, Tom Gieryn, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Padraic Kenney, Paul Losensky, Valerie, Markley, Bryan McCormick, Amanda Meglemre, Michael Morrone, James Perry, Lisa Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, Richard Shockley, Sonya Stephens, Herb Terry, Maxine Watson

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATIVES PRESENT:** C. Bishop (Carrie Donovan), Jennifer Miller (Nate Birkhead), Ruth Stone (Sarita Soni)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Andrea Ciccarelli, Lucas Fields, Valerie Grim, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Patricia Henderson, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Lloyd Kolbe, Lokman Meho, Brian O'Donnell, Dan Ondrik, Daniel Sloat, Jerold Stern, Richard Stryker, Alex Tanford, Neil Theobald, Vasti Torres, David Waterman, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** John Applegate (VPPP), Alex Benson (IDS), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Jin Chen (Education), Roland Cote (Registrar), Sue Talbot (Trustee), Brad Wheeler (VPIT), D.S. Wise (Informatics), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Erin Rykken (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/agendas/08-09/02.03.09.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/agendas/08-09/02.17.09.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Professor Herb Terry)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)
4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)\*  
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry)

5. Resolution on Intellectual Property Policy Revenue Distribution for Bloomington Campus (10 minutes) (Professor Stephen Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B17-2009Amend.pdf>
6. Discussion of Changes to the BFC Constitution (20 minutes) (Professors James Capshew and Lisa Pratt) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B15-2009Rev2.pdf>

#### **BRIEF RECESS**

7. GPSO – SAAAC Resolutions (30 minutes)  
(Professor Brian Horne and GPSO President Nicholas Clark) [SECOND READING]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B18-2009Rev.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B19-2009Rev.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B20-2009Rev.pdf>
8. SAC Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct Procedures for Bloomington Campus (20 minutes) (Diane Dallis, Head, Information Commons/Undergraduate Library Services, Wells Library, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee)[FIRST READING]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B21-2009.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B22-2009.pdf>

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or Professor Terry should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcOFF@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcOFF@indiana.edu)

### **Minutes**

#### **AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**HANSON:** Let's begin. There may be some people still trying to find their way to this room. First item of business is approval of the minutes from February 3<sup>rd</sup>, February 17<sup>th</sup>. Anybody have a chance to look at them? I need a movement of approval. [The motion is made] I need a second.

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** The motion is seconded.

**HANSON:** All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? Thank you. Agenda Committee business, Herb.

## **AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**TERRY:** As some of you will remember, we passed a card through this body a while ago expressing our support for former IU President Brand in his health problems. I wanted to let you know that I received a very nice note back from President Brand. He was very grateful for our expression of support for him and his family. He also noted two things; that he always thought that the Bloomington Faculty Council was a good institution representing faculty interests at the university, and that it had taken a supportive role of his efforts to support academic reform in intercollegiate athletics at the NCAA and that he hoped the faculty council would continue to express its support, and the athletics committee would continue to express its support, for academic reform in intercollegiate athletics. Speaking of President Brand, if you've read the papers, you know that former president Brand will receive an honorary IU degree this Sunday at a convocation, an honors convocation, to be held in the IU auditorium. The UFC conducted a mail vote over the break in order to make that possible. I think it's a very appropriate honor for President Brand and I hope as many faculty, not only in this group but your colleagues, as possible can attend that presentation. So just as a reminder that's at two o'clock in the IU auditorium this Sunday. The formal presentation to the President will be at that session.

At the UFC, the effort has begun to formulate policies for the review of core school deans. The UFC authorized its Agenda Committee to create a task force of people from IUPUI and IUB to look at the policies that we have for system wide review of deans, the policies that IUPUI and IUB have for the review of deans on those campuses and to create a policy for the review of system deans. That group is being formed now. It's going to be a relatively small group, probably three faculty from IUB and three from IUPUI. One way or another we will have a good liaison, not only to the provost, and to the IUPUI chancellor, but probably also to the president's office and we will seek input from the deans of the core schools trying to develop a policy that works. The current policies that we have for review of system deans and campus deans are kind of a starting point, but the charge that we're developing for this committee is that it not feel entirely bound by that; that if it comes up with different and more efficient means of evaluating core deans, that it shouldn't hesitate to recommend that. I certainly imagine that whatever this group recommends will one way or another come back through the BFC and its committees and through the IFC and its committees. Ultimately the power to adopt this policy, because it involves more than one campus, is the UFC's. So, we'll be getting that through. I doubt that it will complete its course before the end of this academic year but I hope it will get a good start and will be at the very least something that the UFC will act on very early next year.

Also working its way up through the UFC is a policy for procedures for promotion and tenure on all Indiana University campuses. This has had a long gestation period. A draft of it that Simon Atkinson, the head of the IUPUI faculty council and I working with John Applegate, came up with has been circulated to our Faculty Affairs Committee for comment. They haven't had quite as much time to deliberate upon it as one would like, so I anticipate that they will bring their comments on that report and their suggestions for change to this meeting on April 7<sup>th</sup>, our

next meeting of the BFC. It will be discussed at the UFC meeting next Tuesday March 31<sup>st</sup>, but will not be voted upon there. My hope is that this campus and all the others can complete some review of it in early April and that we will be able at the UFC meeting on April 28<sup>th</sup>, the last UFC meeting of the year, to vote on that policy and have it in place.

A couple of deadlines, important deadlines, have been met. Next year's Faculty Council is elected. I think I announced that at the last one. We're moving forward. The ballot is out now to elect the nominating committee of next year's BFC and that nominating committee once it's elected will proceed to get the officers in place for next year. I said earlier that my goal was to try and get this done on the schedule as specified in our bylaws; we're getting close. The bylaws say we're supposed to have the Nom Com in place by the end of March. We're going to be close to that. Another deadline that has been met, and I want to thank the members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee for, is that they have submitted their recommendation on the Provost Fund to Provost Hanson. The budgetary meetings are done. Of course everything's a little hypothetical until the General Assembly concludes its work, but I'm grateful to the Budgetary Affairs Committee for their expedited work this year. If you want to say something, that's fine. Okay. Welcome back from the break! Speaking of breaks, however, we've still put in here a brief recess and we've got popcorn, but we have items that are important following the recess so please do not take your popcorn and your soft drink or your tea and leave. Come back after the break so that we continue to have a quorum this time at the second half of the meeting. Thank you very much.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**HANSON:** Thanks Herb. I'll just mention, since Herb spoke about the committee to come up with new policies on core school dean review, that a few administrative reviews are underway now. I've already had a meeting with the committee for the review of the Law School dean and the review committees for the dean of the School of Education; that's a core school dean, and the director of Affirmative Action are about to start meeting. Let me make another few announcements.

One is that this evening is the kickoff for Campus Diversity Day which is, you know, tomorrow but may also include some other events this week. The Campus Diversity Committee has asked all units on the campus to do something if they can if it works into the rest of the schedule at 11AM tomorrow to sort of engage on issues of diversity. The theme of this year's diversity is "More than You Think," and tomorrow evening Rita Dove will be the campus lecturer who has been brought in connection with these activities that have been sponsored by the Campus Diversity Committee.

In addition, this Saturday is Earth Hour which is actually originally sponsored by the World Wildlife Fund, but they asked us to be a campus flagship and I signed or said we would, and so that means at 8:30 to 9:30 this Saturday, all non-essential lights on the campus will be turned down and we hope for cooperation from people as you're leaving your offices on Friday, if you're not in there on Saturday, turn off all non-essential lights. It's something that's going on

all over the world and also connects with the beginning of the energy challenge that the sustainability task force is taking up again roughly this week and then into April and they're getting a lot of good help from our new director of sustainability, Bill Brown, who came on board last month. So they'll be a little publicity about that that you may want to pay attention to cooperating with it.

The other thing I should mention in terms of administrative reviews is that the three year review that's mandated by current Bloomington Faculty Council procedures for the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will soon be underway. That's an anonymous survey in the third year of the first five years of service. A survey is mandated and I consulted with the College Policy Committee to get the sort of questions that should be asked in addition to the standard questions that the BFC itself has settled on so those questionnaires will be going out shortly, probably in e-mail form but I think basically limited to the College faculty. I think that's it and I didn't receive any questions ahead of time. Did you?

**TERRY:** No.

**HANSON:** So any questions or comments?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**CLARK:** The GPSO is holding their first annual, "New Voices in Academia" conference this Friday in the Wells Library. There is a sheet at the bottom of your packet that just has the schedule for the day's events. This is our first effort to sort of foster interdisciplinary discourse between graduate students and graduate research on campus, and to also feature graduate research, so there's going to be a share fair in the main corridor of the Wells Library where people have posters presenting on their research and how it's relevant to the state of Indiana. If you have a chance to come to any of these events, we'd certainly appreciate seeing you. The provost is going to make opening remarks along with Dean Wimbush from the Graduate School and we're hoping for a successful event so we appreciate any support.

