

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 16, 2003
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Summary of Actions Taken:

Agenda

1. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professor David Daleke)
(Circulars B1-2004, B2-2004)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B1-2004.htm>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B2-2004.htm>
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm)
3. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm and Professor David Daleke)
4. Chancellor's "State of the Campus" Report (30 minutes)
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm with Fred Cate and Neil Theobald)
5. Meeting of Standing Committees (4:30 pm - 5:30 pm):
 - BH 008: AI Affairs Committee
Distributed Education Committee
Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee
External Relations Committee
Technology Policies Committee
Research Affairs Committee
Library Committee
 - BH 222: Faculty Affairs Committee
Long-Range Planning Committee
 - BH 241: Budgetary Affairs Committee
 - BH 010: Student Affairs Committee
 - BH 228: Foundation Relations
Fringe Benefits Committee

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Moya Andrews, Sharon Brehm, Neil Theobald, Joyce Alexander, Bennet Brabson, Ann Bristow, Bonnie Brownlee, Erik Bucy, David Daleke, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Patricia Foster, Ann Gellis, Kathleen Gilbert, Laura Ginger, Kevin Hunt, Margaret Intons-Peterson, Elin Jacob, Elizabeth Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Deidre Lynch, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Theodore Miller, Kelly Mix, Richard Nash, Harold Ogren, James H. Patterson, Mary Popp, Eric Rasmusen, Amy Reynolds, Elyce Rotella, Barry Rubin, James Sherman, Sarita Soni, Holly Stocking, Herbert Terry, Larry Thibos, Thomas Walsh, Mary Wennerstrom, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, William DeKemper, JoEllen Baldwin, Casey Cox

Members Absent with Alternates: Michel Chaouli for Rex Sprouse, Robert Noel for Celestina Wroth

Members Absent: Michael McRobbie, Simon Brassell, Malcolm Brown, Michael Hamburger, Andrzej Zieminski, Grant McFann

Visitors: Barbara Wolf (Co-chair, External Relations); Arlene Diaz (Library Committee); Barry Magee

AGENDA ITEM #1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS (Professor David Daleke)

BREHM: David and I have a new policy that we'd like you to know about which is that we'd like to try to start on time. [laughter] So we'll do our best. So we will start with the President of the BFC's report on Agenda Committee Business.

Daleke: Can everyone hear me, or should I use the microphone. Well, first of all I'd like to welcome everyone here; returning members I'd like to welcome you to the continued service in the BFC, and for new members I want to thank you for joining us. This service to the University community is greatly valued, and I want to let you know that we here and other members outside this body greatly appreciate the work that you've done.

I'm going to keep my comments relatively short because we also a fairly short agenda today. As you'll see, we've broken this up into a meeting which is typical and then what will be atypical is the committee meetings that follow this one. So this first meeting is a little bit unusual.

I'll start with some introductions. My name is Dave Daleke; I'm the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council this year. Some of you may have noticed that we have reorganized the Bloomington Faculty Council office and have had some changes in personnel.

Ellen Pettay, who was with us for almost thirty years, is now the Coordinator of the Emeriti House, which is at 1015 E. Atwater on the corner of Atwater and Hawthorne. This house is going

to be a meeting place and an office for many emeriti, and we're hoping to be able to tap into the very strong resource of Emeriti Faculty that we have at Indiana University. Ellen seems the perfect person for this position. She is extremely well qualified and knows a lot of people. But I know she has a lot of friends here in the Bloomington Faculty Council. We wished her well as she moved to this position, but I think she might appreciate an email or two from you if you feel like doing so wishing her good luck in her new job.

To my left is Kelly Kish, who is the new Chief of Staff. This is a new position that we have in the Bloomington Faculty Council Office. Many of you already know Kelly. If you haven't met her yet, you will probably come to know her quite well. She is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education and has an interest in Higher Education. So you'll have many opportunities to communicate with her. As part of Kelly's position she will also be working with a number of standing committees, and later on you might have an opportunity to hear about that in your committee.

We've also reorganized the Council office. If you haven't stepped across the hall in room 010, I encourage you to do so. It's a much, we're hoping it's a welcoming atmosphere for people to come in to sit and chat. But practically speaking we've also created a meeting room in the back half, the second half of the office where committees can meet in the future. This is something you can talk to Kelly about and schedule your committee meetings. We are hoping to provide a venue for people to make it easier for them to have their meetings.

The other officers of the BFC are sitting at the head table here. Chancellor Brehm of course is sitting next to me. Bill Wheeler is the secretary and Laura Ginger is our Parliamentarian. I'll make one comment about the secretary's position. Bill is determined to have a rapid turnaround in our minutes this year. So you will see a synopsis of this meeting appearing very soon after this meeting and then also the full minutes will go up on the BFC website. And so I encourage you to use the BFC website as a reference for much of the work that we do. You'll hear us referring back to it and putting links on many of the documents that you receive.

