

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 6, 2009
Kelley School of Business CG 1040
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Arnold, Robert Arnové, Purnima Bose, Bruce Burgun, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Angela Courtney, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Thomas Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Mary Gray, Valerie Grim, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Brian Horne, Claudia Johnson, Michael Jolly, Paul Losensky, Jack McCarthy, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Patrice Madura, Valerie Markley, Jenna Morrison, Michael Morrone, Robert Noel, Elizabeth Raff, John Raglin, Ranu Samantrai, Peter SerVaas, Debora Shaw, Richard Shockley, Sonya Stephens, Richard Stryker, Herbert Terry, Vasti Torres, William Wheeler, Sue Whiston, James Wimbush, David Wise

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Rob Aspy (Jennifer Chaffin), Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Eric Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Arthur Bradley, Nicholas Clark, Gregory Demas, Jon Dilts, Julia Fox, Patrick Harbison, Patricia Henderson, Robert F. Jacobs, Padraic Kenney, Jennifer Miller, Diane Reilly, Michael Rushton, Eric Sandweiss, Alex Tanford, Neil Theobald, Maxine Watson

GUESTS: Amanda Ciccarelli (Office of the Provost), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Ann Elsner, Pete Goldsmith (Dean of Students), Anne Massey (AVPFAA), Ted Miller (Emeritus), Erub Rykken (Faculty Council Office), Roger Thompson (VPEM)

Agenda

1. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)
3. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)*
(Provost Hanson and President Dowell)

4. Faculty Annual Reports (30 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs; Anne Massey, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs; Matt Sargent, HRMS Systems Analyst) [DISCUSSION]

5. Enrollment Update (30 minutes)
(Roger Thompson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management) [DISCUSSION]

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or President Dowell 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: bffcoff@indiana.edu

Minutes

HANSON: We know some people may be having difficulty finding their way here, but we thought we should begin and hope for the best. There are no minutes to approve right now so we'll turn to Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM 1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: Right, just a few things to announce here. You'll be receiving an email notice of this soon, but the State of the University Address that was originally scheduled for October 12th is being postponed once again and it will take place as part of our regularly scheduled UFC meeting in the spring. Probably February 23rd, but there'll be an announcement when it's finally finalized.

I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the President's Blue Ribbon Expert Committee on Healthcare Cost Containment has issued their report and it's available on the web in PDF form. If you go to the HR website, they have a link to it and you can also Google, you know -- what did I try out? -- "IU Blue Ribbon Expert," will get you to that. "Healthcare" just muddies up the results as it turns out, so...

Also I wanted to thank the Fringe Benefits Committee for issuing their advisory letter on the IU voluntary benefits program. And if you've missed that, probably the most important point that they brought out was that there will be one more signup period for the long term care insurance that does not require a proof of health or a health exam for the IU employee. Doesn't work for the spouse, but that's an important kind of benefit that will eventually, well, important aspect of the signup, that will eventually disappear. That's going to happen in February or March, so keep that in mind and inform your departments that they may want to

make sure that people are thinking about that so that they're prepared to make a decision about that kind of enrollment in the early spring semester. That's what I've got for now!

AGENDA ITEM 2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: Thanks. I just have a few informational items. As you know, we're nearing the end of a search for a new Dean of the University Libraries. One of the candidates has been on campus the last three days, another one is arriving I believe tonight. Faculty are all encouraged to attend the open meetings. You've all had notifications of those. There are open meetings and open receptions, so please participate.

We have a number of decanal review committees in process. One for Law, which is getting close to winding up. One for Education, which is pretty much in the middle. And one for the Office of Affirmative Action and that's also nearing the end. Three additional decanal reviews are going to begin soon. They're all for core schools; one Journalism, one Kelley School of Business, and the other, SLIS. We still have to finish the appointments to those committees and we're trying to proceed in a kind of informal way absent a policy that mandates a connection with the other campus for these deans, but in each case I've asked for representation nominated from the Indianapolis Faculty Council as I did for the School of Education which is also a core school. Informatics and HPER school deans will be at the point of having a third year survey prepared to be sent around to within the school. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences had that in the spring semester. So there's a lot of review activity going on. Any questions about any of that?

AGENDA ITEM 3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

We also received in advance some questions. One had to do with whether or not the Bloomington Faculty Council would mandate that Labor Day be a day off. The Bloomington Faculty Council contingent to the Calendar Committee is preparing a proposal with Roland Coté and Craig tells me that they have finished that and will be sending it on and then we can convene the Calendar Committee. I believe that they are in favor of having Labor Day as a day off and they are proposing various ways of doing that. And then they may want to move on to look at other elements of the calendar questions.

Second question -- these come in anonymously -- I'll just read it to you. "I was wondering if President McRobbie's new scheme to reward students with tuition cuts for maintaining a B average ever passed through the BFC." No, it didn't. "Was anyone ever consulted on this? Shouldn't this be a faculty concern?" The scheme was concocted in negotiations between the President, the Board of Trustees and the Chief Financial Officer during negotiations with Senator Kenley. And as you probably know from a variety of news reports, what the senator proposed was a hold on all building projects for the university unless something was done about tuition. And I think it was appropriately understood that the tuition rates had been set through the usual, methodical process and they had been through a public vetting and had conformed to the recommendations of the Indiana Commission on Higher Education and were

reasonable for what we needed to maintain our operations. It would also be extremely problematic to say the least if after the process was completely finished and approvals had gone through the usual routes, tuition were rolled back. It was also very, very late in the process as you well know and we were having some concerns about when students could be billed for tuition, how we'd be able to float your first salary paychecks. Those discussions about tuition were not of course just limited to IU. There was concern on the part of the senate budget committee as well about Purdue tuition rates. As I understand it, I was not a part of those discussions either, but as I understand it, there were a number of weeks of negotiation and then some silence from the committee. But there was some understanding that this had to be handled with some finesse. And putting a lot of public statements out might have been counterproductive. I know that Erika has also registered on behalf of the faculty concern about the issues of consultation and has had a response. The short answer to the question is 'no.' There were no consultations. Should issues about how those things be set be a faculty concern? I think probably everybody says yes. Whether or not something could have been done differently in that case I think still is an open question. Do you want to add anything to that?

DOWELL: I can just add that I did mention that concern to the Trustees in my remarks to them on Friday when the UFC co-Secretaries and I got a very nice response from Neil Theobald, kind of explaining what Karen just spoke on and I suggested and I thanked him for, you know, explaining it and then suggested to him a couple of other ways that the faculty or at least some faculty leaders in the areas of budgetary matters or the Agenda Committee could have been consulted in some part of the process in a less than public way. And so, as Karen said, he's been notified of our concern and I think the Budgetary Affairs Committee is also going to be working on seeing what they can do to create better structures or relationships to help increase the level of faculty consultation in the making of high level budget decisions.

HANSON: Any other questions or comments on that? Forgive me if you can't hear me, I have a slight cold (not H1N1) but a slight cold [laughter] and I'm trying to talk forward. But if you can't hear me or my voice is going, because I can hardly hear myself, let me know.

DOWELL: It's okay.

HANSON: A third question: "In light of the national debate over healthcare reform, what impact if any do you expect successfully healthcare reform to have on the university? Costs: increase, decrease, or remain about the same?" You know that is really a question that I think is too speculative for me. It's not within my area of expertise. As Erika has mentioned, the President appointed a blue ribbon health care panel to try to see what we could do about lowering IU's healthcare costs. I think, just as a citizen, I think it's the case that if you had healthcare reform what you're hoping for is a lowering of cost and improvement of care but it may be, as many of the people on that panel have suggested, that the most we can hope for is a slowing of healthcare costs in the near term, of the slope of the increases. We do as an institution spend an enormous amount on healthcare benefits. The total for the IU, is about \$146 million or at least it was a couple—one year—ago. So it's even higher this year; it's about that much,

actually it's more than that, it's that much for our full time employees and their families, but it's another \$7 million for graduate assistants and I think many of us feel that there could be even more coverage of some of our part time employees and so on. And so there are concerns both about the quality of the benefits and about the costs but it is true that it comes out of our budget. So we are looking for ways of slowing the growth in spending at the very least and offering better healthcare and that's part of what that panel was encouraged to do. I'm a little unclear, frankly, on whether or not what's been posted on the web is the final report or a report for comment.

DOWELL: Yeah, I don't know.

HANSON: I think some people on the panel think it is just out for comment now and I know we've sent it around to some of our local providers like the hospital and IMA and so on. So I think if you have comments or suggestions for that panel it is definitely not too late to take a look at that and enter your suggestions or comments. Any other questions or comments?