**HANSON:** Thanks. Paul?

**EISENBERG:** Yes. Unfortunately I had to miss the last BFC meeting when the memorial resolution for George List was read. Had I been here I would have said then what I am about to say now and I don't suppose I'm repeating anything that was said then. George List died at, I believe, age 97 or approximately that. A couple months before his death he had applied for a grant that aided continuing research. (laughter) And I think that was simply wonderful, and I wanted to share that piece of news with those of you who were not aware of the fact.

**HANSON:** Any other comments or questions? Okay, thanks. First up then, this time as an action item, the resolution on Intellectual Property Policy Revenue Distribution, Steve?

## **AGENDA ITEM #5: RESOLUTION ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY REVENUE DISTRIBUTION FOR BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS**

**BURNS:** This is the second reading of the proposed policy for handling intellectual property. I should note that there was one friendly amendment that isn't indicated on the sheet and that is the last sentence starts with "for large RC's the guiding principle for distribution," it should just read "the guiding principle for distributing these proceeds to sub components is..." and really this resolution is meeting the requests and requirement of the new policy on intellectual property that we have a campus policy for how to distribute unit funds and what it means, and so the real goal here is just to have the 15% that represents campus unit participation in net proceeds to go as close to the originating unit as is reasonable and practical in a way that will enhance future intellectual property or scholastic development, so questions?

**HANSON:** Convincing! (laughter). It comes as an action item, but it's coming from the committee, right? So it's moved and seconded. All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, discussions of changes to the BFC constitution? Jim and Lisa?

## **AGENDA ITEM #6: DISCUSSION OF CHANGES TO THE BFC CONSTITUTION**

**CAPSHAW:** So we had a discussion last time, people had some suggestions, a few minor emendations, and I noticed that there was one suggestion that didn't actually get into what you have before you. On section 1.2, "Professional Librarians," that should just be "Librarians." I don't know why that's continuing to be in there. I don't want to repeat myself, but I'm open to questions or concerns at this time if people might want to express them. Tom?

**GIERYN:** I received an inquiry from Julie Knost of the Affirmative Action office regarding the definition, the rather inclusive definition, of faculty in section 1.3. Julie is not here – I can't see behind the post, she's not over there, is she hiding? – okay, then I'll bring this forward for her. The concern was that the Council remain aware of the fact that it really is an obligation of other units, that is schools and departments, to pass policies that more precisely specify the rights and responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty and I simply want to endorse that idea. There's nothing we can do at the Council. I think the revisions here are the right ones to make, but it's important that units specify in greater detail than this document should, those rights and responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty, so this is simply noting for example, that section 1.3 does not automatically confer upon NTT's in the various categories, voting rights in promotion and tenure cases, necessarily, or in salary issues or whatever, but simply says that the units are incumbent then to specify what those rights and responsibilities are and since this is a more inclusive policy, one could see in it support in a sense, in the absence of more specific policies at the unit levels, support for greater participation for non-tenure track faculty than some faculty might wish and I think, as Jim pointed out very succinctly in an e-mail, it's incumbent on the units to, when they feel it appropriate, to restrict if they wish the involvement of NTT's in voting on particular sorts of issues.

**CAPSHAW:** And do you also want to make a friendly amendment, because...

**GIERYN:** Oh, I noticed that...yeah.

**CAPSHAW:** ...because I know that you noticed the part time designation should be included in 1.3.

**GIERYN:** We've been round and round on this one and Susan McCammon informs me that there are a dozen or so part time faculty at the Bloomington campus. We got rid of that appointment in 2002. These are in effect, grandfathered positions, but we thought since they were still here that they should be included. If we ever go back and create a part time appointment then our policy would be covered, so friendly amendment to propose, Jim where did I have it?

**CAPSHAW:** I believe 1.3 between "acting" and "adjunct."

**GIERYN:** Yeah, that's the best place for it. It really doesn't matter, but somewhere in that list.

**CAPSHAW:** Okay. Any other comments or questions? Paul?

**EISENBERG:** Yeah, well in a similar vein to what Tom has just said I take it that the individual departments and relevant units should be called upon to formulate policies if they've not already done so concerning the rights and privileges of emeriti?

**GIERYN:** That seems a reasonable thing, that's right.

**CAPSHAW:** Yeah. Okay, shall we vote?

**HANSON:** I'm still puzzled by that last (inaudible). Is it the case that you're voting on a document that then requires all the units to reexamine their own...?

**CAPSHAW:** No.

**GIERYN:** No, that's why we decided not to change the wording of this. I'm simply noting that it is in a sense, important for the units to realize that with this slightly expanded definition of faculty offered by this constitution, that they need to be ever more attentive to crafting policies that actually define those rights and responsibilities very carefully.

**EISENBERG:** My remark was in a similar vein concerning emeriti.

**HANSON:** But what is the status of this element as a constitution?

**EISENBERG:** Oh! That there should be policies, but this is going beyond the constitution and could take the form perhaps of a letter from you, or from you Herb, I don't know, to the

individual departments and units saying that they need to craft such policies if they don't already have them.

**HANSON:** Well, I guess the reason I give pause about this though is that we could do that, but if this has the form it does and then lists the things it does list as under the authority of the faculty, what status do the claims under article 2 have with respect to the inclusive listing in article 9?

**CAPSHEW:** Okay, my understanding is that in this revision really we're trying to conform to current governance procedures. In fact, we have representatives from the clinical and the research ranks and so forth. It's also to conform to current administrative policy. And so this doesn't specify exactly what from that governance will take but this is the general authority for the faculty and definition of the faculty. My understanding is that there is now way in the constitution to specify all the different possibilities that various units might have to integrate the NTT's with the tenure track faculty. And so that's what I thought we were doing and I think we've done that. And I do think that Tom has a good suggestion to make sure that, you know, the units and the schools are up to speed on their rules and their procedures to govern themselves within this overarching constitution.

**HANSON:** I guess, well one other of the main things that I question about it is that this document doesn't make any separation between legislative and consultative authority which some other of our documents do. Is that, has that been, is that something that's deliberate? I mean you have a member of the Board of Trustees with us who might have a comment on that. I mean part of the concern might be whether or not it's regarded as mandating faculty legislation of, for example, budgets.

**GIERYN:** I know we separate these in other documents. When this was presented to me anyway this was not an issue. I mean we decided not to tackle that particular one. I didn't go back and check whether this language was consistent with other policy documents on that.

**CAPSHEW:** Yeah, our feeling was that this was really almost a *pro forma* revision of the constitution and we were not examining, you know, the legalistic basis for this document and we already have NTT's active in faculty governance and that's a good thing and the *Academic Handbook* says that they should be involved and we're just trying to conform to those current practices. Now if you want to open up, you know, the logic and the conceptual history of the constitution, then I guess we go back to the drawing board but I'm not sure that would be useful at this point.

**GIERYN:** The separation that I was aware of was the separation between what the faculty at the campus level has authority over and the schools and that's clearly separated in part A and B. I guess the separation of legislative and con—I have seen that. I can't remember where now but I have seen that separation. But it's not in this constitution, that's for sure.

**HANSON:** It's in the *Academic Guide*.

**GIERYN:** In the guide.

**HANSON:** I think that is where it is.

**GIERYN:** We are in the process of making those revisions. One of the things we do is check for consistency with other policy documents so I can make a note for Jane McLeod to look into that inconsistency.

**HANSON:** This doesn't really have to do with the NTT and the inclusiveness of the faculty stuff; it's whether or not the legislative and consultative authorities are all claimable in this way and this is a founding document so I think the legalese does matter.

**CAPSHAW:** Well, have things changed? I mean, because it says on page, I'm sorry, section 2.1 A, "the faculty of this campus has legislative and consultative authority regarding..." and I mean, is that changed?

**GIERYN:** This is the constitution, but it's also the case now that I believe budget, for example, was moved into a category of consultative, but not legislative. I do remember reading that in the *Academic Guide*. I think it's just a question of, you know, that the necessity of going through these documents periodically and looking for consistency. I'd have to go back and find where in the *Academic Guide* that division was made and by whom, and we can certainly do that as part of the revision process.

**MCCORMICK:** I would speak in favor of that distinction because it really works in two directions, I believe. Not only is it that historically faculty has had a consultative role in budget issues, but they've had legislative authority in academic issues and as written, it's not clear whether we may have only consultative authority in an academic mission under this.

**PRATT:** Although I think we could solve this problem pretty simply by just moving that one item, the item 10, the budget item, into a different category and clarifying that if you thing that's beyond the level of changes and really requires some deep thought and some shared wisdom and I don't think we should tinker with it now but I think we should make sure that it is on the agenda for next year to be looked at in consultation with Tom's office because I think this is too important in fact to try to do it on the fly right now. I think it's very important that you brought it up, but I don't think this is the moment to try to do it. I think now that we're aware of it, it needs to be looked at from many angles because we've found ourselves spending far more time trying to understand the ranking and the language that had to do with faculty than we ever initially anticipated and I think this will be another one we really have to bear down on.