For those of you who are new to the BFC, the order of our meeting is fairly, this meeting is fairly typical of our regular order. We have agenda committee business that we start with first. The next is the presiding officers' business, Chancellor Brehm. Then there's a question and comment period. As a reminder to everyone, if you have questions that you would like to submit prior to the meeting do so by submitting them to BFC Office, bfcoff@indiana.edu is the address, or to me or to Chancellor Brehm. After that is the list of our agenda items. At some meetings they'll be more extensive than others. Today we really only have one agenda item, and that is the state of the campus report. Usually during this agenda committee business time we often use it to make some announcements, and I'd like to make a couple of very brief announcements. One is that this room that we're meeting in is actually reconfigured during most of the rest of the week, actually during the rest of the week between 7:30 and 2:00 pm, as a faculty and staff lounge. In response to requests from a number of faculty to have a gathering spot where they can meet and also to have a café associated with it, this room has now been set up and is run by Residential Programs and Services as a faculty/staff lounge. Those of you in Ballantine hall, your keys will let you in. If you don't have a key to Ballantine Hall, the operator of this facility, Ylly Dema, can let you in during the hours that it's open, but he's trying to work out a system for having the

doors accessible. But I encourage you to use this as a gathering spot, not only to have something to eat, they have great doughnuts in the morning and good sandwiches at noon, but also a chance to meet other faculty across the campus.

Secondly, the Information Commons is opening this Thursday at 4:30 pm in the Main Library. As you might know this is a state-of-the-art facility, for integrated technology and information sharing for students and faculty. And I think this is a real good example of one of the strengths of IU, and that is in information technology. I encourage you to stop by and view the facility.

I'll make a couple of comments about agendas, today's agenda as well as future agendas. As I mentioned, we'll have a State of the Campus Report and Chancellor Brehm will introduce that in a moment. We have a couple of items that were tabled from last year that we will take up first at our next meeting. One of those is the Campus Mission Statement, which will be presented by the Long Range Planning Committee, and the other is a Diversity Statement that will be presented by the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee. Sometimes we will make announcements about upcoming agenda items during this section of the meeting and mostly to call your attention to what is coming up soon.

We also have a large batch of minutes to approve; all of last year's minutes need to be approved. Fortunately through Kelly's work and Kyle Kinnaman (Kyle I'm sorry I should have introduced Kyle. Kyle Kinnaman here is also a member of the BFC office) and through some help from the Chancellor's office, we've been able to grind through all of last year's minutes, and they are all now recorded. But it also means we have to approve them. And rather than doing these all in one meeting we are going to...we've broken them into two groups, and we'll approve half the years' minutes at our next meeting, and at the following one we'll do the second half. We would like you to read those minutes before our next meeting. You'll be receiving an email about this. We could see no other way to do this quickly and efficiently, so I hope that you find it riveting and invigorating reading.

There are a large number of major issues that we will deal with this year. I'm not going to try to summarize them right now, but I will call your attention to another document that will come up, another circular. And that is the Summary of Actions Taken from last year. That will be available also on the website; you will be receiving an email about this, and we might briefly talk about it at the next meeting. It will be a valuable resource for those of you who are new to the BFC to see what it is we do in the course of a year, and for the members who are returning to the BFC, please read that circular and let us know if there are any inaccuracies or changes that should be made.

You have in front of you two other circulars, the traditional B1 and B2. B1 is the roster for the BFC and B2 is the list of the roster for the individual standing committees. Lastly I would like to mention the other Agenda Committee members. They are Ann Gellis, Michael Hamburger, and Barry Rubin. This committee in consultation with Chancellor Brehm sets the agendas for the meeting. If you have any comments about the agendas, please forward them to us in between the meetings. And this body together with the chairs of the committees developed the committee agendas that you will be dealing with later on today. So I want to thank both the committee

chairs and the Agenda Committee for that work. With that, that is the end of the Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm)

Brehm: Over the last week, as you know, we have had a very difficult matter on campus. And I have received a number of emails and of course a lot of newspaper interest, and so I thought it might be helpful for me to make a few comments about the situation as part of my remarks at the beginning of our meeting. First of all, I should note that I was first notified about the existence of Professor Rasmusen’s website at 4:44 pm on Thursday, September 4th. That’s the value of email, you can actually track exactly when you know about things. The 12 days that followed have certainly been extremely difficult ones for our campus. And so I would like to share with you today my perspective on this matter.

First, as I have done in every previous statement I have made about this issue, I want to emphasize that I deplore many of the statements posted on that website.

For example, Professor Rasmusen asserts that “homosexuals” (gender unspecified) should not be hired in jobs that function as “moral exemplars,” such as “teachers, pastors, and elected officials.” He also states, as “a second reason not to hire homosexuals as teachers,” that “male heterosexuals, at least, like boys and are generally promiscuous.”

Professor Rasmusen acknowledges that he has no evidence to support his conclusions, which are, instead, drawn from “the category of ‘what everyone knows.’”

This is deeply offensive, hurtful, and very harmful stereotyping, in which characteristics of individuals are applied to a large group of people whose members, like all people, differ from one another on the exceedingly large number of characteristics that make up a human being. Logically, it is the same as drawing the conclusion that all men are six feet tall.

Such stereotyping is completely at odds with Indiana University’s commitment to inclusion and its respect for diversity, as clearly stated in its equal opportunity/affirmative action policy, in which “Indiana University prohibits discrimination based on arbitrary considerations of such characteristics as age, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status.”

Nevertheless, Professor Rasmusen’s speech is clearly protected by the first amendment. His speech is also protected by the IU Policy on Academic Freedom, which states that “in public utterances the teacher and librarian shall be free of institutional control.”

Also, we have an IT Policy office statement about personal Web pages, and I would like to read you some of this.

“This personal home page service is designed to provide Indiana University faculty, staff, and students with an opportunity to present themselves and their personal interests and opinions, as

well as to learn and exercise web development techniques and accomplish class assignments in various disciplines. Indiana University does not review the content of personal web pages maintained by individuals using this service except in response to a complaint that the pages contain material that violates the law or University policy. The University accepts no responsibility for the content of personal home pages.”