TERRY: I wasn't able to attend the meeting Friday of the new Trustees' committee on healthcare costs and I'm sure I trust you guys. But I was struck by the resolution or report presented at Friday's meeting. It sounded like they are asking the President to take some very specific actions based on that report among other things to compare us, not just in terms of healthcare offered by universities and colleges and that sort of thing, but by the private sector. Can you give me any further report on what the Trustees are doing with that report?

HANSON: No, that really was the first time that they'd taken it up. And as you know, it was not even all the Trustees taking it up. So I think that things are at a stage where, again, it still makes sense for everybody to comment on that set of proposals. Some of what's being proposed there might depend on other changes that are happening within the state with respect to healthcare anyway: the development of the Indiana Clinic in which we have some hand and the possible merger of Bloomington Hospital and Clarian. I mean there are a lot of things that are taking place that are in some way related to this but not necessarily a consequence of this. So everybody was asking for -- sorry Brian -- everybody is asking for further consideration because it is a big chunk of the budget. Other questions or comments on that?

That leaves one additional question. This comes, well I don't know from whom it comes, but it has to do with law school faculty salary raises. And it's a very long question but I can summarize some of it. 'At a time when IU administration requires nearly all faculty and staff to forgo raises for this year, it's extremely upsetting to see that the law school was exempt from this shared hardship.' The written question suggests that many (it says really "nearly all") tenured law professors received raises. I don't know whether that's true or not, and that some got very large increments, most got something, the questioner says. And apparently the person has pursued it because it says when asked, the associate deans at the school said that these were midyear adjustments coming at the end of the spring semester. 'How can this be? Especially in view of all the messages and alarms coming out about where the state budget is headed?' The questioner cites the policy about active discouragement of midyear salary

increments which is you know, not a policy new this year. That is, indeed, a policy that those are discouraged. The questioner asks for discussion on four points. Incremental salary funds equate to many staff positions from which funds are seized when they become vacant. We can have discussion of that. I just want to be clear about that seizing of funds, because that has come up in a number of contexts and I was unfortunately not able to be present at the first meeting where this might have been talked about, but it is important to remember that those funds are not so much seized as sequestered. The requirement that went out from the CFO at the end of the summer was that any staff position that became vacant would have 50% of its salary lines sequestered. But in the academic units, that money was not pulled back centrally. Only the support unit money which is campus for all campus functions are in a campus pot. All of the schools are still holding the money that was sequestered as they were holding their travel funds. So that point; but this doesn't say they're seized by anybody else, it just says they're seized so that's in some sense right. Is there any connection between these salary raises and the very large tuition increase for law students? I think the answer to that is 'no.' Though I requested clarification from Dean Robel and also the CFO. The salary increases were indeed midyear salary increases and most of them were not granted this year but in 2008. They were funded by the Lilly gift which was specifically for faculty salaries to raise up the profile of the law school; the Lilly gift that came in 2007. So they were not being funded out of the tuition increase that was proposed this year. The law school made a number of arguments about its tuition increase -- we can talk about that separately --but this question has to do with the faculty salary increases. So that is the first point. Those were funded out of that Lilly gift which was specifically intended for that purpose. And this is a rather complicated element of the gift, but the gift, as so many gifts of these sorts, have fallen in with the bad stock market. The value of that gift has fallen as well, and we're finding ways of parceling out the salary increments first by doing cash components and then trying to find those and building those into the base budget for the law school. So they have spread over the process of using that gift over a couple of years. And the schedule for the increases in the faculty salaries really was set, the Dean assures me, in 2008 by a faculty committee which worked out of merit processes as they always do for salary increases. And again, the money was coming from the Lilly Endowment.

So, the other ones have to do with whether or not central administration should lighten up on the rhetoric about shared sacrifice. I don't know what central administration actually has to do with this; it's a law school matter. But the faculty governance groups, presumably within the law school do know about this and now this group knows about it. So that's the answer to that question. I mean are there other...is there any discussion of it or do you need clarification on any of those points?

TERRY: Is it uncommon for us to fund salaries out of non-General Assembly funds?

HANSON: What?

TERRY: Is it uncommon for us to fund salaries or incur any expense from non-appropriated dollars?

HANSON: Yes! Well, no. I shouldn't say that so quickly. We've funded a lot of salaries out of tuition money. So that's not an odd question for the person to ask. I mean a larger portion of our budget now comes from tuition. What is unusual is endowment funding, substantial endowment funding for salaries.

TERRY: And I know that was the purpose of the Lilly gift given back in 2007 and just wanted to know what kind of precedent were setting. Other schools may or may not be able, in the future, to increase salaries by going out and getting endowment monies.

HANSON: Right.

TERRY: And the second question I raise is kind of follow up to that and you may not know the answer. But there was a question we got from another faculty member about whether the endowment is also picking up fringe benefits and will require that you fund the contributions when this goes to base.

HANSON: You mean the law school funds?

TERRY: Yeah, or if that's being somehow or other absorbed by the campus or out of General Assembly money? That's a follow up I got yesterday, so I didn't have a chance to take it to the Council for the next one.

HANSON: I very much doubt that it's being picked up by the campus. I mean, I just really don't see how that could happen.

TERRY: That was what I told the questioner. (Remark inaudible)

HANSON: That, I mean, unless there are, are there other questions about that? That leads to another budget question that came in on Friday and was something that arose from discussion of the Trustee meeting. It says, "At this morning's meeting of the Trustees it became clear that even after financial aid and start up packages for scientists are deducted, there's a lot of money available on Bloomington campus this year due to unbudgeted tuition income." The three questions about it, "The schools have additional expenses due to extra students however getting the funds they need to cover these expenses, hiring additional instructors, adjuncts, etc... What system is going to be used to decide who gets these funds eventually and what are the roles of the President and the Provost in making these decisions?"

That is correct. There was a fair amount of unbudgeted tuition revenue this year, as there was last year, and that is because the size of the class was a little bigger than we had budgeted for. That is a difficult question and it's one of the reasons it comes up for discussion in the Trustees' meetings because in general you do want a budget to show where your expenditures are going and not have a lot of cash you know, I was about to say floating around, but that's not what I should be saying. You don't want to have a lot of cash that it looks as if you haven't planned for. But the truth is this unbudgeted tuition revenue is something that was in some sense

planned for and there has to be some of it in every year to allow us to make some orderly transitions.

The short answer to the questioner's first item is that the money does indeed return to the schools. The tuition revenue returns to the schools in the same way that tuition, other tuition revenue returns to the schools: according to their market share of the student population. So that money is not being held by the central campus. Some of it is indeed going to cover financial aid which is understood in part to have produced the large number of students who bring in the tuition revenue. So some of that money goes into that central service, the financial aid. But the rest is returned to the schools for academic services.

Why should there have been any unbudgeted tuition revenue at all? Because again, we had slightly more students than we budgeted for. Why didn't we budget for more? If you budget for more and don't come in with that number of students you are in deep trouble because then you've already committed to spend money that you do not have; so better to have a little bit of surplus revenue than not enough for your operating budget. The Trustees want to know where that money is going which is why there is a request for the schools to come back with their plans for spending it, but there's no question that they hold that money. They just want the Trustees to be informed about how it's being spent by the schools. And by and large, it is indeed being spent for academic services.

We are, as you know, in a period where we are at a higher number of students than we have ever had in the past. Last year in particular, we budgeted for fewer students, considerably fewer students, than we had and had a larger sum of unbudgeted tuition revenue and every school showed how it was spending that money, both to accommodate the students and to proceed with other priorities each school had. In this year, we did move up the number of students we budgeted for slightly in order to reduce the problem of having too much unbudgeted revenue. And indeed we hit that mark and then went a little beyond it. So it's really the fact that we had about 200 students we didn't -- we budgeted for close to the number we had -- but we had some we didn't budget for. But the money goes back to the schools to educate those students.

I asked Jim Donges when the money was returned to the school. It was returned last week. It all passed back through. It was about \$13,000,000 and again went out proportionately to their market share in the same way tuition revenue is always distributed. \$5,000,000 was held back for financial aid, to meet the financial aid requirements that had been made in the commitments to get those students and then Jim told me, he also held back \$550,000 in case there's a need for student refunds; if students drop out or something, so that the money isn't all already spent by the schools. So, again, the money has all gone out to the schools.

Those were all the questions I received ahead of time; are there any additional questions or any discussion about that? Let me say one other thing about budget as long as I still have the floor, and that is that the target for base budget reductions all went out to the academic units several weeks ago. The targets for the support units went out last week. This is in connection with

cutting in an orderly fashion our base budget in case we can't have it filled after the stimulus money runs out from the state. We have a two year budget which has backfill with stimulus money and in order to prepare for the possibility that we may have a base budget reduction two years hence. These requests to begin an orderly reduction in base budgets went out in the summer.