**HANSON:** What's your pleasure?

**CAPSHAW:** I would like to have a vote.

**MARKLEY:** Just I have a question. By this definition it seems to me that without specifically specifying that our ROTC representative is included in the faculty, the issue is about the voting privilege.

**CAPSHAW:** Yeah, that's under the bylaws of the BFC. There will be further revisions to the bylaws as a separate item.

**MARKLEY:** For next year?

**CAPSHAW:** Perhaps this year, but it would be nice to get through this first and then revise the bylaws. You know we've been working on this for six months or so now, so.

**TERRY:** Karen?

**HANSON:** Julie?

**BOBAY:** You know, if I understood this the idea was that we should vote on this document now pending more information that we might get about how it lines up with others, but I guess I have a real question about that. I mean this is the constitution, and to pass a constitution of the faculty that we know – unless there is a real driving need to have this passed right now, I just am personally uncomfortable voting for a document that looks like we need to spend more time on it and do more work.

**CAPSHAW:** If I can respond. If we don't pass this, look at the stuff that's marked out. It doesn't apply, you know it talks about associate faculty, we have researchers, we've got all kinds of language that just does not apply at all either in the governance or in this administration. And I find that yes; this is going to be an imperfect document. It has been an imperfect document. It will continue to be an imperfect document, but it is better than we have now and it doesn't really create, you know, some kind of hole that people are going to be jumping through, right? I just feel like this is a fairly routine thing and yes, it is bringing up some really deep issues because we don't think about it very much but this document had deep issues before we started looking at it.

**BOBAY:** Does it need to be ratified by full faculty?

**CAPSHAW:** I believe so, yeah.

**TERRY:** Yeah.

**BOBAY:** Another point about passing a document that in my view, looks like it might be not quite done, is that to come back to it would mean, if I understand correctly, if the BFC passes it now, it would go out for ratification by the full faculty. They would ratify it. Then we would come back in the fall and say, we need to do this again. Is that...?

**CAPSHAW:** Yeah, you know people revise your courses and things like that. If you look at the list of changes, okay, we haven't done this – well we've done it, oh, a couple of years ago. It's not unusual to have things every year or two so you know.

**BURNS:** I was going to actually move to pass it a minute ago, but I'll respond that we're moving toward accepting these changes to fundamental flaws that are there, so not passing it seems like we'd be leaving an even more imperfect document intact. So I think that I support the changes.

**GIERYN:** I agree with that and also policy revision is endless as I've learned (laughter) and it takes a lot of time and the issue that has – that Karen brought up – is an extremely important one and we're in the middle, in my office, of going through the entire *Academic Guide*, tearing it apart, checking for the consistency, making sure that all the current BFC policies are in there. In the course of that if you could give us some time to do that, it's not going to be done this spring, it'll be done sometime next year we hope, but what I'd like to propose is that we pass this one now, revisit some of these broader issues as part of that more thorough revision of the *Academic Guide* and wait at least until we finish that before we go in and make more specific changes because I think there will be a number of other changes that will come before the Council as a result of that revision process.

**EISENBERG:** Of course you're right that documents like this require revision and then further revision and so on, but so far, unless I've missed something, only one problem, although a major one was brought up, could that one problem be addressed by adding to 10 under 2.1.A maybe even in parenthesis "(consultative authority only)?" That is what regarding facilities and budgets, does that solve that particular problem adequately for the time being or is there yet more that needs to be done than just that very simple addition? I'm asking anybody.

**GIERYN:** I knew I should have brought the *Guide* with me, but with all the revisions that we're in the middle of making it's a rather bulky thing, but I should have brought it. This isn't the only one, Paul. There are others. So...

**EISENBERG:** Okay, so if we patched here there would still be further problems, so it's hardly worth doing it.

**HANSON:** Other comments? Julie?

**BOBAY:** I have one more. This one I'll speak in favor of. (laughter) You know Article 4 "Meetings of the Faculty;" I will say that with our current constitution when we tried to hold a meeting of the faculty, which was a rather historic event many of you might remember several years ago, we found that we could not define or count the faculty based on the definitions that we had at our disposal and this document really would take care of that. That if we ever had to have a meeting of the faculty and had to know what was a quorum and who was the faculty, this document would do it, so that's a big step forward.

**PRATT:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** Any further discussion?

**MCCORMICK:** Is possible to consider the articles separately within the constitution? I mean there clearly are some elements within the changes that make a great deal of sense, but I will continue to argue though that article two is problematic in that it doesn't define what is consultative, what is legislative. I continue to see that problematically.

**CAPSHAW:** But do you think that we can, you know, solve this problem easily?

**MCCORMICK:** I think it's fairly straightforward in the *Academic Guide* and I think it'd be relatively easy to address and identify the authority of the faculty in what's consultative and what's legislative. It is pretty well spelled out in that.

**CAPSHAW:** Well, I still feel that the language really does help a little bit and the issue between the legislative and consultative authority is something that's an open question in this document and so, you know, I guess I would be in favor of passing this document and then, you know, assigning the Constitution and Rules Committee for next year to investigate that in consultation with Tom and other folks.

**HANSON:** Any other views on it? Lisa, do you want to speak to that?

**PRATT:** I'm just going to support what Jim has said because we really found ourselves having a difficult time consulting widely enough to really sort out the handful of problems that we tackled and although I would love to think that the difference between budgetary and consultative is fairly straightforward, I fear it is a thorny, thorny issue and if we just tried to make that adjustment right now we'll find ourselves either in conflict or revisiting this yet again next year and I think the effort in the VPFAA office is really finally an effort at the right level to really take us through this in a more complete way if we can just put up with a little, you know, a little inconsistency now, we've got a much better document and we'll expect this to be taken to a more complete conclusion next year.

**HANSON:** Any other discussion? Are you ready for a vote? All in favor? [35] Opposed? Abstentions? [2] Let me get them down. I don't think we're quite at the time for a brief recess, so let's take up the GPSO-SAAAC Resolutions. Bryan and Nick?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7: GPSO – SAAAC RESOLUTIONS**

**HORNE:** Thank you. All three of these resolutions were items which we visited the last time we were here. They have all been revised a little bit, some of them more than others in the format in which they're presented but they're essentially the same, three of the same, four resolutions from the last time we were here. The first one has to do with the new committee that's the

student academic appointee stipends. The second two, in my mind at least, are tied together. One of them is registration information and the bursar fees, registration information and how it is presented and when it is presented, before the semester starts and before registration starts so that students have to ability to make informed decisions for their classes. This also on the back page of that one has an appendix so you can see that sprung out of a vote that the BFC took in 1995. So we created that to kind of address the issues that come to student information at the beginning of the registration process. The drop and add fees resolution again comes from the GPSO.

If you'll turn to the back page of that, that is the GPSO resolution that is revised from the last meeting. Nick Clark went back and reworked that and it is approved. It did not show at the bottom, I didn't have that information at the time, but it was approved in February (inaudible). So the new version has been approved by the GPSO and that basically reflects concerns that were brought up in the last meeting that we had here. So the way I see it the registration and information bursar fees resolution is the information to the students at the beginning of the process and the drop/add fees is kind of at the end of the process so that if they can make a change later on because they didn't have information, then it would address that in that way.

Personally I would like to take up the creation of the new committee for student academic appointee stipends and at the last meeting we talked about this in principle and Herb Terry suggested that we come up with more specifics about when it would meet, and who would appoint different members and so the GPSO actually amended their resolution to address that so then I put it in this format that would be these five points. "The BFC shall create a committee in the Fall of 2009 and therefore every other year to review salaries that are paid to student academic appointees at Indiana University and it will be known as the SAA Salary committee. Number 2, the committee shall be organized by the provost and chaired by the dean of the University Graduate School and should consist of administrators, faculty members, and graduate professional students from each school that awards SAA fellowships. Three, the administrators shall be the dean of each relevant school or his or her designated representative. Faculty members should be appointed by the nominating committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council. The graduate professional students shall be appointed by the GPSO and that committee would meet under the, chair by the dean of the graduate school, organized by the provost in the fall and would meet every other year." As I understand it, it has, I think we mentioned it at the last meeting, it has the idea of this, not this resolution itself, but the idea of this has already been approved by Dean Wimbush and the provost and they're pretty much lending their support to it. Do you have any questions about that particular one?

**MCCORMICK:** Yeah, it's just in terms of detail. The terminology, stipend, salary and fellowship is used somewhat interchangeably throughout this thing. It strikes me that it should be consistent. Are these variously known as stipends, salaries and fellowships? Or are we really talking about – at least my familiarity is that it is a stipend.

**HORNE:** Honestly, I don't know that I can answer you. I'm using them fairly interchangeably but the term with which I'm most comfortable is stipend as well. I personally would be comfortable just adding stipend everywhere.

**WATSON:** Yeah, I think typically fellowship implies there's no employment associated with it and so for tax purposes I think you want to be very careful about not conflating those two.