“Free expression of ideas is a central value within the academy. Some materials displayed on pages in the service may be objectionable or offensive to some visitors, but that does not necessarily mean that the material is illegal or that it violates Indiana University policy. Absent a violation of law or University policy, the University will not take action with respect to material on a home page.”

“Individuals using this service are expected to observe all applicable laws and University policies, and present themselves in a manner consistent with the high ethical standards of the institution.”

The postings on this particular website have, of course, created the difficult challenge of affirming the right to speak, even when we deplore the speech itself. As hard as this is, it is the only way to maintain our liberty. It’s easy, in fact, to defend freedom of speech when we agree with or don’t care about the speech itself. Only when the speech offends us, do we realize the strength and courage of those who wrote the first amendment and all those after them who have affirmed and upheld it.

In exercising my own freedom to speak against Professor Rasmusen’s statements, I also provide the opportunity for others to agree or disagree with my views.

There is, however, another more general issue that President Daleke and I have discussed at some length. We agree that it would be useful to ask the UFC to review the current policies, practices, guidelines, costs, and benefits of “Mypage,” which is the UITS service for personal Web pages. It seems to us that, as a community of scholars and students, it is crucial to think about the role of these personal pages in our communal and intellectual life.

And now I’d like to close with a quote that I found when I was preparing these remarks. Actually a student helped me; a student sent me a reference to a page that has really some wonderful material on it about freedom of speech, and this was a quote that I thought was very interesting and I, for one, have not read before. Here’s the quote: “But the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.” It’s John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, 1859. So those are my remarks for this occasion. I felt it was important for me to make them to this group, and we will now move on to our question and comment period. In accordance with David’s and my focus on timeliness, we will limit this to 10 minutes, and Laura GINGER, our Parliamentarian will be keeping the clock.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm and Professor David Daleke)**

BREHM: Yes, Professor Rasmusen.

RASMUSEN: OK, we won't debate things too much now, but I was wondering if that statement was up on a website or somewhere where I can respond?

BREHM: What I just read? Certainly. I just read it to you, and I just wrote it last night and today.

RASMUSEN: Are you going to post it?

BREHM: I'll give you a copy of it.

RASMUSEN: OK.

BREHM: Ok, that's fine. Yes, Mary.

WENNERSTROM: I just wondered if you had any news about the Dean of the Graduate School. I noticed on our list here it says Dean of the Graduate School, but there's no name on it?

BREHM: It's my understanding that Dr. Slattery from the University of Washington has accepted our invitation to come and be the new Dean of the Graduate School. Ann Gellis knows that I think more intimately than I do...He's a professor of pharmacology.

WENNERSTROM: He's coming this semester?

GELLIS: Yes.

BREHM: No more questions, comments?

DAVILA: Would there be any change in the structure of the Graduate School with this new appointment, or will it be the same as it has been in the past?

BREHM: I don't know. I think it is interesting, if you recall President Herbert's comments at the Board of Trustees meeting, he did list a number of items that he wanted to review. One of those items was the School of Continuing Studies, and I was well aware that he wanted to review that. As you may know, we proposed a reorganization of the school, and he wanted us not to go forward with that reorganization until he had a chance to review it which is obviously is very important. We would never want to go forward with the reorganization and then have him be unhappy with it and have to move back. The other item that he mentioned in that list of ten was Graduate Studies, so I think we'll probably have a conversation in the University about Graduate Studies, but I don't know the parameters that he wants to look at. But with a new Dean that's an appropriate moment to do that. Yes.

TERRY: You proposed that the review of the Mypage standards should be by the UFC. Why go directly to the UFC rather than have it first begin at the campuses because of their diversity?

BREHM: I will mention my views, and then David may want to comment. I just see it as a, because UITs is a university-wide organization and all of our IT Policies are, as far as I know, university-wide, certainly this one is. It seems to me that that would be the level of consideration.

DALEKE: That server actually includes web pages not only from this campus but from all the campuses, which is the reason why I thought it made sense to send it first to the UFC and their Technology Policies Committee. There is a link to the BFC, and I'll just briefly mention committee structure here. Many of our standing committees have corresponding committees at the University Faculty Council level, and we have representatives from those standing committees on the University Faculty Council as well, so we do have a link, and I thought this definitely would provide us with a good information conduit for other issues as well as this particular one.

TERRY: What UFC committee would you think would be the appropriate place to review this?

DALEKE: Technology policies.

PATTERSON: Am I on that committee? Is that where it should be? Do you have other ideas?

TERRY: No I'm not sure. But as the Chancellor has indicated that this is an intersection of the core values of the university with technology, and I would hope that the committee reaches out to others that may have an interest. I would thank the Chancellor for her defense...in a difficult time. That's my area too, and, as you said, you do not need the First Amendment to protect speech, that perspective as well as this is a technological problem. But we have resources to get to that committee.

BREHM: We must find a way to move this [microphone] without making such a ruckus. Are there any more questions or comments?