Some of the units have already met their targets for this year. And one of the things that's important to note publicly is once those targets are met, the request that they sequester half of each vacated support staff or professional staff salary is eliminated so that we are back to a purer RCM environment and they are also allowed to backfill travel at that point once the reductions have been met. And some schools have already met their reductions and some support units have as well. So they're doing well on that.

Any other questions or comments about that? Okay, Faculty Annual Reports. Do you want to talk about that, Tom?

AGENDA ITEM 4: FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTS

GIERYN: Yes, thank you. First I want to invite my colleagues to come on down in front here. Matt Sargent, Akash Shah, and Pat Goodall. And of course this is Anne Massey, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

I want to begin in a kind of odd way and simply admit that no faculty summary report could constantly capture what we do as a faculty member and the full range of your contributions to Indiana University. I think it's important to say that up front. No drop down can possibly capture or measure your imagination; no text box can possibly capture the inspiration that you provide to your students in class or inspiration for colleagues through your scholarly and scientific works. No field can possibly capture your passion for what you do. I think it's important when we talk about the Faculty Annual Report and its move to an online and web based delivery system that the evaluation of you as a faculty member and of all of our colleagues on the Bloomington campus is not exhausted by what is put on these forms which is why, in terms of promotion and tenure decisions, merit reviews, reappointment decisions and so forth, other things are taken into account. Judgments made by us and your peers about those things that you might call intangibles, like inspiration, imagination, persistence and all of that...They're hardly intangibles, they're just not very easy to report and measure. But they are very much a part of what we are as faculty. With that, everything else is just technical details.

Here's what I'd like to do. Talk a little bit about the Faculty Annual Report, what some of its virtues are, why we went to this system. Then turn it over to Anne Massey who will talk a little bit about the governance process and the faculty structure for providing oversight for FAR and then we'll turn it over to Matt Sargent who will pick up some issues pertaining to the administrative use of FAR data, security and access to that information.

'FAR,' as we say in our office, 'online for '09.' It's the Faculty Summary Report put into an online delivery system on the web. It goes into effect for the 2009 calendar year. It will be campus wide. There is no opting out of FAR. There is one school, Education, that has begun with a prior system, an online faculty reporting system. We're negotiating with the School of Education at this point. But for the remainder of the schools and all of the departments, everybody will go to FAR to report their accomplishments for the 2009 calendar year. Yes, FAR replaces the paper forms we've used, some of us for three decades, and more recently the CD reports.

However, all of the familiar, recognizable categories will be there. In other words, when we designed -- I didn't design, these guys designed -- when the design process was being pursued there was an attempt to model FAR on the Faculty Summary Report. So although you'll be doing it on a screen and there will be formatted fields and text boxes and so forth, the substance is pretty much the same. There's a couple of exceptions and I'll mention two of them in just a second. FAR has been three years in the making. This is not a fly-by-night operation. It was thought about well before my occupancy of this office. It has been piloted with a number of units on campus. It has been tested. We've revised in response to your comments and to the data we've collected in terms of people who were willing to be guinea pigs for testing FAR. It is a system that is being rolled out campus-wide this year but by no means is a frozen system. For a lot of reasons that you can easily imagine, continuity is important. We hadn't changed the Faculty Summary Report all that much in 30 years that I've been here. But changes can and will be made. If we really didn't get it right, we will change it whenever possible.

Most of you are in units that have benefitted from training sessions provided by Matt and Akash and Pat. What we started doing early in the summer is setting up a series of meetings where we will train the trainers. So we met with people in each of your units who would be the people that would then train and provide information, answer questions for your colleagues who are going to go take a look at FAR for the first time and go, 'Ah, ah, ah...!' some of them and they will have somebody within your unit, somebody we hope in every unit, is designated as the contact person for providing help. We also have help online, FAQs, and you can phone us or email us. It'll eventually get to Matt, Akash, and Pat for additional help.

Why did we go to this system and what are the advantages? Short list: first, for the first time we have accessible, retrievable, and usable data about your accomplishments. There is a rumor that the old Faculty Summary Reports ended up in the basement of Bryan Hall never to be seen again. It's true. [laughter] Except for, as Pat has reminded me, there is one reason why we actually went in and went through all of them systematically. You can imagine for 2000 faculty that this would take some time. We went through and mined them for one very specific thing and that was the awards and honors just to make sure that we didn't lose track of anybody who had some special noteworthy accomplishment. Otherwise, they collect dust. The reason they collect dust is the reason why a whole lot of things are going from paper to online or digital form: because we couldn't get at it without too much effort. Now, and I'm going to leave this for Matt in just a few minutes, administrators from department chairs to presidents of the

university can now get data on what we do and that's the primary reason to put it online, to have structured formatted fields means that we can get our hands on the data and make use of it.

The second advantage for you. Some of the fields are prepopulated which means you will not as you always had to do, remind yourself of what you taught last spring. That will be prepopulated. For those of you on external funding, you won't need to go back and fill in all the details of the amounts and the start dates. Those will be prefilled for you if it's a funding that is run through the office of contracts and grants. Those are two fields you don't need to do anything about anymore, I mean, right there that should suggest that FAR is an advantage.

Third, you can enter data into FAR all year long. A lot of faculty especially very, very busy faculty who publish tons of papers and sit on hundreds of dissertation committees complain that at the end of the year it's going to take them forever to dump this stuff into FAR. If they would get into the habit of doing this as they get a paper published, a grant comes in, a dissertation is defended, which they will be able to do, they will save time. This hypothetical busy faculty member, and be able in a sense to keep that FAR record running alongside of their CV. In a sense when you adjust your CV, you should adjust FAR, and then at the end of the year you won't have to spend so much time inputting data.

Fifth, we develop this locally. It's a homegrown product. One of the benefits of the enormous investments we make in information technology is that we have some of the best people sitting here, among others, to design these systems for us. This saves us a huge amount of money, it allows us the option, the other as you might guess is to buy it off the shelf. Many other CIC universities are buying a system of faculty productivity records, whatever they call it, off the shelf and when they buy it off the shelf they either have to pay a lot of money to customize it to fit their campus or there's not a good fit. We started because it is homegrown with our system and our own culture and we're able to develop it ourselves. The cost efficiencies of doing it this way are enormous. Updates will be much easier to make so it's an advantage.

Finally, the sustainability lobby is smiling because there is the obvious paperwork reduction if we don't all make copies of everything that we put into FAR. I'd like to now turn it over. I think the best thing would be for us to go through our spiels and then take questions. Anne Massey?

MASSEY: I just wanted to make a couple of comments to make you aware of two committees that are being constituted with regard to FAR. One is a committee that would be consisting of some of the academic associate deans that will be addressing issues from a reporting perspective. That is administrators, department chairs, deans' offices, and so forth; people that are interested in using FAR to pull data out of FAR. FAR in and of itself, and Matt and Akash and so on can speak more to this, but in and of itself FAR doesn't have a lot of reporting right now other than popping up individual faculty reports. To get data reports out, we basically run FAR against other IU systems like IUIE. This committee will work to see if there's anything from within FAR that administrators would like that would make it easy to access and/or how to do

some things running against other systems. So there will be one committee that will be focused on reporting issues.

The second committee that I think will be of interest to the broader faculty is a faculty advisory committee that will speak to issues around usability, how do we make the system more useable for faculty from the inputting perspective. But also importantly, this committee will take up questions around access. So we're getting a number of requests from different constituencies on campus saying, 'Hey, we realize that this data's in FAR. We'd like to be able to mine FAR to pull out this data related to whatever.' We're going to have this faculty advisory group provide some input and some direction with regard to: Does that make sense? Who should have access to FAR data? And some governance issues around that. It's a very early stage, but these are important issues that faculty have questioned. Matt will speak to issues around security, and there is a difference between security and privacy of our data. I think all of us as faculty have some expectations of privacy with regard to our faculty report. And right now currently just like our paper reports, it's the same reporting structure of who will have access to your electronic data but as we get more and more requests for access we need to deal with those requests and determine an appropriate policy around that.

GIERYN: Actually, I should interject that Anne is actually leading the way and will chair those two committees for our office. Matt?

SARGENT: Like he said, I'm Matt Sargent and I'm going to tell you about the application itself today. There's actually three components to the application. There's the worksheet which is the faculty side where you can go in at any time throughout the year, enter your information, generate previews, export copies of it, do what you want to at that point. As Tom mentioned we do populate all the course data from the SIS and any contracts and grants that are in that database. Being that this is a university built in-house system, you know, we're always looking for other areas where we could prepopulate information if it's already out there in another system. It kind of goes back to what Anne mentioned that, you know, easing the year-to-year entry is what we want to really work with with that faculty advisory group just to make it more efficient. Additionally, you don't have to submit any paper copies anymore. They show up where they need to. If you're a split employment faculty, it will go to all those areas. And again, it will go to your department, your school, and the VPFAA. So there's no need to mail those things around anymore.