**MCCORMICK:** As a friendly amendment, could it be consistent with SAA stipend?

**TERRY:** (inaudible)

**HORNE:** Oh, yes thanks.

**HANSON:** Other comments?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** Would the committee be mandated with only looking at the stipend portion of it, or if people are getting paid for their hours of teaching for example, or would they also review tuition and fee remissions and benefits packages and basically the whole appointment.

**HORNE:** Well I believe, again I think would certainly like Nick to weigh in on this since this come from the GPSO. My understanding is, my initial reaction to that question is that tuition remission and things like that are fairly standard but that, you know, stipends are not. So I don't know that they would weigh in on that or consider that, but the point would be to make sure that from school to school, department to department around the university and then also within a certain school. I represent the School of Music for instance; it doesn't do us any good in a competitive way to see what our music AI's are paid compared to Ohio State's because Ohio State is not really a competitor of ours. So we would need to look at Michigan, Eastman and each field would have their own competitors. So I believe what the intent is to look at the stipend only in comparison to make sure that we're treating the students fairly but also to make sure that we are using it in the most efficient way as far as recruiting for them, but as far as the other things, I believe and I'm not sure that I'm right about that, but I believe that fee remissions and things like that, I believe those are more standardized throughout the university and I don't believe their intent was to address every issue of that, but I would surely like him to respond.

**CLARK:** Yeah, that's right. There is a committee already that addresses the benefits and budgetary affairs from the BFC is represented on it and different campus constituencies so that's already currently covered and that's organized by the provost's office and human resources. I do believe the tuition remission is pretty standard so this would be focused on stipends.

**CAPSHAW:** I'm wondering, what's your thought about how big the committee's going to be? Is that something just the provost has authority over?

**HORNE:** Well, according to this wording it would be fairly large but it would be fixed. I mean there would be an administrator, either the dean, him or herself or an appointed member, you know, a representative of the dean and, you know, a faculty member from each, I believe the way it reads, from each school that awards these and then a student and they would come from different populations. So it would be, you know, a fixed network.

**CLARK:** I mean obviously one of the ideas that we have behind it is that the committee would make a recommendation for some sort of minimum pay threshold and I think that's emphasized much more in the GPSO resolution. But, to the extent that that is a possibility, the idea is that, yeah, it would be large committee but you would obviously want representation from all the different schools since everyone would be subject to that sort of threshold.

**TERRY:** Just to clarify something for the record and Brian in your interpretation of point 2, is it basically each school that awards SAA Fellowships would have three representatives on this committee, one administrative, one faculty member, and one graduate or professional student? Is that correct?

**HORNE:** That is my understanding because that was my understanding of what came to me from the GPSO, I would concur.

**TERRY:** So the committee size would be three times whatever normal schools we have on the Bloomington campus to fit that definition, plus the dean of the University Graduate School as an additional member, as chair?

**HORNE:** Yes.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? Are you ready to vote on this?

**R. ARNOLD:** Are we voting on the actual appendix? Are we voting on this entire document or are we voting on the first page?

**HORNE:** No, no, no. The appendix was what came to the Student Academic Appointee Affairs committee from the GPSO and I wanted you to have that but that isn't necessarily the correct format for action to be taken in here; so I wrote the first page as essentially a summary, you know, representing what the GPSO wanted, so...

**R. ARNOLD:** And so our vote is...

**HORNE:** Our vote is on the first page only, yes.

**HORNE:** With the exception of course that any time you see any word other than "stipend" you replace it with "stipend." (laughter)

**HANSON:** You mean any other word that roughly means stipend.

**HORNE:** Right, like my name for instance still is my name. (laughter)

**HANSON:** Any others?

**TERRY:** In point two, is “fellowships” also the correct word to use? At least in my department we sharply distinguish between fellowships and other kinds of academic appointee positions. Our AI’s for example aren’t recipients of fellowships; they’re recipients of AI appointments.

**HORNE:** Well, I think at this time that would already be changed to stipends.

**TERRY:** So “fellowships” as well as “salaries” has been changed to “stipends?”

**HORNE:** Yes.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Christine?

**FARRIS:** I have a question about the last paragraph of the appendix. How would you identify relevant faculty representation? Some faculty would be very aware of AI teaching students, others might not.

**HORNE:** Well, that would be again, you’re talking about in the appendix?

**FARRIS:** Yes.

**HORNE:** And in the appendix for, I don’t choose to be disrespectful, but the appendix is what created the first page but it is essentially a moot point now; who is relevant is going to be the dean of the school is going to appoint the administrative representative, the nominating committee of this body will nominate the relevant faculty and the GPSO will do the students. So...

**FARRIS:** Alright, well define relevant then?

**HORNE:** Well, the nominating committee of this body will decide that. It doesn’t say relevant in this action, and we’re only passing this action. I do want to make one other change though and that would be because I suggested a name that it was the “SAA Salary Committee” and so that of course, the name is fundamental and it will of course have to be changed to “SAA Stipend Committee “as well.

**CLARK:** One amendment I might suggest just because I don’t think it’s explicit in the summary and I didn’t catch this earlier, but you know, if the purpose, at least what the GPSO would hope

for the purpose of the committee to be is to establish a minimum pay threshold. And that might be very low, it might not change what the current minimum threshold is. That's up to the committee, but right now it doesn't really task the committee with something so I might suggest an amendment in which we ask for the committee to establish a minimum threshold across the university for SAA stipends when it meets every other year.

**HANSON:** Shall we accept that as an amendment?

**HORNE:** Yes. Do you happen to have specific wording by any chance you want to suggest?

**CLARK:** Yeah, I would say this would go in the first paragraph; where it says "and thereafter every other year to review salaries that are paid to the student academic appointees at Indiana University and to make recommendations on the minimum pay threshold for SAA stipends."

**CAPSEW:** You used the word "salary."

**CLARK:** "Stipend." (laughter)

**HORNE:** I'm sorry, "and to make recommendations...?"

**CLARK:** "...on the minimum pay threshold for SAA stipends."

**HANSON:** Lisa?

**PRATT:** I'm a little bit concerned about placing this nominating, this appointing process on the nominating committee of the BFC. I mean the nominating committee is a relatively small group of people who might or might not really know somebody in every single school. This is going to be extremely difficult to get through the Nom Com which is already struggling to keep up with nominations for various reviews. I'm worried about this and I don't know what the alternative is, but I don't think we can put this burden on the Nom Com.

**HORNE:** Well, actually, if I may respond to that, I think there's an easy alternative and that's to have the dean of the school appoint them. It just concerned me that if the dean is already being a representative and or his designate and then designates a faculty member as well that that's, you know, two thirds of the representation right there is basically from the administrative and that would remove a little bit of (inaudible) I think it could be done that way I think very easily. I'm just not sure that's what the GPSO wanted nor what we thought would be best.

**MCCORMICK:** Is it possible to (inaudible) the unit faculty governance bodies with the nominating?

**HANSON:** Any other comments?

**TERRY:** If I may weigh in on that a little bit, this Council requires every school to have a policy committee. It's not clear that every school actually has a policy committee despite that fact that we require them to have one. It might be a good idea to indicate that these people are supposed to be appointed by the policy committees of those schools.

**HORNE:** So I would then change then number four to "the faculty members shall be appointed by the faculty governance bodies of each school."

**PRATT:** I think you need to use "the policy," because that is the wording that's in other documents.

**FARRIS:** Well I'm certainly in favor of anything that would raise those stipends, I'm just curious why this is not some way connected to a review of conditions of the work that might vary considerably from department to department for AI's. How much teaching, what sort of teaching responsibilities...

**CLARK:** Well, we wanted to leave it fairly open ended for the committee to, I mean, every time we sort of wandered into specifics of how things should be considered, what we were advised from all quarters; students, faculty and administration, was that, you know, the conditions for that are going to vary from school to school and as Professor Horne pointed out for instance with the School of Music, if you're drawing comparison on what graduate students are getting in that school, you know, in terms of stipends for what they're doing, you know, the comparisons to other institutions are going to be very different than for the College for instance, and so we wanted to leave it fairly open what the considerations were for the committee to discuss. Where there would be broad representation from all the schools and everyone could say 'well, these are the considerations we're taking into consideration when we do this,' so that's the reason why it's left open like that.

**FARRIS:** Aren't you going to need to gather that information though? That this faculty representative may not know that, unless there's a mechanism for gathering?

**CLARK:** In the GPSO resolution we tasked the committee with gathering information. Although again, that's not made explicit in the summary that the BFC is voting on, I think that's pretty clearly in the task of the Graduate School and the GPSO and the faculty and the committee itself to get that information as part of this.

**GROTH:** So I really support competitive stipends for graduate students, certainly. But I'm a little worried about what the outcome of this committee will be as I think about it from the responsibility center that you may go to. If you're a unit that pays high stipends then that person will go to the committee but they're already being competitive. They're not trying to be competitive on campus, they're trying to be competitive with their peer institutions elsewhere in the country and the world. If you set a minimum that's above what certain graduate students are being paid, that's great. The net result of that will probably be fewer graduate students though. Is that something that was discussed by GPSO?