**AGENDA ITEM #4: Chancellor's "State of the Campus" Report
(Chancellor Sharon Brehm with Fred Cate and Neil Theobald)**

BREHM: OK. We'll go along to the first item of business, which, in today's truncated general session, is the state of the campus address. I think last year I actually gave an address; this year I decided that we would do it a little differently. I want to start, since as far as I'm concerned, the most, the single most important thing that happened last year was the Strategic Planning and the Commitment to Excellence process. And so I have asked Fred Cate, who has been so generous with his time and energy to be the chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, and also of the Review Committee, to join us and sort of bring us up to date on where we are and where we're going from here.

CATE: Thank you very much; it's a privilege to be back with you. It's a privilege to get to share the brief amount of time we have today to cover this topic. Let me just quickly remind you the Strategic Planning process began in September of last year, one year ago. The first three tasks the committee was asked to address were to draft a statement of missions and values, which you've heard will be back before you for revision and hopefully, ultimately, approval. The second was to draft a statement of academic priorities which would help guide the funding process of the Commitment to Excellence funds. That was done, and you will recall I have appeared before you twice to discuss that. I will turn in just a moment to the possible revision of that, so there will be an opportunity for further discussion of that. And the third obligation the committee was asked to meet in its first four months of operation was to propose a process by which proposals for Commitment to Excellence funding would be reviewed. You undoubtedly recall that that process operated very quickly last year, because, of the timing between when the process was recommended to the Chancellor and when those decisions had to be made. Nevertheless, the Deans submitted 36 proposals. Those were each reviewed, and 7 were ultimately funded after consultation with the Deans, with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, with the Trustees, and with the Interim President.

That was not the end of the work, either last year, nor will it be the end of the work for this year. The fourth task which the committee was specifically asked to undertake was to draft a statement of general, meaning not discipline specific, priorities, which we did by the May 1, 2003 deadline. I take just a moment to mention this because, given both the timing—many of our minds may have been elsewhere by the end of April last year—and also the fact that there was so much attention on the funding process with the Commitment to Excellence program, there was frankly less attention on the general priorities. This was not a surprise, but I think nevertheless, given the importance of those priorities—there were five of them: undergraduate education and student life, graduate student support, infrastructure needs, personnel, and campus coordination and decision making—given their importance, given their really central nature to what we do on this campus, I would encourage you once again to take a look at those. Those are all on the website on the Strategic Planning Committee's website. And we, although we consulted with the Long Range Planning Committee about those, I would welcome, and I know the entire strategic planning committee would welcome, further input about those to make sure that both we've identified the right priorities in the non-discipline specific category and also for creative thinking on how we might go about implementing those.

The last task which the committee has been asked to do, and I've learned one thing very carefully when dealing with the Chancellor, that, even when lines are numbered out into five tasks, there may be more than a single task in a single line. The last task is to recommend benchmarks for measuring the success of specific Commitment to Excellence investments, to recommend benchmarks and a process by which the entire strategic planning process will be evaluated, and to, all of this being under one point, to identify any necessary revisions to the academic priorities that we identified last January. We will be undertaking that quite seriously and energetically this fall. We took a major step towards that last spring when we actually released a draft statement of benchmarks, which we thought would not only provide an opportunity for campus discussion but also be useful to the Deans as they were working on their...on implementing these seven, funded Commitment to Excellence proposals, to know the types of questions we were likely to be asking as to how were those proposals in fact working

out, what type of impact were we in fact seeing from those investments. As we expand this fall to not just the Commitment to Excellence but the strategic planning process generally, we will again be working to obtain maximum input from you, from the other constituencies on the campus. The strategic planning committee has revised its website to try to make that as robust as possible. That is on the campus main page link to the Chancellor's welcome message, you cannot miss it. We will also be holding a public forum to encourage all members of the campus community who have comments either about suggested revisions or about ways in which we might measure the impact of this process to help participate in that process.

Now if I may make just one last comment and then I will stop and happily take questions, and that is there were sufficient funds left over after the decisions were made last year with regard to Commitment to Excellence proposals for a second round of Commitment to Excellence funding this year. That round will be somewhat, somewhat more leisurely in nature than last year's was. Proposals will ultimately be due from the Deans to the Chancellor by January 15, 2004, and the review committee will have, instead of two weeks, it will have six weeks in which to review those to make its recommendations to the Chancellor, who will again be following the same process as last year in terms of consultation with the various constituencies involved. It is, I think we would all agree, very important that, although those ultimate proposals come from the Deans representing schools, that we seize sort of the best ideas, we have the maximum opportunity for all members of the campus community to suggest ideas within the schools. And to that end we've been doing a number of things, some small some somewhat more significant. Again, we're going to be hosting a campus forum on Thursday, September 25, at 3:30, in the Law School Moot Court Room, to provide an opportunity for anybody who either was interested within their own school trying to propose an idea for one of these proposals or who wanted to discuss the process used last year or the process to be used this year to have a chance to have that discussion in again an open forum so that everybody hears the same thing. There have already been discussions with the Deans, and there will be another meeting with the Deans and with the Chancellor to make sure that all of the schools are on a level playing field, that they all understand equally what are we looking for in terms of these proposals, what are the criteria by which they will be evaluated, to try to make the numbers as interchangeable as possible so that they can be compared in a meaningful way. There will be a communication going out to all faculty on this campus, which will again outline that there will be a second round of funding opportunities and outline these and other opportunities for people to learn more about or, participate in their schools own process. And then finally, I've been working my way through the schools slowly, but surely, meeting with Deans and faculty who are interested, particularly those who submitted proposals last year that were not funded and understandably would like feedback on why weren't they funded, what might have made them stronger proposals. It's a difficult task in the sense that the committee will be different this upcoming year, so there's no degree of, if you will, predictive value from that. But in some instances there really did seem to be some differences among schools in the way that they went about generating proposals; some schools being maybe more used to this type of proposal process, and I think we're all committed to wanting to make sure there's no sense of inequity in the way that everyone has the same shot at funding for these proposals. Questions or comments? I don't know if Chancellor Brehm, if you have anything you want to add to that?