The second part is the administrative side and that's the review portal. This is kind of built off the current process that most areas have in place. So every department in every school defines who can see reports. That may vary from department to department, from school to school, depending on your culture. Some departments it's strictly the chair and their administrative assistants. Some departments have their merit review committees in there. Like I said, and it is secured that way. No one has access to a department's reports by default. It has to go through the department chair at this point. From the review portal you can look at the report that's been submitted, you can also get at any attachments that the faculty may have made in their worksheet. The attachments for the College of Arts and Sciences, they require a dated CV.

That's one attachment that some people are using. With the attachments you can really define anything you want to and attach it: music, video files, if you're in the music area, those kind of things. So that's the review portal, and as I said it does work up the tree and it is secure so no one has access by default to that. Comments can be made at the department level that are then seen by the school and the VPFAA from within the portal as well.

The third piece we have is our IUIE which is the IU Information Environment. The majority of the information from the Faculty Annual Report goes into the IUIE. I say majority because any time you do enter an activity that you've done, so say you were on a committee, you can make personal comments that are only seen in the review portal but are never aggregated or seen in the data warehouse. So we do provide that sort of secure personal communication area, you know, where you can put your personal thoughts in the report. They're then seen by the reviewers but not someone who's looking at the actual data side of it, so... But the IUIE is secured by the department tree hierarchy just like the review portal is, so if you're set up at Math, you can see Math faculty and that's it. If you're set up at Business you can see all of the School of Business or if you're set up at a department in the School of Business you'll see just that department. Requests for IUIE access does go through a review process. We make sure that you're in the department, that this is something that you're allowed to have, and those sort of things. And no one has access by default. It is set up, again, like the review portal based on how the department functions at this point.

What else did I forget? Like Anne mentioned, we're starting to get questions for outside information requests. We've not given those out yet. They're going to go through these committees. We'll only give out if it's in the best interest of the university and the faculty. And so far, kind of the rule that we're looking at is it will be summary information, no individual faculty level information. So, the IUIE does allow administrators to make reports on their faculty. It does minimize the amount of re-surveying that goes on throughout the university and we've heard this from departments where they may submit their report with all their publications on it and then three months later they get a question: what publications did you do last year? And that may happen a couple times throughout the year. Here, someone from the administrative office could run a report and not re-survey everyone for that kind of information.

And the other thing we're working on with the IUIE is some standard reports that the departments may need. You know, if you want a list of honors and awards to kind of tally up the achievements that your faculty have made that's something that's doable within the IUIE; if you want to look up student engagement to see how you're developing that; information for review committees or surveys. Education uses their system for their NCATE accreditation. You know those are the kind of things that you can use this for. And again, you can use this system once you've been in here for a number of years to do trends. You know; what are the publication trends for my tenured faculty compared to my non-tenured faculty? And really we don't know the extent of reports the departments in schools are going to do because as Tom said, most of the time they end up in a tub or in a filing cabinet. So, you know, that's kind of my quick little five minute spiel on the application itself. I'll turn it back over to Tom.

GIERYN: Before we open it up to questions, two of the changes that we made that you'll notice from last year to FAR. One is that we've created what we refer to as the A-list of awards and honors. It begins with the Nobel Prize and it goes down from there. We're hoping this year, but who knows? That will be a drop down list, this is a relatively small list of awards that covers across academic fields or are generally recognized by national or international scholarly and scientific bodies as the *crème de la crème*. And I've been working with Vic Borden and John Applegate in the president's office to figure out exactly what it is that the university wants to track in terms of very special achievements by faculty. In the past, there was no -- well, there were no drop downs -- but you weren't given a menu. In this case you will be given a menu of those A-list awards, and you'll also have the opportunity, and this is why I bring it up, the opportunity to put down other awards and honors that are not on the A-list. We won't -- I hesitate to call it a B-list, but I -- and these are typically things that are specific to your own discipline which are not going to appear on the A-list so they're very important that we put them down.

The one change that's substantive that is really exciting is an initiative that came out of some work by Vice Provost Sonya Stephens and her office which is a renewed interest and a greater importance attached to undergraduate research experiences. We've heard a call from various student reports up for greater involvement of faculty with undergraduate research activities. And it's pretty clear, despite what I said at the beginning of this report, that one way to get faculty to take more seriously some of the things we do is to ask them to report it on the Faculty Annual Report. So there will be an opportunity for you to indicate not just the courses you're teaching that might have a research involvement, but the full range of experiences, research experiences, that you are bringing to your undergraduate students. This is an example of where, you know, we can teach an old dog some new tricks to reflect the changing priorities of the campus. Questions? Bob?

ARNOVE: Tom, since you mentioned imagination and creativity, I'm just wondering in your office or other university offices, what kind of data runs through in terms of statistical descriptive summaries that will then go to external bodies, whether the legislature or what, and you mentioned awards; can you see some other trending that you would be talking about? Or giving, using electronic data?

GIERYN: I'm going to ask Matt to answer it, too, but a couple that we can think of is just if we needed to retrieve data on, for example, where people are publishing in certain fields to establish sort of the intellectual leadership of the Bloomington faculty, we can pull that out and report it. Journal editorships or offices if you remember a big chunk of the Faculty Summary Report dealt with service. You can pull out officers of prominent academic societies, professional associations, to indicate the extent to which faculty are involved in those activities. I think one area that we need to work on better; the category of service seems to be morphing into something better called "engagement," and represents engagement, not just in university activities but more broadly in the state and beyond. And I think if there's an area where we're not very good at capturing what is increasingly important, I think it's that. That we're not,

we're not doing a terrifically creative job of allowing faculty to report the kind of engagement they have when they serve on committees. It's lumped together under service and it's generally, whether it's local or distant. We might be able to do better in formatting that so that the data would be more easily captured for a report in case somebody or a legislator wanted to do what the faculty is doing for example for state government: serving on committees at the state level, providing reports to state offices. That would be great to be able to pull that out if we could.

SARGENT: I think you covered most of it. The one that struck me is, you know, in the service area you can say this was something that was service for your community or your public. So if we wanted to tout our faculty's involvement in our local community you know those are the kinds of things that we could report out of the system. But...

ARNOVE: And with regard to confidentiality or privacy issues....Obviously the data are going to be more accessible in electronic form. Can you tell me a little more about the dangers of people hacking into the system?

GIERYN: Hacking is his business...[laughter]

SARGENT: Yeah, and you know that's something that falls under UITS as far as, you know, the security measures they have involved. I'm not really in tune with that, but as far as just from an access side of it, if somebody wants access to the data, you know, through the proper channels that we have at IU, it does go through our review process. And as Anne mentioned if it is something that someone wants more summary type data that maybe doesn't really fit into a department or a school it'll have to go through that group. But the security measures is, you know, UITS, I would have to rely on them for that kind of information.

GIERYN: Bob, I think the important... We're actually enhancing faculty governance over this process by creating the committees that Anne described for someone to ask for a report to be run, especially if it's going to be reported publicly, this is something that as faculty—it's our, it's our lives there collectively. And we thought it was important that now what's changed is not just access but usability. I mean it's going to be easier for people to describe the Bloomington faculty in flattering and potentially unflattering ways. And we felt that this was important for faculty to be able to have a say as to what sort of images and pictures that we've used, developed and used. Herb?

TERRY: I wonder if you've considered motivations for faculty to provide good data. I've begun to hear anecdotally that some faculties say—take the people who were guinea pigs—and they're saying, 'Well, you know, there aren't going to be salary increases, the main use of this thing was in my department and if it takes me a lot of time, and it's a lot of bother to fill the thing out, I'm just going to be,' you know, 'very incomplete and just do whatever I have to do to get them to accept my form.' Personally I'm very glad to see us go this way because it promotes the new institutional research and (inaudible) that we haven't instituted in the past, but I am concerned about what the motivations (inaudible) educational processes going on to

convince faculty that providing this data even if it may not have impact on their actual salary is worth their time and energy.

GIERYN: We could throw the policy at them. That wouldn't make them very happy but they are required to do it by BFC policy. One hopes also that the raise situation, or the lack of them, is a temporary situation. There are other things that these reports are useful for in terms of just recordkeeping that chairs and deans need to have to be able to look at equity issues across faculty in a unit. To be able to say, 'Gee, you know, I never really noticed this pattern.' And it will be easier to determine; the pattern of who teaches what, the load carried by certain faculty as opposed to others. Even in the absence of raises, these data will allow people to see what's going on within a unit to possibly deal with issues of inequity.