**CLARK:** That's a discussion that we've had and that I know has come up around the salaries issue in general and I see your point. I think there is a possible tradeoff there, but again I don't want to push everything off on the committee if it is in fact eventually convened, but I think that's something the committee should take into consideration. And I'd say personally, if we're talking about raising the minimum pay threshold; I know that the College of Arts and Sciences just did it for instance and they by far have the most AI's and they just made the effort to raise it to \$11,000 dollars as the minimum for their students and I don't believe that that affected the number of students they were able to enroll. I could be wrong about that. So, I think when the committee's having that sort of a discussion, if they're talking about what a minimum threshold would be that would be appropriate that's certainly something that would come up and would be taken into account and I'm assuming that that is something that has been taken into account when we've seen similar actions like this at the different units.

**HORNE:** If I may so too, I may be somewhat idealistic about this, but I don't share the concern I think that I inferred from your statement there. If you are from a unit that already pays above that I don't think that the action, that that unit would be bound by this committee that they would have to lower it. I think that there's a reason why you already, what some unit or another would already pay what is perceived to be higher because they need to in the marketplace and I don't think any action of this committee would motivate them to lower it. As far as at the lower end, I think sometimes we're just awaiting some reason to do that with accreditation, not in this issue but in other areas, with accreditation or something so that you just never get around to upgrading a certain building but then the accreditation for that department is in trouble and so, by golly, they find a way to do it and I think this might be a good way to kind of motivate units that are on the lower end. I don't really worry that it would be that there were fewer graduate students. I think they would find a way to do it and probably wouldn't because they wouldn't see themselves as being able to operate with any fewer stipends. So, I might be very idealistic about it but I don't share those concerns.

**REILLY:** I share that idealism in that I think since it's a minimum threshold that we're talking about here is basically to get our graduate students above starvation level because some of the graduate students in our department until last year were earning \$8500 dollars a year and I think we can all agree that it's not fair to ask students to live on that. So if it means that there's one fewer graduate student in a unit just to bring people above that really pathetic level of pay, it might be a sacrifice that we're willing to make. So I think that that as a mandate is probably a good one.

**HANSON:** Any other discussion. Alright, ready to vote on this? Do you want to run back through some of the changes?

**HORNE:** Essentially, I believe that at all instances, any word that is "salary" or "fellowship" or anything would all be changed to "stipend." Point number one would read, essentially, "The BFC shall create a committee in the fall of 2009 and thereafter, every other year to review stipends that are paid to student academic appointees at Indiana University to be known as the

SAA Stipend Committee and to make recommendations for a minimum pay threshold for student academic appointees.” Number 2 would just end with the word “stipends” instead of “fellowships.” Number 4 would change to the “Faculty members shall be appointed by the faculty policy committee of each school.” I believe that covers the changes.

**HANSON:** All set? All in favor? [37] All opposed? [1] Abstentions? Motion passes. I guess, we should take a brief break now and then go back to the other items in number seven?

**HORNE:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Very briefly...

### **BRIEF RECESS**

### **AGENDA ITEM #7: GPSO – SAAAC RESOLUTIONS (CONT.)**

**HANSON:** Let’s get back to the agenda, although, Tom located something he would like to read into the record for this meeting.

**GIERYN:** Well, if I thought that it was in the *Academic Guide* I would have saved my time; it’s not in the *Academic Guide*, this is the issue of where consultative and legislative functions of the faculty are assigned. And, in fact, so you probably were remembering, as I discovered, the *Academic Handbook*, which supersedes the policy that we’re actually working on. On page 32 of the *Academic Handbook*, the legislative authority and consultative authority of the faculty is clearly separated, and it’s not just budget it’s also physical resources, faculty compensation and benefits, and establishment of administrative offices. So there’s a set of things that the faculty only have consultative authority over and that’s spelled out. So we’ve got the document which would supersede whatever is in the Bloomington Faculty Council – sorry, the Faculty Constitution for Bloomington. And it’s right here if anyone would like to read it (laughter)—it only took me fifteen minutes to find it.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Tom. I think it does underscore though our need though to get our document cleaned up. Thank you.

**HORNE:** Well we have remaining then two resolutions, which again in my estimation are tied together. One of them would have to do with the dissemination of information before registration—stemming from action that was taken by the BFC in 1995. In my introduction to this at the last meeting, I summarized it and the way I see it is that there was a mandate to the BFC in 1995 to stabilize the course schedule and they took certain actions, and the actions that were to kind of motivate students to get their schedules done and in place—those have taken and it works. But they were not really—the actions that were taken to motivate faculty to get information out sooner and to be as informative as it should be has not necessarily taken place and we wanted to try to address that. So if you’ll turn to the second page of that, there are five points. Those five points are essentially the same five points that were on the first version of

this. However, the really important point—the teeth of it, so to speak—was point number five. And what I had originally said was that those fees would be billed to the department, and both the bursar and Provost Hanson pointed out to me that that is not a viable solution—that is not workable. So I reworded this, so if you’ll read number five that is really the only change to this document and that is: “if a course does not meet during the first week of classes and/or the course syllabus, grading summary and rough schedule of assignments, tests etc... is not available to students before the end of the first week of classes, the drop/add fees and penalties to the student for making changes in his or her schedule should be paid by the bursar upon confirmation by the home department.” Excuse me, that should be “waived” (laughter) not “paid”—Susan would just write a check for each one (laughter). Excuse me, should be “waived” and I’m really grateful to all my committee members for letting me get up here without having pointed that out. (more laughter) So, “should be waived by the Bursar upon confirmation by the home department.” So that students, if again, they did not have the registration information available to them as we have said since 1995 they would, then they would not be charged for making changes to their schedule. That’s that first one.

Now the second one, the drop/add fees for graduate students, as we discussed last time, this comes from a GPSO resolution. The version you see here on number two was revised after by Nick and the GPSO after comments from the last meeting. So that what you see as appendix on page two on the back part of that, that is a revised version based on those comments. And then the action that the SAAAC is presenting are the two paragraphs at the bottom of page one. And again I would like to say that the Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee is split on this at least at this point. I asked them again after getting the revised version and I have still essentially the same answer that one faculty member is for it, the rest of them are against this action. But the students are all for it, with the exception of one who is against it. So it’s mixed, but I did not want to just table it. I wanted to present it to the BFC and let the BFC, you know, talk through this. So this essentially – if you just cut to the chase at the end of this—this would essentially keep administrative penalties in place, a \$19 charge or an \$8 charge or whatever those are, for making changes. But the part that would be levied, that is summarized on page two in Nick’s GPSO resolution, the first part, where a non-resident graduate student enrolled in twelve credit hours would be charged \$874 for switching from one four credit class. That substantial penalty would not take place until the beginning of the third week, so they would have two full weeks to make changes and then that penalty would not kick in until the third week. So, that’s what we’re essentially doing. Now my understanding is I don’t think the BFC can make a vote and mandate that that happen. What we essentially are saying is we would like the university, the bursar, the University Faculty Council, you know, if we make a positive vote on this, what we’re saying is we want it to go to the next steps to see what would be done—the implications financial and otherwise—and we would like to move in this direction. Because I don’t believe that we have the authority, but you can correct me on that. I don’t believe we have the authority to vote on this and just say ‘this is now going to happen.’ What we would be saying is essentially a sense of the Senate, this is what we think the GPSO is right, and we would like this to move forward— and have any investigation into the financial implications and registration implications and so forth happen at that point.

**CLARK:** Just very briefly, and again it's only the appendix, so I'm not sure how terribly relevant it is, but we did change the resolution substantially to reflect several suggestions from the first reading. So for instance, you know, I know one of the points made by the registrar was that there were general principles stated that could later be brought up as a foundation for, you know, rolling back the fees even more. So what we have tried to do in this resolution is roll back arguments about, you know, what students need in terms of the time to decide on their appropriate course schedule and instead just focus on the fact that there's this second penalty being imposed on top of the first. And that's really what we're focused on, not the idea that fees are being imposed, but this specific second fee that's being imposed on a specific constituency. We also, on a suggestion from the University Graduate School, have made clear that any change should apply only to those graduate students, or those students, subject to this fee on the IUB campus. So this wouldn't entail a system-wide change; we're only focused on basically giving a similar exemption to graduate students at IUB that undergraduates, law students, and MBA students already receive. And then along those lines in our resolution we tried to allow for some flexibility because there were different ideas that were suggested to me after the meeting, such as, maybe instead of giving a second week, we could roll back the penalty. So in our resolution we in essence asked the Faculty Council to come up with some solution. We suggest either rolling back the penalty so they don't take effect until the third week or reducing the actual fee that's imposed. In the actual BFC resolution that's coming from the SAAAC, they keep the original suggestion that we make, which is that graduate students should have two weeks to make changes without being subject to this. We certainly would agree with that policy recommendation, but it was suggested to us at the last meeting that we might try to open it up for other solutions so that's what we did in the resolution.