MILLER: I have a question...you are expecting that some of these proposals from last year that were not funded will likely be resubmitted?

CATE: I would expect that, yes.

MILLER: There isn't a change in the focus of the priorities that would make that not appropriate.

CATE: No change at all. In other words, the same strategic planning report, the same strategic objectives will be in play this year as well as last year. And although it is possible that, in the process this fall, if there's some consensus that there needs to be some change in those, that the strategic planning committee would then make such a recommendation. Absent that recommendation, I think the same objectives will attach.

MILLER: Just a follow on. You say you've been talking to those that submitted those proposals that were not approved, is this...are, is the information about the weaknesses of the proposal, is that verbal information? Are there written things that are available?

CATE: It is verbal information.

MILLER: verbal information.

CATE: The offer was made both in writing to the Deans and again in a face-to-face meeting with the Deans that any Dean, in theory all of the proposals had a Dean's name on them, that any Dean who wished to talk about those or to have the faculty that they knew were involved, even though we might not know who those faculty were, that we would be happy to meet with them one-on-one or in a group. However they wanted to do it. In only one instance has a Dean actually asked for written comments, and that was an instance where there were a number of proposals involved and the difficulty of getting those faculty together seemed so great that the Dean thought it would be better to have a written document, which that Dean then broke into individual comments. That's my understanding of how it worked.

MILLER: Is this an ongoing process, or is it over?

CATE: Oh no, it's certainly ongoing.

MILLER: It's an ongoing process?

CATE: Absolutely.

MILLER: Thank you.

BREHM: Can I, Ted, I'm not sure exactly what you mean by ongoing?

MILLER: This process of consultation with the Deans.

BREHM: Yeah, but the second round will be the last round.

MILLER: Well, no I'm sorry, what I meant was, have you finished talking to the Deans about proposals that were not accepted.

CATE: Not at all, and my guess is as we get closer, this would just be my guess assuming the Deans share the same human nature that most of us share—I understand that may not be true. As we get closer to the time when people are really thinking about putting together proposals for a submission by January 15th, the interest in what happened last year may go up.

MILLER: I got you. Thank you

BRABSON: Fred, Ben Brabson. Two questions. One is could you give us a sense of the fraction of the original proposals that, sorry, could you give us a sense of the fraction of the monies, for example, that have been spent in some sense? How much is available for the second round? The other question is this: in the first round, as I recall, certain general areas, physical sciences for example, were not on the highest priority, biological sciences took that role, and is there some chance that, then in the second round, we can reverse that or change that or is that part set in stone?

CATE: Let me answer the questions in reverse; I'll probably forget the first one by the time I get there. Set in stone is not quite the term I would use. I don't believe at this point, there is an intention by the committee to reopen the strategic priorities on its own, but if there were an overwhelming sense from other campus communities that the five strategic priorities were somehow not quite right, that one needed to be adjusted or there needed to be a sixth or whatever, that's exactly what the committee, that's why we'll be holding the open forums, that's exactly what we'll be encouraging. The other thing I'll just say in relation to that, the actual decisions about what was funded were made through a fairly complex process—the review committee made recommendations; the Chancellor discussed those recommendations with many people; many of you in here were part of those discussions—and therefore I would expect the review committee to follow whatever the written document says, in terms of what the priorities are and so forth with a great deal of fidelity. At the same time, I think we all recognize that there certainly is room for discussion as to what you ultimately do with the review committees' recommendations. And so it is possible that the Chancellor or the Deans or the Budgetary Affairs Committee or some other group would say, looking at the review committees recommendations, we think this time they were too whatever—fill in whatever you want in the blank—and that therefore we may reach further down their list of recommended proposals and what have you. So I don't want to give the impression that the review committee thinks or did in fact make those decisions, it made recommendations. Now what was your first question?

BRABSON: Roughly speaking, how much money was spent?

CATE: I believe that the last year's, the first round, committed 12 million dollars in base funding and the expectation is that this year will commit 6 million dollars in base funding.

BREHM: Let me tell you a quirk in the funding. There's actually 28 million dollars total. Neil and Fred can count with me on this. It's 12 for the first round, 6 for the second. There's 3 million dollars out there that will be used for one-time only money, because it's so expensive, and by the way, the physical sciences are getting some of that money, ok. So that 3 million dollars, eventually seven years from now or so, will fall into the Chancellor's fund and be allocated, but that's a long ways away. The other, if you're keeping track, other 7 million, 4 million goes into financial aid for student scholarships, undergraduate scholarships, and the other 3 million dollars for graduate fellowships, and both of those funds will be used to match private donations in the campaign, hoping thereby to double them.

RUBIN: Last year Sharon had mentioned that there was a potential that we might need to use some of that one-time money to pay some of the bills that accumulated. I'm assuming that that has not occurred? Do we still have the full amount of money to use for the Strategic Planning priorities?

BREHM: Yes, absolutely. There was a moment there, but we got through it.

RUBIN: Good.