TERRY: I just think that many of those are not broadly understood by our colleagues. And when they sit down, and we'll sit down at the end of the year despite the fact that they could do it now to fill the thing out, if it doesn't work for them or doesn't seem to be appropriate to their discipline or their field or the way records have been kept in their department in the past they may not supply very good data and then we have bad data in the system....

GIERYN: Well, it's a tough situation because we never know if they just were getting lazy or they hadn't done anything that year. I mean, you can't really tell...

TERRY: Well, we have to check. We might somehow or other take some sample of these things and actually go backwards and try to find out if they were done.

GIERYN: It's an interesting idea. I would think that would be done at the most local level possible. I would think as a department chair to take a look at these and begin to realize that things don't seem to be added in. Again, you can compare it to the CV which is an attachment and if a person doesn't want to put stuff on their CV, I think that's simply irresponsible.

MASSEY: But I would also suggest that it's no different than the paper form. I mean, it's—we're now going electronic—but it's basically the same content. And we can use it in different ways, but what's the motivation for doing the paper form? I mean, the motivations I think remain the same. It's an issue of what we're going to be able to do long term electronically.

GIERYN: There will be some frustrations. Let's admit to ourselves that when you go into a system like this that's online, that's different, there will be frustrations. What we've hoped is that with the training sessions and the locally available help as well as the help provided centrally by our office that we're going reduce the frustration down to the bare minimum. Carolyn?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I will admit some frustration, but I want to know whether you're going to do a composite of units annually? And your last comment suggested that you were going to do that...

GIERYN: My office personally? The provost?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes. Your office.

GIERYN: I'll certainly let Karen answer for the provost's office. I think that one of the responsibilities of this office coming out of the former Dean of Faculties office is to provide certain pictures of the Bloomington faculty across the campus: who are we? You know we do that kind of demographically in terms of gender, race, distribution by ranks, NTT to tenure track. We now can do that a little bit more by talking about some of our activities. The numbers of journals that we publish in, the range of journals that we publish in, the awards we get, things like that. We hope when we get our new website developed, which should happen by the first of the year we hope, to be able to give a kind of richer picture of the Bloomington faculty.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, what will be the consequences of that richness?

GIERYN: Gee, it might help us recruit people? It might help us retain people when they begin to appreciate what an outstanding faculty we have? Whether we anticipate that it would be used invidiously to compare and contrast departments, that's less my objective. I can see that deans might very well want to use this, especially in colleges that are depart—schools that are departmentalized—might well want to make comparisons across units in terms of certain output measure of productivity and they could do that.

HORNE: I'm sorry. I have a question for Mr. Sargent here and it's possible you addressed this and I didn't hear you correctly, but I'm fairly reassured by the fact that you are forming two new committees and you're very aware of the issues of privacy and issues like that but every time anybody has said anything about that it seems to me that the committee will ultimately make the decisions so what you're saying is if my colleague, you know, Professor Madura from the School of Music, has done some fabulous thing and has entered it on her faculty report and she submits that to you and somebody for some reason wants a piece of that information it will go to a committee, and that's great. But once she's entered it, it's the university's decision whether that information is public or not? Or does she get to decide whether that's public or not?

SARGENT: I would say it's the same as the prior paper process. When you submitted it at that point it goes to the Dean of Faculties office and that's where it...

HORNE: That's it exactly, but as you have all said, this will be much more accessible.

GIERYN: As we tried to suggest—Anne, why don't you...?

MASSEY: Yeah, I was just going to say, I mean at this point we are getting requests for more summary-like data. There's little or no interest so far in specific faculty. But you can imagine a situation where maybe there's something very unique that a faculty member or two do, that if I

said, 'Give me a summary around that topic.' It would be pretty obvious who those faculty were. And we need to be aware of that and we need to respond to that. We don't have to the best of my knowledge, specific policies around at this point with regard to how we're going to deal with some of these requests for access to kind of summary data. That's what the faculty advisory committee will at this point vet. I don't think that we have concluded at this juncture that that committee is going to be the be-all-end-all decision maker but rather we need to have some substantive discussion around this and kind of deal with some of these requests that we're getting right now which are very few. But I suspect, as we become more versed with the FAR, that we're going to get more of these. And it may well be that we do need to have more substantive, formal policy around that.

HORNE: Just out of curiosity, even with the written reports? Then if a certain person, you know, now not my esteemed colleague Professor Madura, but just anybody—an executive assistant or something in an office puts together a guidebook for something on their time and they've invested their heart and soul into it, but they were paid for it, so that's work product and the university owns it. Is that the way the university sees these documents?

GIERYN: No, it's not, it's really in a different category. If we were to receive an inquiry about a particular faculty member's work we would refer them to your esteemed colleague and let them deal with it. This is simply a...

HORNE: ...and by the way, Patrice has nothing to hide. [laughter]

GIERYN: Yeah, we'll check her FAR report to see about that! It's really—the questions that are of concern to us are requests for some aggregation huddle. So that again, it's a powerful body of data, there's no question. And it can be used for all sorts of nefarious purposes and we watch out very carefully for that which is why the committee is a faculty one with broad representation across the campus. It's going to make sure that data are used in ways that are serving the university.

HORNE: Thank you.

HANSON: Insofar as part of what might be in those reports would also form part of your personnel file. The uses of those and the publicity of those are already constrained in various ways by law so that, you know, there are clerks who might be working on and compiling those but that doesn't make that—because it's a university work product—something that's accessible. Those things are already private, but to go back to Carolyn's question, too: there might be things that you might think of as nefarious uses, that other people might think are wonderful new options. And some of them do have to do with what you might think of as an increased climate of accountability for universities. And I guess I would—I don't want to raise alarms—but I think there are some ways in which that that you have to see that that is a good thing for us. If we have various ways of reporting the work that our faculty as a whole do and show the time that they put into things like individual research with undergraduates or the kind of effort that goes into individualized seminars and so on, none of which will be recorded on an

ordinary workload about faculty teaching assignments. That's a good thing for us to get out. And there are very many measures of that kind about our engagement that I think it's important for us to try to be more public about and frankly, also in some sense, to track. It is important if it turns out that all of the intro courses are being taught by non-tenured track faculty or something. That is important for us to know, and it might be something we should—not that that is true! [laughter]—but tracking those kinds of things at an institutional level is important for the maintenance of quality. And I don't think that involves necessarily reaching into, and it doesn't involve reaching into, anybody's particular personnel file. But understanding how you're operating is important to making sure that the operation remains as good as it can be, so...

GIERYN: The tracking evolves over time so that the value of FAR will accelerate as we move along. I mean now we're thinking 'Oh my god! Why didn't we start this ten years ago so we could go back and see how we're better than we were ten years ago?' But ten years from now we'll be able to do that.

HATTEN: Do all departments require an attachment of the CV?

SARGENT: No, I think that very few schools will. I do know that--

HATTEN: The other question is, as an attachment, it's not going to be as easily mined for such things as awards, previous offices, and so on. Is there going to be some kind of provision to provide that sort of back data that is not every year data?

SARGENT: So far we've left that as a department or a school decision whether they do want that back filling. Right now the application will allow a three year backfill and that's mostly modeled on the College of Arts and Sciences' kind of suggestion for a three year rolling review or faculty report. But right now there's no mandate or...

HATTEN: For instance, if somebody won the Nobel Prize ten years ago, that's not going to get mined.

SARGENT: Right, but they could enter that into the system. You can enter retroactively.

GIERYN: You can, but what we're doing is to short circuit that because there's been kind of incomplete data about some of these faculty honors and awards. We'll be sending out something later this semester or in the spring to kind of catch up, make sure that we have a complete record of all of those honors.

DOWELL: In the back?

WISE: This is going to be a Luddites comment, but okay. First item I do respect the very good intentions and even perhaps a very good project. Your presentation is terribly weak. Those black things on the ceiling are projectors, those white things on the front wall are screens and

that black thing in the middle is a computer. And this is probably the ideal room for showing the whole Faculty Council what you are and what you have done.

DOWELL: Well, we should note that typically BFC prohibits Powerpoints at its meetings, so they probably weren't...

WISE: Well, in this case though we're talking about software...

DOWELL: No, I understand...

WISE: ...and a demo is a good thing.

SARGENT: And currently the Internet is down, it's locked. The entire city is down.

WISE: (remarks inaudible)

GIERYN: So we're hampered that way. The other concern is that...

WISE: I am fully prepared to generate a paper copy of the faculty report regardless of what's handed to me over the web and I would like to point out that the Faculty Council policy you cited applies to paper. I don't think the Faculty Council has endorsed your interface unseen and if (some remarks inaudible) there is resistance then people are perfectly free to back off. This, the project, at least from my perspective, is a reprise of the continuing tendency to push down to the departments and the individual to ask them to do the data entry. And it seems to me that if your interface is difficult or not well received a perfectly appropriate tack is to send you paper and let you do the data entry. Because there are some difficulties like, you know, how you format for citations and that sort of thing that are non-standard. NSF did take a few years to get that one straightened out. So I haven't seen your interface and I'm not prepared to judge it as I sit here, but there may be some difficulties ahead before we accept it.