**HANSON:** Questions or discussion? Steve.

**BURNS:** Does this second fee have an official name?

**HORNE:** Roland?

**COTE:** I think we get confused when we talk about fees. What we're talking about here is technically not really a fee. We're talking about the refund schedule. The student is penalized during the second week because they don't get a hundred percent refund from the dropped course. They get a seventy-five percent refund from the dropped course. Which results, when you add another course at the same time, you have to kick in that extra twenty-five percent that you lost for the drop. It's not a fine, it's not a penalty—it's, well, it is a penalty—it's the nature of the refund, which is universal. The first week is a hundred percent, and then the course is not a matter of record on the transcript. The second week you get seventy-five percent back; the course is a matter of record with a 'W' if you drop. The third week you get fifty percent back, the fourth week twenty-five percent. Then after that, you get nothing, which means, anything you add, you have to kick in the extra twenty-five percent, fifty, or seventy-five. So I wouldn't call it a fine or a special fee. It's not a fee, it's not a fine. It's the nature of the refund schedule. Does that explain what this is?

**WATSON:** Except that refund schedule doesn't apply to those groups of people that are paying just a uniform amount.

**COTE:** Yes it does.

**WATSON:** It does?

**COTE:** It does, it can. The student who is enrolled in twelve hours—the flat-fee student like an undergraduate, a typical undergraduate—enrolled in fourteen hours, they drop three and add three, they're still at fourteen hours which keeps them within the twelve to seventeen hour range of the flat fee. The graduate student who's in twelve hours has a problem because there is no range. That's the issue—that's why this is a problem. They drop from twelve hours down—now, it's true if a graduate student is enrolled in nine hours and they drop and add, the add may be covered. That extra twenty-five percent may be covered by their fee remission because they weren't enrolled in twelve to begin with. It gets complicated.

**WATSON:** It seems to me it's a technicality.

**COTE:** Well the flat fee is a radically different structure than a for credit hour fee. And an AI is in a very different position than a non-AI graduate student or a non-subsidized student or a student without any kind of fee remission.

**CLARK:** It is safe to call it a financial penalty though, right?

**COTE:** It's fine, that's okay. It is a penalty – I mean you can view it as a penalty. It is the penalty for dropping during the second week or the third week. But it's not a special fee. It's not a fee.

**HORNE:** May I ask actually Roland or anyone else who knows the answer, one of my concerns about this, because I again have mixed feelings about this resolution, I wanted to bring it before the whole body, but personally I have mixed feelings about it. And one of them is, they're being very clear that this should only apply to these populations on this campus, but I don't know that that's—since you have said that it's fixed—I'm not sure that that's possible. Would we be allowed to make that exception for our students when the whole statewide essentially operates the same?

**COTE:** Fees are different on each campus. For example, there isn't a flat fee at other campuses for undergraduates. I mean it's not unusual—I think we have that prerogative. The difficulty, however, is that, you know, this penalty doesn't apply to everybody— I mean to all graduate students even.

**HORNE:** That's one of the points they're making.

**COTE:** Because if you are a student with a fee remission enrolled in nine hours, drop three and add three, you're fee remission will generally cover twelve hours. So if you drop three, add three, then the twenty-five percent can come off the remaining three hours that you're not enrolled in. If you are not, if you don't have a fee remission, then you're out of luck whether you're enrolled in three, six, nine, or twelve.

**CLARK:** But I would say though, my impression is most of us, we have to complete so many credit hours to get our PhD, and we have to do it within the amount of time that we have funding. So more often than not, at least within the college as I've seen it, we're going to be encouraged to register for the full twelve hours even if some of them are dissertation credits.

**COTE:** That's correct, that's correct. I mean basically if you only need six hours of coursework, you're going to take the other six hours as dissertation hours. It's typical.

**WATSON:** Well it still strikes me that if you're paying fees for services—if you're taking twelve hours, drop three, pick up three, you're still just taking twelve hours of services from the university. So what you're paying for is the administrative cost...

**COTE:** What if you're taking twelve and you decide to wait until the eighth week to drop three and add three? Is that still the same?

**WATSON:** Well I don't know, but you'd be in big trouble with the one you picked up. (laughter)

**COTE:** That's correct! You may be in the second week as well, but there are federal requirements that force you to have a refund schedule. You need to have a refund schedule, and this has to do with financial aid and a whole bunch of other issues. I am not, by the way, the most articulate person on this subject. The bursar would be a better person to have here.

**WATSON:** But you are able to adjust the fee schedule, if we were to move it by a week that would be...?

**COTE:** That would require some programming, require some effort. We haven't really measured that effort. That's part of, I think, what Brian is trying to do today is get a general sense from the group; Do you believe this is a good idea? Should we then figure out what it will cost in order to accommodate the change? And what the fiscal/financial implications of this are. That's all.

**HORNE:** Actually, I would also like to know, though I don't know how one would measure it, but you would be the one to do it. I am concerned about the stability of the course schedule in the second week. And when you met with the committee, you were very convincing, you and Susan both, about why we needed not necessarily this refund schedule, but why we needed those fees and the difference between students making changes on Friday of the first week compared to Monday of the second week and how significant that is. And I would like to know

if there's a way to do it— you know I'd like to have an advanced sense of what the effect on the schedule would be.

**COTE:** We can't predict what the graduate students will do, and we couldn't predict what the undergraduates would do if we extended the 100% refund period not on the record an additional week. We can't really predict that. We do know now that the beginning of the second week of classes, there is very little activity, particularly when you compare it to the drop/add activity during the first week of classes, I mean it drops significantly during the second week. We know that. We also know that in past discussions in this particular forum, there was a lot of concern expressed about the instability of the first week of classes and what can we do to prevent drop and add. That's when some of these other policies went into effect and particularly the concept of putting class descriptions out there, syllabi out there and more information out there in advance. We know that that happened and that did have an effect. That was back in the day when 45% of classes turned over during the first week of classes. We are down now to 30% or so, class enrollments turning over and that – that's good. (laughter)

**MEGLEMRE:** I actually wanted to point out, I said it on the previous meeting that this was discussed and the registrar showed the numbers. I would note that the numbers dropped in the second week for undergraduate and graduate students which means that the smaller penalty that I don't get is that it is effectively doing that job so I don't think we should necessarily rely on this penalty fulfilling that purpose since we're already seeing a drop off for both populations, even one population that doesn't incur the 25% retention of the tuition.

**COTE:** Well, that's right.

**WATSON:** That was really wise.

**MCCORMICK:** As this appears to be an extension of the policy created in 1995 that came from the Educational Policies Committee, two of the points that I would add were, as I look at appendix one on the very back, the idea is that the incentives and penalties experienced by students should be an appropriate level to encourage registration to lead to a first stable week and should not be unduly harsh. I think there are a couple things that are worth considering.

**HORNE:** I'm sorry, which resolution?

**MCCORMICK:** Appendix one, on the back of circular B-19.

**HORNE:** Okay, thank you.

**MCCORMICK:** Reading from the second full paragraph, because this was the policy that was approved in – this was the resolution approved in '95, and so to me the question is; is the current system of penalties unduly harsh? Number one. And then I would drop down to the third of the resolution that identifies a review of programming change fees, evaluating its

fairness and effectiveness. To me, I mean, is that what we're discussing here, are the current penalties unduly harsh, is this in fact a fair and effective policy at this point?

**HORNE:** I think that's what we have to decide. I think that the first set of fees, I can't quote, but as I understand them from making the changes, I don't think those are all that significant, but I do think if you go from Friday afternoon to Monday morning and that costs you \$800 dollars, I could make, you know, a case that yeah, that perhaps is unduly harsh. My concern, personally I am still not necessarily in favor of this, because I don't want what happens now finally on this big Monday of the second week of classes to be postponed, so the question to me is the point that Amanda Meglemre just made is; are the other fees, the administrative fees, enough to keep everything stable? While we change the refund schedule, so that if that were not longer the case, would the schedule still be stabilized on the end of Monday that second week? But to me the part that concerns me more also from that package from which you're reading is point number 2, because I believe that's the part – it seems to me that in 1995, this body took steps to both address the fees that would motivate students and then motivating faculty. The student part has been in place and the faculty part has not been in place. It may be by and large, but there's enough anecdotal evidence to me at least, as I've gone through this process, that some faculty are just not doing that. That's why I originally said in my point that any late fees should be paid by the department, because you know I think that department chairs need to find a way to motivate even their tenured faculty to honor what we have been trying to do or what we've said we would do for fourteen years and we're not.

**MCCORMICK:** And just for clarification, this policy from the Educational Policies Committee has affected all students on this campus, but the penalty currently appears to have the greatest impact on only those graduate students, or undergraduate students I presume, who are not covered under the flat fee.