CATE: If I may just say, since it looks like there are no more questions, I'll just ask myself one and then sit down. It is extremely tempting in a process like this, you know, for there to be a certain amount of fatigue, I can understand that personally. And at the end of sort of the coming up with the initial strategic priorities, a lot of discussion over that, a tremendous amount of meetings, but then the funding proposal process went forward, and I think a number of people sort of breathed a sigh a relief and went on. I actually think we are at probably the most important part of the entire strategic planning process now, which is we have the chance to look back over the past year and ask what did we do right and wrong, and we now have the obligation to put in place the review process and the benchmarks by which both the specific Commitment to Excellence proposals and the overall process will be evaluated. And one of the things you've heard me say before, and I will continue to say, is how good we are at committing money for things in the university and how bad we are at asking if those commitments were successful. And so I think really the task that's in front of the committee now is certainly, the hardest task, I think, of all five and, in many ways, really the most important. So I really strongly encourage your input, and you will find us back on the doorstep of your committees, and in the full session I hope, so that we get that.

BUCY: I've got one other question. Ben was asking about what are the possibilities potentially of awards for physical science projects. I have no interest, personal stake in the humanities, but I've heard from various quarters that there was a wish for humanities awards. Is that in the works, or is that in the mix? Could that happen or does it look like this is going to primarily be a science initiative?

CATE: I think it can definitely happen. First of all, it did happen last year. It didn't happen maybe to the extent that some people, perhaps many people would have liked, but I don't think it would be at all reasonable to say that humanities proposals were excluded. Certainly the Deans

didn't understand it that way. They sent forward quite a number of them, and some were funded. I think this is a little bit where the concern about making sure that all schools come at this equally arises from, and that's making sure that the sciences don't have an advantage simply out of the fact that they would be used to a funding process which this is somewhat more akin to, and that therefore, to the extent that the form and quality of the actual proposals, that it doesn't really matter what discipline they're from; they come with sort of a uniform quality and focus on the same strategic priorities that everybody's focusing on. But I would certainly expect to see excellent humanities proposals, and I would expect to see some of those funded this year. Thank you.

BREHM: Thank you so much. We have a second part, but we're going to delay that so that we make sure that we get you through on time to go to your committee meetings. But we also, on another meeting when it's convenient, we would like to have Neil report on the state of the budget and go forward on that. I would like also, before I go into a few campus goals for the coming year, I'd like to introduce Carol Elam. Carol, if you would stand. Carol is from the University of Kentucky, and she is an ACE (American Council on Education) Fellow and will be working with me this year. This is supposed to be an educational process for her, so she may come by and talk with you and ask questions about the campus and the university, and I hope that you will all help us be her teachers. So, Carol, we're really delighted to have you here.

ELAM: Very pleased to be here, thank you.

BREHM: Rather than a formal report, I thought it would be better to just go down some of the goals that are apparent to me. This is not by any means a full list, and I'm sure others will come up as the year goes by.

The first, of course, is the Strategic Plan and CTE funding. I cannot emphasize to you strongly enough how important it is that you go read the strategic plan. It is actually reasonably short and reasonably well written. And it's really important that you read it, because it is there and it's not going to be in stone, I mean we'll have a review process and there will be time to make modifications and whatever. And supposedly this will have some influence that will extend beyond the CTE funding. And the funding I know everybody's interested in, but you might also want to, you might not all have read the projects that actually got the money, so you might want to go to the same website, the Strategic Plan website, and take a look at that.

I have to tell you I think it's a very important thing for this campus that we have done this, and we will continue doing it. It puts us in a very different mindset, and also actuality, than many of our competitors. Many universities are being absolutely squashed by the state budget funding problems that they're facing, and they're just scrambling to stay afloat. We're not just scrambling to stay afloat. We're moving ahead. And I think we will see that in terms of we've got a window here for a couple of years—I mean I hope not longer than that because that's as long as the economy stays down; so I'm hoping the economy actually does pump up fairly quickly—but I do think we've got a couple of years where, if we do it right, we can make some real progress and get ahead of the game, and the way to do that is, at least in part, to focus on selected projects and fund them well and have them hire a great deal of faculty. My estimate is that, by the end of the—and it will take many, it will take years, it will take five, six, seven years

for all of this to play out—but when it’s all done, I believe that we’ll have hired somewhere in the neighborhood of 135 new faculty. That’s a big deal, and that will have a big effect on this university. So we are not frozen as someone said to me. California is frozen. We’re not frozen. We’re moving. So I hope you feel optimistic and energetic and enthusiastic about this.

And the Strategic Plan and CTE funding is not the only reason. Obviously all the Deans and all the faculty are working hard, but it is as a community we’re moving ahead.

To help us do that I think there are some issues, other issues that we have to focus on. One is undergraduate education. And, here it’s not that I’m saying that there’s something wrong with undergraduate education at Indiana University Bloomington. To the contrary, everything I learn about the undergraduate education here impresses me more and more. However, the campus has not had a history of very much coordination, and I think that that is a weakness. Because I think that, if we coordinate more in fact, then, we can take strength from each other and we can make sure that more faculty and more students know about the programs and have them more effective.