GIERYN: You raise some very serious questions. Ones that have haunted us as we developed this. We worry about responses or the lack of response. We know there's a risk that some faculty members will individually opt out no matter what I might say about nobody opting out. We'll have to deal with that. We have a way of keeping track. The units will be able to keep track so that every department and dean will know who has filled it in and who hasn't. There will go prompts and prompts and reminders and at some point presumably go talk to a faculty member and see if there's something that can be done. It may be that somebody will have to sit with a faculty member and enter it if it's that way which could be done. In terms of downshifting the data entry to individual faculty, the other side of that would be to upshift it into the central administration. A) I'm not sure that anyone would really want that and B) do you want to have more money taken away from legitimate academic purposes to fund yet more people to input data in Bryan Hall? Probably not, I'd rather have...

WISE: The answer to that is...

GIERYN: ...something that's a good tradeoff between time and money.

WISE: ...for all the data entry that's been moved out of Bryan Hall do we have that money?

HANSON: Actually I don't know what he means. There's confusion. Central administration versus campus administration, but in any case, what data entry are you talking about with respect to this? The Faculty Council, right...

WISE: It was hypothetical. I should not have gone in that direction.... non-disclosure, routine stuff. Grade entry we used to be able to run. Incidentally, just an aside remark, I noticed that enrollment verification is not on Onestart or Oncourse suddenly. We're doing data entry on a new system...

GIERYN: Not my world, I saw that, too, and I have no knowledge of this. We could get—who handles that?

THOMPSON: [Raising his hand] That would be my area. [laughter] The goal was to provide better service and easier functionality, interface in the new system that was put up and is online now. That goal may or may not have been accomplished.

WISE: Just weird.

HANSON: But I mean it is the case that the faculty always entered the grades. It's just a question of whether or not they entered them online or on a piece of paper. If you prefer to have an extra step, that's...

Are there additional questions about this? Okay, we'll just take a couple more, but then Roger's here for his presentation as well.

LOSENSKY: Yeah, it's good to hear that there are training representatives around. Who are they and how do we find out?

GIERYN: That is somebody in your department.

SARGENT: Yeah, I have met with every department throughout the Bloomington campus, except one. And everyone has scheduled faculty overview sessions throughout the rest of this fall semester. So hopefully unless you're in Slavic languages you should get a note that is coming soon. [laughter] So yeah, like I said these are scheduled and I'll be out and about throughout campus.

LOSENSKY: So these are training sessions that are coming up in the semester?

SARGENT: Correct. There are a few areas that have been through, that I've been through so far but most of them are looking at the November time frame for those.

LOSENSKY: And just one other question. You talked about downloading classes. What about classes that are listed like direct reading courses where there's a single roster given to the department?

SARGENT: Right, yeah. And right now those are, I believe, those are in most departments, those are set under the chair's name. They will show up in the chair's list. And at that point, the chair can dink all those out where they have nothing to do with it. On the flip side, the faculty does have a lookup into the SIS to pull in those courses into their report as well. So there's nothing and on, you know, kind of a hitch that is, there's nothing that says if the chair does not take those classes out someone cannot have the course as well. The course can be on multiple faculty's reports. Especially when you have co-teaching. You know, three faculty members may have that same course on their...does that address your question?

LOSENSKY: Yes, I'll have to see how that works.

STRYKER: Is there any discussion of extending FAR to emeriti who are also asked to submit annual reports?

SARGENT: That's new! But I really don't see any reason...

STRYKER: (Some remarks inaudible) ...captures I get, I see those as part of circuit they do. There's about 150 a year and a lot of them are retired doing very consequential research and other activities.

SARGENT: And I think that kind of follows along with our librarians, not directly, but they do a different type of report as well. So when it comes up to the emeriti, we just have to analyze how you will report your vacancy. What fits, where our gaps are, and work through those...

GIERYN: Matt will be in touch.

HANSON: One last question?

TERRY: I like my privacy as much as anybody else, but we are a public institution and the state's public records laws apply to us. I'm wondering what the involvement of the University Counsel's office is on this because in general in this state, once you create a record it is presumed to be public unless it fits under the narrow exemptions of public records.

GIERYN: Uhhhh...[laughter] It must have happened in the two and a half years before I became Vice Provost, how's that?

TERRY: We need to make sure, I think, that we don't suddenly find ourselves in conflict with the media in this state. I mean, they like to publish our annual salary reports now because those are public.

GIERYN: Again, the switch to an online form from a legal standpoint is probably not going to make any difference if there were no legal issues raised by the print form then.

HANSON: Okay, thank you.

GIERYN: Thanks to all.

HANSON: And we will now have an enrollment update from Roger.

AGENDA ITEM 5: ENROLLMENT UPDATE

THOMPSON: I'm going to come down here so I can see you all. Well I think I begged and borrowed to get the exemption so that I could use these,* so thank you very much.

The goal I would offer is just to simply give you a few key data points. I think they'll be easier to see up here but I have provided them in a handout to you. I'll move fairly quickly through these charts and graphs so that you can...[laughter]...Okay, well that's—when I hear the snoring get loud, I'll speed up. Nonetheless, I'll try to move fairly quickly through the slides and the data points and really try to focus our attention at the end on your questions, your issues, your concerns.

Whoa!—gentle thumb [laughter]. So here are the organizations that comprise Enrollment mManagement here at Indiana University. I'm not going to really talk about any of these. This is just background so that you know the different areas where we're involved. Our job is to try to manage enrollment along with many others on campus who share that responsibility whether it's on recruitment, retention. We like to say it's everyone's job to recruit and retain students. We, many times, are held most responsible for that but we don't do it in isolation. This is a fundamental principle of our organization and for that I wanted to share it with you. We really believe that in the student lifecycle, we must be effective in every step of that lifecycle if we're going to have a successful enrollment management program for our institution. You'll notice it moves from prospect through the time of graduate/alumni/donor. Every time I show this someone always asks me, why do you go to donor? Your organization doesn't seem to be involved in that. We're not. But I believe strongly that donor is a measurement of alumni satisfaction and we are in the business of trying to provide satisfied alumni as are all of you. And so if someone's willing to donate their time, energy, goodwill, perhaps financially, but even if they're willing to make positive comments in the Kroger, we think that's a sign that they're a donor in some form.

* Referring to Powerpoint slides [Editor's note].

Okay, we had four primary goals for recruitment this year. Many of these come from discussions of earlier BFC's. When I first came to IU the hot topic and I'm glad to see Ted's here was in terms of improving the freshman profile to match the academic quality that was found at the institution. So our very first recruitment goal is to improve the quality of the freshman class. We define that by grade point average and standardized test score. Increase the diversity of the freshman class. We define that a little bit different than some other institutions do. We define it both in terms of ethnicity and social economic status. As I like to kid, I'm hopeful that one day we'll have a parking lot that reflects a spectrum of cars similar to my own. Mine's on the low end. Increase the international presence and keep IU affordable. I'll figure this out one way or another. Okay so, this is really why I wanted to bring the PowerPoint. I think it's easier for you than a handout to see sort of what's happening.

So if we're going to improve quality, we need to change the applicant pool. And I think this slide demonstrates that we've done that over time. We've gone from roughly 21,000 applications to 33,000 in 2009. The quality in terms of high school grade point average and SAT score has changed dramatically over that time as well. I'll show you some slides related to that. I think the biggest change that's happened here is we've become more aggressive. I mean that in a positive way. Maybe proactive is a better way to say it. We're no longer waiting for good students to find us. We're trying to find good students and help them understand all the opportunities that are available at the institution. Here's our beginning cohorts looking at '04 through '09. We've changed this from freshman class, that's typically what we used to label this. We now label it beginner, because we find many new students who bring AP credit that makes them sophomores when they start even though they're coming straight from high school. So you can see that '04 we hit 6,300 and what we've been doing since then as the provost mentioned, 2008 was an extremely large year 7,564. You probably noticed that in your courses, we certainly noticed it in residence halls and other places. That was driven primarily through significant increases in Indiana residents and the North Shore of Chicago. In 2009, we were targeted as the provost mentioned. We came back and eventually budgeted for 7,000 students up from 6,800 up to 7,000 to try and ease some of the anticipated trouble that was forthcoming from the state and as you can see we ended up above 7,300. I must tell you, that 7,300 did not come easily. This was a year when predictive modeling, logistic regression, all the things we use to try to forecast entering classes was very difficult because the largest variable out there was the economy. And we didn't know how it was going to play. But we were fortunate. We were one of those, I like to think we were fairly smart. So we came in a little bit above where a lot of our colleagues came in below.