**HORNE:** I believe that's correct, and you know to me whether, well, you say is this unduly harsh or not? I think that's what this body has to decide. That's one of the decisions to make. But to me if we change this policy I'm a little concerned about the stability of the schedule so I don't know where exactly I would vote on how we should proceed with this but I, you know, when you read that first paragraph that came from the GPSO, I think we must have to say that instance is, yeah, that's a little bit harsh.

**WATSON:** Yeah, I had a question about the turnover rates. You had said they dropped from both graduate students and undergraduates in the second week, but are they at comparable levels?

**COTE:** I'm sorry?

**WATSON:** Are they at comparable levels?

**COTE:** Yes, the drops were percentage wise at comparable levels.

**WATSON:** So they both dropped 30%. Students both graduate and undergraduate are changing during the first week.

**COTE:** Actually, during the first week there was less graduate level changing than, percentage wise, fewer graduate students changed their schedules than undergrads do and when we went to the second week, the levels, the percentage levels, were roughly equivalent. I don't have the numbers with me.

**WATSON:** Okay, that helps, thank you.

**HORNE:** If I may, just before anybody else makes another comment, to clarify the first point that was made. Is there a name for this? You can refer to it as the refund schedule. In the second paragraph on page one, circular B-20, the last paragraph of the resolution; in the third line, would you add please that "this body recommends that the refund schedule policy be changed to allow students..." and that I hope will clarify. Do you see that?

**COTE:** Yeah.

**TERRY:** Yeah.

**HORNE:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** Any other comments or...?

**BLAHA:** I'm trying to balance out what is harsh for students, and motivating faculty and motivating students and why some of this gets perceived as particularly punitive to students who feel like they really don't deserve it. Nowhere in here have we tried to address faculty members who are out of town and their class doesn't meet in the first week. Those students, you know, if they're getting charged a fee for a service rendered if they drop that class, well that class never met, that's not a service rendered at all. How can they make a decision when there's nobody to talk to and you don't know what's happening in that class if it doesn't meet until the second week? And then you don't have a chance to make that decision until the second week, then that needs to be addressed I think in terms of motivating faculty. A lot of faculty members will meet in the first week of class and then decide they want to change the class to their preferred class schedule time as opposed to the time their department gave to them. Students balancing out TA assignments, other courses, meetings, whatever they've got on their plate can't always adjust when the professor wants to adjust, and that isn't accounted for in something like this, too. I myself had to deal with being told a minimum number of credit hours that I needed to register for by the school. I was fortunate enough to be getting a fellowship from the NSF and after I had registered, word came back from the government I hadn't registered for enough credit hours to receive my fellowship. I had to go back in and register for more. This is also after the fact from receiving wrong information from the university as to what my required minimum number of credit hours were, they're apparently different according to your funding agency. Again that's something that was out of my control

at the time, so there are lots of other factors that I don't know if they need to be taken into consideration in this document, but they do play a role in balancing out what's happening here.

**CLARK:** Those sorts of instances were detailed in the first draft of our resolution and I would say also we took them out simply because that was the suggestion that we not focus on things that number one, might be exceptions, and number two, might establish principles that can be applied at a later point in time to the fees that undergraduates pay and fees that law students pay, so we're not establishing a general principle that says because the system doesn't always work there should be no fees, instead what we're saying is just this refund schedule shouldn't be quite as harsh. And that's the reason why we took out all of those clauses that did address those sorts of exceptions and I also think that the SAAAC resolution takes a large step toward addressing several of those problems in terms of information that's available and what happens if a course doesn't meet and all of that.

**HORNE:** That was again, we did talk about that the first time these issues came up, we talked about specific instances like that and I read an e-mail from a student who had enumerated a number of those instances, and to me that was the genesis of the SAAAC resolution. Just to make sure: to me it seems again back in 1995 we made a decision, I wasn't here but you all made a great decision and inserted this policy, and at least over time faculty have kind of backed away from that and deans to some extent, that they are not meeting the first week or the information that students need is not available and instead of addressing it at the end of that I would prefer to get back to what we decided back in 1995; to, you know, kind of hold people's feet to the fire, myself included, to be sure that information is available in a timely manner and if it is not, then in that instance then students should not be held accountable for those fees, and Susan would write a check to pay for it. (laughter)

**HANSON:** Any other discussion? Randy?

**R. ARNOLD:** In the circular B-19 in the fifth point, it doesn't put a timeline to which the schedule would be waived or whatever, the refund schedule would be waived, it just says that if this happens during the first week, but it doesn't say that the student would have to be finished changing courses by the end of the second week, for example, so I didn't know if that needed to be specified in that part. Because, you know, with the way it's stated it seems like in the fourth week you could change classes and still claim that during the first week this happened and that's why I'm changing in the fourth week of classes.

**COTE:** I think that's going to be part of the analysis that we're going to do, assuming that the spirit of this group says 'yeah, go for it', we will do more analysis. I don't think we want to approach it from a standpoint of this particular group of people or this class of people, we want to change the refund schedule so that the 25% is now the third week, fourth week, fifth week. I'm not sure that's where we want to go. What we probably would end up doing is saying, 'okay, for this class of student, for this group of students' – assuming we can identify them cleanly – 'they'll have 100% refund throughout the first two weeks, and 50% in the third week

and 75% in the fourth week and basically just extend the 100% by one week and leave the rest the way it is.'

**R. ARNOLD:** I guess another question about that, is there currently an appeal process for a student?

**COTE:** Yes there is, and in fact one of the reasons all of these reasons were left out, all of these issues and problems that come up were left out, was because there is an appeal process in place where we get documentation from the department, and indeed you know a student's schedule has changed because their teaching schedule had to be changed; well, all of this is taken care of. So there are exception processes, that's why I don't think we should focus on these individual issues as much, because for the most part they are taken care of by exception, as long as it's either a problem with the instructor, a problem with the department, a problem with the organization or the management of the student's workload and schedule, that's not a problem.

**HANSON:** Any questions or comments? How do you want to handle voting on these? Oh, sorry!

**FARRIS:** Number 3 on page 2 of B-19; what is different from 1995 seems to be that you would want faculty to have syllabus and class schedule ready during registration; like pre-registration? And by class schedules do you mean exactly what's being read and discussed and where papers are due and week by week, is that what that means?

**HORNE:** I believe that I took that from...

**COTE:** That's basically from the '95...

**HORNE:** Yeah.

**FARRIS:** That's from '95, too? Because the course description is different...

**COTE:** And the intention was that there be a syllabus out there by the time the student initially registers in April for the Fall.

**FARRIS:** Week by week, day by day?

**COTE:** What do you mean?

**HORNE:** I'm sorry?

**FARRIS:** There's a difference between a course description...

**COTE:** The idea was an adequate description upon which the student can make a decision.

**FARRIS:** Right, but this sounds like syllabus and class schedule, as if it means week by week, in week one, this is going to...

**COTE:** No, no, not at all!

**FARRIS:** Well that's not clear. Generally we often think of a complete syllabus as...

**COTE:** You know, there's another initiative that's currently underway that's also addressing this, and I think that maybe we shouldn't confuse too much of this and – it's a problem, and the reason why students adjust their schedule so much because they don't know what to expect until the first class, but we shouldn't concentrate too much on the content here of what that description would be. I don't think we need to do that, and there's another initiative that's in the works to address that kind of information that should be out there. Fair?

**FARRIS:** Right. That's fine.

**HANSON:** So Brian, how would you like this to...?

**HORNE:** Well, I would like to vote on both of these unless the body feels that they need more time to consider this, and again the drop and add fees, both of these are essentially giving a sense of the senate and a sense of the body to the Bursar essentially. I think particularly with B19. B20 would be, well I'm sorry that's not true, B19 would be for the bursar but also then to motivate faculty and deans or the administrators to make sure that faculty are complying with that a little bit better. B20 again I think is just a sense of this body to say we want to go further which would require that we have a little bit more information as far as the fiscal ramifications and what it would do to the stability of the campus if this body feels they have enough to vote in favor of it or not, you know, but I don't think anything definite would come from that meeting except that people would do some research on it and kind of report back as to what the ramifications would be. If this body, if you all feel like you has a sense of where you are on either of these, then I would like to go ahead and take a vote.

**BURNS:** So can I just be clear, so a vote of yes would mean that we want this to move to a more detailed study?

**HORNE:** I believe on B20 that that's yes, it would mean that there would be a more detailed level of study and unless, you know, we're not mandating that they report back to us, there would be a more detailed level of study and then I guess it would come back if the registrar, if fiscal officers felt that this couldn't be done then it would come back, I assume, to the SAAC committee.

**HANSON:** But the B19 comes though moved and seconded.

**HORNE:** But B19 this would be done, and then again, the point number 5 is the major point to that which would be something that the bursar and then individual department deans would need to be aware of and address. That one would be a definite action.

**DILTS:** Just a point of clarification in B20, this is a resolution to recommend a policy change is it going to say that? It's not resolution we refer to another body, it's a resolution to change a policy, to recommend a change in policy.