There are three areas where I am particularly concerned. One is recruitment and financial aid. The Bloomington campus has in the past been relatively reactive; we have not been very proactive. We need to be proactive. There is no way on earth that we are going to increase diversity among our student body—at this point I’m speaking mainly of undergraduates—there is no way we can increase that diversity unless we become very proactive; and that includes financial aid, it includes feeder programs, it includes a lot of outreach. I think we are beginning to draw the strengths of all of this together, and Moya Andrews did a very, very excellent job over the summer. She pulled together a task force in a variety of areas, one of which was recruitment and financial aid—and in fact out of her office will come a summary paper making some suggestions for the next step in this area, and in some other areas of undergraduate education—but recruitment and financial aid is absolutely critical—and I have to tell you it is going to cost some money. If you want to recruit a more diverse student body and if you want to recruit more high achieving students it does cost money. But it’s not just money, it’s also programming. But, as you know, programming costs money too. So, I think we can move ahead on this, but we need to be very coordinated, very focused, and have very clear goals.

Second is international experiences. This is coming along in a wonderful way. I want you to know that, within a very few years, maybe four, Neil can tell me if I’m dead wrong on this, but about four years is my guess, we will have enough money between an endowment, a very generous endowment, and the campus, to provide an average of \$1500 per student for 600 students studying abroad. We don’t actually have the capacity almost to handle that. I’m hoping these are new students, right, not just the same students. I’m hoping we actually increase the number of students doing study abroad, so I would urge all of you in your units to talk about this, to think about this. It’s called the IEP program, International Experiences Program, and it’s run through the Honors College. Karen Hansen knows all about this, and it’s not restricted to the Honors Program. There’s a GPA requirement, it’s like 3.2, but it’s not restricted to the Honors College. So that is one thing.

Another area that we need to find some money for and I'm trying to do that, although at this moment I cannot report success to you, but I can report effort. We need to find some funding in order to enable more Bloomington faculty to lead study abroad programs. Now I know it's very hard to do this for a semester or a year, but maybe in between semesters, maybe over the summer. Why is that important? Well, first of all, if you're going to truly internationalize your curriculum, you need your faculty to be really interested in this; ok, it has to mean something to the faculty. That's one. Number two, having IU faculty lead the program is very attractive to students and their parents, so we, actually that's another way to increase their participation. And another is that there are two lacks in most study abroad programs, and we suffer from the same deficiencies. One is, typically, you do not have very much participation among African-Americans and Hispanics, and, to some extent, even Asian-Americans do not do that much study abroad either, but they do a little bit more than the other two groups. So, it's very important that we bring in these students to do study abroad as well as our White/Non-Hispanic students. So the diversity issue is one that I think our own professors can reach out, can in essence urge our students and recruit our students from a wide variety of groups to participate in study abroad. And the other is we need more programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Most of our programs are still in Europe. And we lag a little bit behind in terms of our participation. I think the national figures are something like 25 % of study abroad programs are—or student experiences, I think they track it by the students—the 25% of students go to programs in non-Western countries. Only about 19% of our students go to programs in non-Western countries. I think we all understand, Europe's wonderful. I went to Europe this summer, enjoyed it. But there's a different kind of educational experience when you go to a non-Western country, and I think, if we had more of our faculty involved, we might be able to increase those programs. So, international experiences is coming along nicely, and, again, will be included in the report from Moya's office. But there are still some things we need to do.

The third is probably the most, well, the least interesting in some ways, it's very bureaucratic. But I'll tell you, it probably affects the daily life of more students, even than the first two, and that is that we need to take a really serious look at what I call internal transfer. And that is that students who go in school X, start in School X, and then they decide they're going to transfer to School Y, and they've taken their General Education courses in School X and they find that they don't count in School Y. And that puts them back in terms of their progress. I believe that with a very thorough examination—and Sally Dunn has been working on this—I believe that it is possible that we will find many, many, many commonalities among the General Ed requirements among the schools. And where the differences lie are in the exact courses that satisfy those conceptually similar requirements. So I think if we can work towards a little bit more course overlap, that we could really make the lives of our students much better. And I believe behave in a better way as a campus. The students after all take those gen ed courses in good faith; they don't really realize that they may not transfer to another school. So this is something that's being looked at very carefully and, again, will be part of Moya's report.

The third issue is external transfer, called articulation and transfer. Some of you may remember that last year this became a very difficult issue at the state level. There was a lot of discussion. There's been a lot of discussion internally. I believe, we will have, again, from Moya's office, particularly with David Nordloh, her new Associate Dean of Faculties, we will have some "to do" steps—some things that we need to do internally to make sure that we stay true to our values

and true to our quality control and make it a system that is more permeable to the students who really are qualified to be here. I think some of this is a communication problem. But it's something that is very important for us to address. I would note, by the way, and this stunned me when I discovered this but it's true. You may think in your mind—I won't ask you to say it—think in your mind how many transfer students we have on the Bloomington campus, a number will come to your mind. The real number is 700. I suspect that's lower than what most of you thought. OK. We don't have many transfer students. Given that we don't have a whole lot, I think that means that we can make a little bit of extra effort to make it a bit easier for them. Not if they're not qualified, I'm not saying that. But if they in fact are qualified, try to ease that transition a little bit for them.