This one I think will be of interest to you. This is looking at the composite SAT score over the last five cohorts. This includes ACT. And I noticed coming over here I didn't do as good a job as I would have liked. I wanted to have the slide that showed you SAT and ACT combined so that you could see how they shift over time. If you look at our pure SAT this year, we'd be 1182. By converting the ACT's which is about 25% of our freshman class takes an ACT, actually it's closer to 30. It comes out to a 1203 as the overall composite. Here's our 25th and 75th percentiles. This includes the ACT's converted. This, we've had significant movement. I think we're really very pleased over the last several years that we've not only brought up the bottom end but

we've raised the top end as well. And this is a kind of key stat that I hope is beginning to show up in your courses, this is the share of Indiana residents who have graduated in the top 25% of their high school class. You'll see in 2000 we were 56% if we were going to track the percentage over the course of 1990 to 2000 it's roughly been a percent or two of 56. It's either 54 or 55 so for a long period of time that was pretty much where Indiana University fell in that mid-50% range. You can see over the last several years we've tried to dramatically increase that and that has led to many of the things that you may read about in the popular press or you may hear about from your friends or neighbors or I hope to Pete you haven't experienced it yourself. That is, we're denying more students. And so sometimes the myth that's out there is the talented student from Muncie can't get in because we care more about the student from Minneapolis. There is nothing further from the truth. What's happened is a better student in Muncie has taken the place of the kid in Muncie who used to get in. And so many of you have probably heard me say it before, I'm a firm believe that quality brings quality. And as harsh as it may sound, sometimes a denial is the best thing to help you in terms of bringing quality. And so I don't think we'd be enrolling nearly 80% of the Indiana residents in the top quarter of their class if we were still taking kids in the top 40% of their class.

And I'll run through these and then open up to your questions. Here's undergraduate enrollment. You can see that over the decade we've moved from about 28,000 to about 32,000. So we've grown our undergraduate population overall and we've also improved the academic ability of that undergraduate population. Here's an important one, relates to our second goal. This is minority enrollment, US only. Right now this campus in terms of underrepresented populations, domestic students is at an all time high: 13.3%. If you look at this year, every ethnicity group whether it be Hispanics where we're showing our largest growth, Asian Americans or African Americans all have record enrollment for this Fall 2009. Here's international share. These are primarily underrepresented students who come from off our shores, international students. You can see that this, like the other slide is at an all time high: 5.3%. So if you combine those two, you're looking at about 19% of the population comes from what we would traditionally call an underrepresented group. Interesting about the 5.3%, our largest feeder country this year is China. That's the first time that's occurred. And this year we enrolled more Chinese students than we have in the last four years combined. And our international enrollment in the freshman class increased by 78% compared to last year. Last time I said that to someone they said, "Can you re-state that? You must have misspoken." No, it was 78%.

Here's some really good news that a lot of us have been working on. This is freshman and sophomore year persistence or retention. You can see that traditionally, Indiana University has been in the 87/88% range. That's very good. The vast majority of institutions would kill to have a rate at that range, but we've continually aspired to get to the 90% range. Those institutions that have above 90% on the public side are generally UVA, Berkeley, Ann Arbor, places that I think many of us would welcome to more closely resemble in some respects. So you can see that freshman and sophomore retention has gone up. Here's sort of my warning slide. This looks at resident and non-residents. So, just to kind of walk you through these bars: on the far left hand side those are the overall percentages I just showed you split out. And now you see

next to it the resident and non resident. What has us a little concerned, we don't have the 2009 data in yet which would be measuring how the '08 cohort persisted, though we will soon. But the one thing that's a bit of an alarming trend and we think it's primarily dollars driven, the economy, because we know that the '08 class was the most talented academically we've ever enrolled. But at least early indications are that from a persistence standpoint we're going to have a, we're going to take a little hit on non-residents. And we tend to think that's families making decisions that, you know, maybe it's time to move closer to home and you know enroll someplace that might be a little less expensive.

Here's overall campus enrollment over the course of the decade from 2000 to 2009. You can see that that's had a few bumps in the road but has generally been on an upward sling since 2004. We are fairly proud that in conjunction with all of our campus partners about 24 million dollars unbudgeted revenue was delivered this year. We're dependent on tuition, so the idea that we're publicly supported, we're probably publicly assisted. But our students are paying the bulk of the freight. With that, I'll stop and be more than happy to answer any of your questions about the data points that I've shown or anything else that might be on your mind. Yes, sir?

ARNOVE: I'd like to talk about the relationship between measures of quality and efforts to diversify the campus. We go back ten or fifteen years or so, at that time there was I believe this was called Dean of Admissions, who placed very little emphasis on SAT scores because he said they were approximate with socioeconomic status. He was more likely to look at advanced placement courses and ranking within the class. I know a number of state funded universities have gone to looking at the ranking within a graduation class rather than the SAT and ACT scores. So maybe the more emphasis you place on the SAT, the less you're going to diversify as much as you'd like to. The other thing is it would be very helpful if you could just disaggregate the data on diversity by ethnic group and in-state and out-of-state students and see who we're getting.

THOMPSON: Right, I can give you a little context on both of those. I didn't show you a slide with high school GPA, but that's increased from 3.4 to 3.7 in a similar way to what the test scores have done. Ultimately you have to look at lots of measures. I was on a panel two years ago that the College Board sponsored debating the SAT. My view is every measure's flawed. So I can take you to high schools where a 3.5 in this high school would be worth a 3.0 in a different high school. Things about the SAT have been well documented, as well. So I think what's important is to look at multiple measures and try to make sure you're meeting your recruitment goals. From a diversity standpoint, as we've raised our quality standards we've become more diverse. That's why I showed you that slide. Sometimes it seems counterintuitive. One would think, well we'd better lower our standards or stay where we are try to get more diversity. My experience has been that there's plenty of good students everywhere. They come in all ethnicities and so if we disaggregate the minority population, you'd find that it's primarily residential, residents of Indiana; and then across the board, Hispanics are coming out of St. Joseph's county which is South Bend / Mishawaka, Indianapolis area, those are our two biggest feeders there. For African Americans, St. Joseph's county again, Indianapolis. And Asians—I don't know that data quite as well, but—you can do both. I think

it's, I go to lots of these meetings and I think you hear enrollment people use sort of access and quality as a crutch with one another and I just think they're crutches. Yes ma'am?

SHAW: What percentage of the enrollment is in-state?

THOMPSON: In-state this year was 64%, out of state was 36%.

SHAW: Is that similar to past years?

THOMPSON: That's actually down slightly, but that was by intention. We had one year that hit 40% non-resident. Only time in my career I've ever received hate mail. I got 7 pieces. I think about half of them called me expletives. So that was a fun Saturday for me. I called every person that sent it to me. They were a little surprised when their phone rang and I was on the other end. But I thought it was a better way of handling it than sending letters back. So anyway, that year just kind of turned out to be a little odd. You know, our models were a little bit off, non-residents got a little higher than we thought. And so, you know it's hard to predict what an 18 year old's going to do. [laughter] Except you, (inaudible). You're practically an 18-year-old.

So we've been pretty intentional in trying to shrink that non-resident population a little bit. We have differing admission standards too. If you're a non-resident, you're going to have to meet a higher standard than if you're a resident student. We think that's reasonable given the subsidy tax payers provide. Yes, ma'am?

FRAZIER: I had a question about retention aggregated by diversity profiles.

THOMPSON: Yes!

FRAZIER: And also a concern about a cut in funding to the cultural centers on campus including for high school recruitment.

THOMPSON: Yeah.

FRAZIER: For example, La Casa doesn't even have—all they want is mileage money to go talk to Indiana Latinos...

THOMPSON: Yeah. You know that's...you raise some really good points. When you look at retention and you break it out by ethnicity we do really well on most of our minority groups through the first two years. We see a little dropoff in the third and fourth year and I...the provost has charged Sonya and Pete and I can't remember if you're in on that or not, Tom, [laughter] but I know at least the three of us are sort of beginning to drill into that data a little more. I used to think it was debt mode that students hit too much debt and they think, 'This isn't worth it,' and they go home. That's sort of been the area I've been sniffing around for the last 8-10 months. That hasn't really panned out. We have the lowest debt load in the Big Ten.

18, 19,000 something like that. That's a lot of debt, but compared to our peers it's not. So I don't know. But that's one of the areas that I think we're going to look into with the group that the Provost has tasked. As for the funding on the cultural centers, I agree with you. It's not my area. That comes out of DEMA, Diversity...Oh, whatever the DEMA stands for. And I think that's, it's challenging. You know, students start the recruitment process earlier and earlier. New data shows that by sophomore year of high school most kids have already narrowed their list of schools. Which means talking to kids in 8th even 9th grade is becoming something that we need to do and that's what those centers are trying. Yes sir?