**HORNE:** Well that's why I'm saying, if you feel that you have enough information to go ahead and vote on this, then we can do it, but what's going to have to happen is some kind of study, some kind of report by the registrar and various fiscal officers on what the financial ramifications would be for this. I don't think that this body has the authority to just mandate that this happen, but I could be wrong about that but I believe the question is whether we even think that it's a good idea to even pursue it as a policy.

**HANSON:** Should we take a vote first on B19? It comes moved and seconded. All in favor of B19? [32] All opposed? [3] Abstentions? It passes. Alright on B20, what the committee is asking for is a sense of the faculty council. It's open to somebody else to move this resolution and get a second but what the committee is asking for is a sense of the Council to whether or not they'd like to have this studied further, so do you want to vote on it that way?

**HORNE:** I would yes. But again, a 'no' vote would mean it would just not go any further. A 'yes' vote from the body would mean that, you know, this body is saying, 'yes, we think this should be how we pursue it,' and we would have to have additional information about that. If you think it is better to table it, then I can try to compile that information but I don't have an idea yet of whether you even think that it's worth doing and that was my concern.

**HANSON:** So what Brian is moving is the study of the possible implication of this. Is there a second for that?

**EISENBERG:** Yes.

**HANSON:** Any discussion?

**DOWELL:** So these two paragraphs...?

**HANSON:** It's moving that there would be a study of the policy proposed in these two paragraphs.

**MEGLEMRE:** I'm sorry so just to be clear; we're going to decide if there's too much financial effect on the university to change the policy from charging graduate students this much money?

**HORNE:** I don't think it's just the financial, I don't know that that's the crux of the decision. We're going to find out what the financial implications would be if we can, and what the ramifications to the stability of the schedule would be if we can and, you know, at that point we can...

**MEGLEMRE:** Right.

**HORNE:** ...I'm not sure exactly what the step would be. I believe that report would come to me and we'd have to revisit it. But, we are at least saying that this body thinks it is worth going to the next step in discovering that.

**MEGLEMRE:** I guess I'm just a little confused on the next step because I thought the next step would be UFC, for instance.

**HANSON:** Well, it also may be one of those legislative versus consultative issues (inaudible remarks then laughter) the trustees set the fees.

**MEGLEMRE:** Well I'd point out then that our constitution currently allows us to make legislative (inaudible remarks then laughter)

**HANSON:** Right, but it's superseded by the other! But that is the motion that's on the table and it has been seconded that the Faculty Council, well the motion is to consider the possible implication of the recommendation of the GPSO.

**CLARK:** So, I'm sorry to continue clarifying, but the idea then is that a vote for this is saying more or less right, that this may indeed be too harsh in line with what the 1995 EPC statement's saying but we want to know also if it's going to be too expensive or if it's going to affect courses in too dramatic of a fashion. Okay. Sorry.

**HANSON:** And actually explore various fee schedules I take it as well, but there might be some middle ground in removing them. Okay, is everybody clear on that then? (laughter) Clarity is good. What's being moved is, and has been seconded is the proposal that your committee study the possible implementation of what was proposed by the GPSO in circular B20.

**LOSENSKY:** I didn't hear you...

**HANSON:** Didn't hear me? I said, what has been moved and seconded is a motion that the student academic affairs committee study the implementation of the resolution in B20 that was proposed by the GPSO. Right, does everybody think that's what they moved and seconded?

**LOSENSKY:** So we're not voting on this resolution itself. We're tabling this, is that...?

**HANSON:** Right, but what Brian's view is you're expressing support for it as a possible direction, otherwise there would be no reason for them to take the time to study it. That's what they really want guidance on.

**DETHLOFF:** So it's a straw poll.

**HANSON:** Well, sort of, okay?

**EISENBURG:** The motion takes the form of a recommendation, so to support the motion is to support the recommendation that would need further study, right?

**HANSON:** Right. Okay, anybody have any questions? Ready to vote. All in favor? [32] Opposed? [2] Abstentions? [2] It passes. We have just a tiny bit of time for number 8, so thank you, Diane. Do you want to lead us through that?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #8: SAC CHANGES TO THE CODE OF STUDENT RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT PROCEDURES FOR BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS**

**DALLIS:** Okay. I am bringing forward for a first reading some changes that the Student Affairs Committee is proposing to the procedures for Bloomington campus to execute the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*. What I think will be fastest for us is to go through line by line, and I'd like to go through – it isn't as bad as it sounds (laughter) – and I'll go through as quickly as I can and if we end up not having time for discussion, I'm glad to take questions away with me and then come back with those questions and answer them at the next meeting if that makes sense, because we are pressed for time. Okay, you have both documents that there are changes to and then a summary of those proposed changes and I'm just going to go through those changes for you. The spirit of the changes just to give you an overview is to update the language and to clarify some language so that's the intent of these proposed changes.

So, in the student complaint procedures that you have in front of you. On lines 52 through 63, you'll see in the preamble that it's just been reformatted to show sections that are included in part one. So it's just sort of clarification. There are changes proposed on lines 81 through 84 and that's the section complaints against members of the university faculty and administration. This is actually a new item that is intended to clarify that grade appeals are handled by academic fairness committees established by the BFC. This statement was not included in the past because academic fairness committees were established only for the Bloomington campus, but that's okay because this is our document.

On lines 88 through 89 in the "Formal Complaints" section, there is a small change, it's a parenthetical reference to an appropriate section for clarity that's been added. In the same section on "Formal Complaints" on lines 94 through 98, there is a change that, let me see, that is intended to designate actually who has authority to determine whether or not a student have reasonable justification for filing a complaint without first attempting to resolve this complaint

or put the problem informally. It's just really intended to explain who has the authority to define what is a justifiable complaint. As you can imagine, I'm sure that whoever is making the complaint thinks it's justifiable, but it's helpful to identify that there is actually a process to determine if a complaint is justifiable. Okay, and again under "Formal Complaints" on lines 199 through 127, these are small changes they should have gone through last time and they didn't. It just reduces the number of days from 21 days to 14 to avoid unnecessary delays in the process. And then in line 129 under "Formal Complaints," it deletes the initial attempt by the dean of faculties to resolve a complaint and instead directs that formal complaint to the campus grievance commission. Okay, that's the reason for that change.

And lines 131 through 169; this is formal hearing. This moves the procedure for appointment of the grievance commission to Appendix A in the second part under "Student Disciplinary Procedures," that's also where those appendix – they're added as an appendix so it's really a consistency issue. That's why that change is being proposed. On line 286, this is the first of many instances that the Student Affairs Committee is proposing to change the language that refers to the "dean of faculties" to the "provost or designee." In some cases we're also proposing that it's not the office of the Dean of Faculties, but it's the Provost's office that makes a decision or that moves something forward but I'm not going to list all of the times that we suggest that change because there are very many of them. Again, under "Formal Hearing," on lines 316 through 317, that's actually an editorial change just so that the sentence reads more precisely. Moving on to line 349 through 350, it's the section "Action by the Provost;" this change is being recommended to simplify the process. There is some language there that's somewhat confusing, is what the committee felt. Under "Formal Hearing," on lines 372 through 411, this eliminates the appeal to the president. These are the campus procedures and they really don't apply to the entire system, so the final decision, the authority, stops with the provost and that's why the president has been removed. Line 431 adds "gender and gender identity" to update the anti-discrimination clauses. And the last set of changes in this part of the document ends on line 479 through 482, "Complaints Against Student Organizations." This has been recommended to provide guidance for a student who files a complaint against an advisor of a student organization. It just explains what the procedures are for that. Okay, so I'll move on to the student disciplinary procedures if that's okay, we're running out of time.

**HANSON:** We've reached mandatory adjournment, but is there...you went through that so quickly!

**TERRY:** If no one objects, we can continue.

**DALLIS:** And this is the first reading, it's...

**TERRY:** Continue.

**DALLIS:** Okay. There are not as many changes here in the Disciplinary Procedures. If you'll look at line 491, it's again one of many instances where we've recommended that we change that language from "dean of faculties" to "provost or designee." And then under sanctions on lines

969 through 970, the sentence has been changed to more accurately reflect the way that records are handled. The committee has gone back and forth about this but we feel this is the right language to use right now. There are guidelines for how long records are retained and that is what is really happening on this campus I guess, is what we decided. It's hoped that we would always remove records on a very regular schedule but the reality is that there isn't sufficient staff to do this kind of work with regularity that students might want. We might want to talk more about that later but it is a move to more accurately reflect the campus procedures or the practices on this campus in the document. Read that again maybe before the next time and I'm happy to try to answer questions about that. And then the final change is it says in the summary in line 1370 but that's incorrect, it's line 1277. In Appendix A, campus grievance commission procedures are added to the appended sections and that's what that change is and so it's pretty routine. So that's a really fast summary of the changes that we're proposing. Is there time for questions now or later?

**HANSON:** That was very clearly done so I think people should have the changes in mind, and I think we should probably come back to them unless there's something burning right now. Alright, thank you very much Diane and we'll pick it up next time. We're adjourned.

**Meeting adjourned: 5:33PM**