Next issue, very interesting, possible merger between Informatics and Computer Science and perhaps SLIS. We have started these conversations. We have a faculty committee, and the first step will be to look at the possible, look at the academic impact—that's the first assignment—of the merger between Computer Science and Informatics; just the academic impact of just those two units. Once that's done, then SLIS will need to decide, as a group of faculty, whether or not they want to sort of make a three-way examination of academic impact. And they'll vote on that, and if they vote to do it, we'll do it, and if they vote not to, that's fine, we won't do it. The next step is, whether we've got two units involved or three units involved, is to get the finance people to look at the—we've already looked at the impact academically, that's what has to be first, and if there is a recommendation for a merger, either two or three or at least it looks possible, feasible—then in fact we need to look at the money. The reason I want to do the money last is because the money overshadows everything, and it shouldn't. Really, the first consideration needs to be academic. And if there are academic reasons for doing it, then that should motivate us all to find a reason, to find a way to manage the finances. This is underway, and everybody—we have also some people from cognitive science and math on the committee just because they're related areas. The faculty will be fully informed, the BFC will be fully informed, everyone, this will not, there's nothing secretive about this. It's a small group, because they have to do a lot of work, but they are in all—and I think at the end of this, wherever it ends up, what I'm hoping is that people will feel that it's been a very good and constructive process. And we'll just have to see how it goes. Right now the committee is meeting, looking at the pros and cons academically of merging the two units, Computer Science and Informatics.

Development. Many of you who have been on the BFC before know this. We are beginning to plan the next Bloomington campaign. We're still in the pre-silent phase. I think we soon enter the silent phase, and then we anticipate announcing this in the summer of 2005, and it would go until 2010. This will be a major campaign, and we will focus this time around primarily on students. That doesn't mean we won't have endowed chairs and professorships; we absolutely will; and also each unit will have its own slate, its own menu of items that it wishes to pursue. But at the campus level, we have a great opportunity to take these Commitment to Excellence funds and use them for matching, for financial aid and merit, for undergraduates and graduates. And this could really make, I think, a huge difference in terms of our ability—all this stuff links—in terms of our ability to recruit a diverse student body as well as a more high achieving student body.

Speaking of diversity, we are going forward with the One for Diversity fund. There will be a student fund that will be the first item that will happen. And that will be sometime this fall. I'm also talking with the Deans about a faculty/staff solicitation that would include the One for Diversity fund but not be limited to it by any means. I'm talking with the Deans about just how that solicitation would go; that wouldn't be until the spring. We're also, of course, looking very carefully at recruitment and retention of faculty, students, and staff. As you know, in my State of Diversity speech, I went through all the numbers. I will do that again this coming spring, go through all the numbers. I hope the numbers are encouraging. So I think we're all pretty focused on this, and I think we are making some progress in some areas. And one of the items, Terry Dworkin is our new Dean of the Office of Women's Affairs, and Terry is very interested in pursuing women and minorities in STEM areas, which is science, technology, engineering, and math. This is still a very great problem for our country, and at another time perhaps I can talk with you about why it's particularly a problem right now. But we very much need to have more minorities and women in these STEM areas, or we're going to face some very difficult issues down the line as a country.

The School of Continuing Studies. I have proposed a reorganization to the President. This reorganization was put together by all of the Vice Chancellors, and Moya was very much involved, and it was a multi-campus effort. The President wants to take a look at it. He will take a look at it, and then we'll see what direction he wants us to go, maybe in this direction or another. I think the good news is this is a very good moment to look at this and, hopefully, come up with something that we all think is very affective.

We are also searching for an IU Press Director. That search, we're looking for a search from—Don Gray is the Chair of the committee and it is a spectacular committee. If you're really interested I'll send you the list of faculty. You would be hard pressed, I think, to come up with a more outstanding group of faculty, and they are doing this because it's a labor of love. As you know, university presses all over the country have had a tough time, and so this is the opportunity for us to really understand the problems that our IU Press has faced, to work with it, to help it, and that may include money, and to get a new Director with a lot of energy and vision. So I think we're, you know, we're not to the end of the line on IU Press, because we have some things we have to do, but I think we're heading in exactly the right direction.

We're also working on the Multidisciplinary Science Building 2. Lisa Pratt is the Chair of that committee, that's coming along. And that will of course go in the Science District—north of 10th Street.

We will have a search for a Dean of Journalism, and that is underway. We will also have a couple of other searches in my office, but right now the President, is trying to get his view of the, I think, organization of the university, and he has asked all of us who have a variety of executive searches waiting to sort of hold until he can talk about his ideas and his vision for the organization of the university, which is my understanding will be sometime in October or November. So, and that's fine.

So those are the things that I'm tracking daily, and I think these are all important areas. And, in every one of them, I feel like we are, again, moving forward, that we're making progress, and we're just a very lively place to be right now.

Are there questions? I'm right at 4:30. No, ok. Terrific.

DALEKE: I'd like to make just two quick announcements. One if you haven't signed in yet, there's a green sheet that we send around at the beginning of every meeting; please be sure that you check off your name. If you come late, Kelly will have this, so it's important that we have a record of attendance. Secondly, we'll be breaking up now into committee meetings. As you know, most of the work of the BFC is done in committees, and we have a strong record of faculty governance here at IU, and actually that's where all the work gets done. So as you start your committee work for the year, keep that in mind. Some excellent work has come out of our committees in the past, and I'm really looking forward to working with you this year and seeing some equally excellent work come out of our committees. Lastly, a technical matter, the list of the committees is on your agenda sheet—the committee meeting sites, excuse me. If you find that some of these rooms where multiple committees are meeting is too crowded, there may be other rooms that are available that are nearby. So, if it is too crowded, you might have to hunt. If you have a problem, please come down, send someone down to the office, and we can help you out. And Kelly has keys to any of the other rooms; she can get in to anywhere in Ballantine Hall. Those of you who would like to use the elevator, we have a key to the elevator here too.

William H. Wheeler
Secretary