MCGREGOR: Is it the case that Vice Provosts for enrollment management all talk to each other and compare notes so that this very interesting finding about the decline in the non-resident category and your hypothesis about students taking a little closer to home...can that be benchmarked to other schools? And can you get together every year and kind of share that information?

THOMPSON: Right, great question. That's what's proving out. In fact, I just got a report this afternoon from Maguire Associates which is a national consulting firm that is always looking for business which is why they send out their reports. We're not a client. But their findings from 2009 were that students' mobility shrunk. They were more inclined to stay closer to home and pay in-state fees. Our two big meetings, typically that happens. That happens at NACAC which was last week in Baltimore. We, like all of you, had to make cuts in our travel budget so we didn't attend. But we will go, the other one is the National College Board meeting. We had to scrap that one too, but we will be at the Midwest meeting in February. And that's where those kinds of discussions take place. And while February may seem a long way from September, I don't think we're out of the economic woods. So I anticipate those discussions will be fairly strong on what happens.

ARNOLD: Can you say anything about incoming transfer students and that trend over the last few years?

THOMPSON: Yeah, incoming transfer students we were up, I didn't bring that data but it seems to me it was either just below or just above 10%. We were a little, as Karen knows, we were a little nervous about boosting transfer enrollment because we have two big cohorts going through and those students typically come in at the upper division where it costs all of you a little bit more money to teach them. But we were worried about how the economy was going to play out and whether we'd hit the 7,000 number. We went to weekly meetings on trying to manage that freshman class in February and we had to go to our waitlist three times. For historical purposes we didn't have a waitlist when I came and in the other years that I've been here we never went to the waitlist. So it was a hard year to figure out so we kind of supplemented with transfer and then came in I think 1,200 roughly external transfers compared to maybe 1,000 in the past. Herb?

TERRY: Larger, more academically able classes with higher retention among residents will I think shift the educational aspirations of those students in terms of whether they want to major

in ecology or sociology, education or whatever. Do we seem to have the flexibility to meet the shifting academic goals of these shifting classes?

THOMPSON: That's a great question. It probably depends on who you ask.

TERRY: Yeah.

THOMPSON: You know, our registrar's office does a good job of sort of measuring movement within schools and across the college. And at least with the 7,564, a very big class, we seem to be managing that okay. This one was a little bit smaller and I worry a little bit about when they get to the upper division how things will pan out. Classes tend to get a little smaller and that can make things tighter. We don't have any indication that that is a factor in the non-resident retention. We couldn't get into my school somehow. Yeah, and again this is Thompson's theory. No empirical data at all. I am worried that we have a little bit of, you know, Kelley wannab....[laughter] Kelley hopefuls maybe. Where you're pre-something else and you're hoping to get into Kelley. But that comes from years of bias in my opinion. When I was at the University of Southern California, we had you know 10% of the undergraduates were all pre-cinema and they were never going to get into film school. And so sometimes I think there might be some similarity there but we have not drilled into it. I think that's really what the provost wants us doing is looking into some of those things.

FIELDS: You talk about the lifecycle, how it remains the same, how prospective students become students and graduate. And I guess I'm sort of enamored of my new diplomas, what are we—are students graduating on time? As the quality of the student changes are we seeing different graduation metrics?

THOMPSON: Yeah, you know as the profile of the students gets better, you should see that translate into better retention numbers, better four year, better six year graduation rates. It's one of the things enrollment folks talk about all the time. There's lots of programs designed to boost those three measures. But one of the quick ways to boost them is to change who's coming a little bit. It's too early to see what the impact is on four and six year graduation rates, but certainly as you saw, it appears on the retention end that there's some good gains there. But lots of other things go into that too. Financial, social, and academic, so...I haven't been looking at my wrist and I don't know how long you want me to go, so you can cut me off at any time...yes?

ARNOVE: Granted there's a high correlation between ethnicity and socioeconomic status, however I'd like to know what percentage of incoming class comes from the lower 25% in the NCS of income? Do you have that data?

THOMPSON: Yeah, we do actually. We started a program three or four years ago called the Twenty-first Century Scholar Covenant Program and that built upon the state's Twenty-first Century Scholar Program which is designed for low-income Indiana residents. Essentially the state says to them, 'If you work hard, play by the rules, stay drug and crime free, the state will

provide you with funding for the cost of tuition.' Our Covenant Program said the cost of tuition is this, on a spectrum of cost of attendance like this and so Indiana University makes up the rest. We put that in three cohorts ago. We enrolled something like 275. Last year we enrolled something like 385 and this year we've enrolled almost 500. We know that those students are low income because the state has defined it as free and reduced lunch so we know how those students look. Additionally this year we enrolled 1300 students who identified themselves as first generation college students. Again, that's a self identifier. The other group I gave you is by state data: free and reduced lunch. So I feel fairly confident in telling you that we've done very well on diversity when it comes to social and economic status. I'm extremely proud of our university for the Covenant Program. It's been recognized internationally by the College Board as a terrific access tool for low income kids and I think it says a good deal about our institution and our values that we'd be willing to put millions of dollars into helping those students, so...

ARNOVE: And the number coming from the upper 25%?

THOMPSON: You know that one I don't know offhand. So...

HANSON: That number's hard to keep because they might not identify themselves.

THOMPSON: Actually, yeah, now there's an interesting idea. If we assume that high income students don't file a FAFSA because they don't need aid, then that would indicate that we've probably got about 25%, I think it's 25 to 27 something like that that don't file a FAFSA so that might be a fair assumption of what the high end is. Everybody else is in the middle. Yes?

GINGER: Does your office track the retention and graduation rates through the Ivy Tech, I don't know what the program's called but folks that come in that way?

THOMPSON: Yeah we do! I assume you're talking about Hoosier Link which is a program for those students that can't be admitted to IU who partner with Ivy Tech. They take some courses there. If they earn a 3.0 they can come over at the mid-semester or they wait until the end of the semester. It's new enough that we don't have real good data on it yet. We don't have good data about how the students perform when they get here.

GINGER: Too soon?

THOMPSON: But it's on our radar.

MCMANUS: Roger, I'm going to get back to the transfer students and I'd like to know first of all about the Ivy Tech students. Are they considered transfer students when they arrive and don't continue? Then a hypothesis perhaps that some of these out of state students are going home? Well wouldn't there be out-of-state Indiana students who then decide in their third and fourth year to come home and so you would see that. So one of my questions is well, without the Ivy Tech students how are they compared to first time college students in our program? Also, how in general are the students who are transferring into IU students who, had they applied two

years before, not been strong enough to get into IU? How comparable are they? And finally, can you tell us anything about what I see among my graduate students which is that the diversity of undergraduate degree, it's phenomenal. Students seem to be moving across different campuses quite often...

THOMPSON: Yeah, boy, you gave me a whole...

MCMANUS: Sorry...

THOMPSON: So if I miss some part of it, it's simply due to my flu shot...

MCMANUS: No, it's the issue of transfer students mostly...

THOMPSON: Yeah, the transfer students on Ivy Tech I'm just going to come clean and say we haven't looked at it in as much depth as we need to for me to answer you effectively. I can tell you that the students that we move to Hoosier Link are below our typical admission standards, but I should also tell you truth in lending, three years ago a lot of those kids would have been admitted. So the quality that's going to Ivy Tech is better. What we don't know, we're certainly tracking how many come over. We have not done a good job to date of measuring how well they do once they're here. The hypothesis on kids staying closer to home; that's why we don't quite have the retention data done yet but I think the theory is going to pan out. Anecdotally we had a lot of stories of students who came from someplace in Indiana and went to Ivy League or read "expensive private" and have decided maybe this isn't, it's not working out in the cost-benefit analysis. And so they're coming back closer to home. We've had transfer students from terrific places but I haven't run that in aggregate form. I've more or less heard the stories individually.

MCMANUS: On the flip side, is I could get a couple years at an inexpensive community college, transfer to IU, get a slightly better year and maybe transfer into that Ivy League to complete it.

THOMPSON: Right.

MCMANUS: Bargain basement—great.

THOMPSON: I think that's potentially very likely that we're going to see some of that. You know we had on the freshman entering class, our financial aid filers were up 12% compared to a year ago. So that tells you how the economy was hitting families.

I may have run out of questions. So thank you all very much for your time. I hope that—I always like to say it's great to show you a bunch of bar charts but the value for us is when you begin to see a difference in your courses with the level of discourse that occurs. It means more than a 1203 on a chart. Thanks. [applause]

HANSON: A great job and a very, very tough year. I think we are done with our business then, so we stand adjourned.

Meeting adjourned 5:22PM