

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 21, 2006
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

Members Present: Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Katy Borner, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Emily Fairchild, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Susan Jones, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, David Mackay, Gerald Marker, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Nicholas Williams.

Members Absent: LTC Lori Bass, Jorge Chapa, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliott, William Leckey, Alyce Miller, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Richard Rubinger, Alex Shortle, Maxine Watson, Gary Wiggins.

Visitors Present: Charlie Nelms, Bradley Wheeler.

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes: February 7, 2006
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/02.07.06.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions
Professor Felix Oinas
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B31-2006.htm>

Professor Georges R. Edelen
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B32-2006.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business
(Professor Theodore Miller)

4. Presiding Officer's Business
(Interim Provost Michael McRobbie)

5. Question / Comment Period*
(Interim Provost Michael McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

6. Indiana University Bloomington Policy on Undergraduate Admissions [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B13-2006.htm>

7. Search and Screen Procedures for Senior Administrators [FIRST READING]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U13-2006.doc>

8. Policy on Developing New Graduate Programs at Indiana University [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U12-2006.htm>

9. BFC Presiding Officer [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller)

10. Standing Committee Reports

11. Old Business

12. New Business

Minutes

MCROBBIE: Ladies and gentlemen why don't we get started. Forgive me, I have a heavy cold which probably makes my Australian accent more incomprehensible to you as well. I welcome to you to this meeting, the first one that I'm chairing. It's a great honor to be able to do that, quite a few items of substance on the agenda as well. And forgive me if I make any procedural mistakes, I'll hopefully learn quickly.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: The first item is the approval of minutes and I assume that the standard of practice is just to take the motion for the approval of the minutes. Can I ask for such a motion?

TERRY: I move.

MCROBBIE: And a second and is there any discussion on this motion? If there are no corrections or anything then they'll be forwarded independently. So, all those in favor of the minutes? Opposed? That's clearly carried.

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

MCROBBIE: And now there's a number of Memorial Resolutions and I think Jeanne, you traditionally take care of those.

SEPT: Yes. We have two today and as before I have the honor of reading some excerpts from these resolutions but I refer you to the full text in the full minutes.

Professor Felix J. Oinas passed away at his home in Bloomington, on September 25, 2004, at the age of 93. He was born on March 16, 1911, in Tartu, Estonia. He was a world-renowned scholar with many areas of expertise. At Indiana University, this was reflected in the fact that he taught courses in three diverse departments: the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, the Uralic- Altaic Department (now the Central Eurasian Studies Department), and the Folklore Institute. He was considered the first pioneer of Estonian folklore and is credited with upholding the high scholarly standards of the study of Estonian folklore during the period of Soviet rule in Estonia.

Fortunately for Felix Oinas' intellectual development, he was able to attend Tartu University in the early 1930's, during the period of Estonia's independence. He specialized in the Finno-Ugric languages, including their folklore, ethnography, and literature. In 1935, he was able to spend a year abroad, in Budapest, and deepened his knowledge of Slavic linguistics, which he had begun in Tartu. In 1938 he was awarded an M.A. from Tartu University in Finno-Ugric, comparative literature, and folklore. In the late 1930's, he taught Estonian in Hungary, also completing research projects in the field of Hungarian literature and working on Hungarian-Estonian translations. He remained in Estonia during the 1940-41 Soviet occupation and the 1941-44 German occupation, leaving for Germany soon before the entry of Soviet forces, in 1944. While in Germany, he studied Slavic linguistics and literature at the University of Heidelberg.

In September, 1949, the Oinas family sailed to the United States, first living in Detroit and later moving to Bloomington, Indiana, in 1950. In 1952, Oinas successfully defended his Indiana University Ph.D. in the field of Balto-Finnic linguistics. While at IU, he also worked as a lecturer of Russian. In 1955, he received a tenure-track appointment as Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies (the forerunner of the current Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures). His promotion to Associate Professor took place in 1961, and in 1965 he was promoted to full rank, with affiliations in three areas: Slavic, Uralic-Altaic, and Folklore. His emeritus period began in 1981.

Professor Oinas received many honors during his life, which are too numerous to mention in full. In 1977, he was elected as a foreign member of the Finnish Academy of Sciences. In 1985, he received the Kalevala medal from the Finnish government. In 1986, he was made an honorary member of the Folklore Institute of Pázmány Péter University in Budapest, Hungary. He was honored by many more organizations in many countries. He had many visiting and guest appointments in such institutions as the University of California at Berkeley (1976), various Finnish universities (1962), Stockholm (1962), and Belgrade University (1974). He also gave lectures at numerous other universities across the United States. He participated in many international conferences and was active in professional organizations, such as the Modern Language Teachers Association. He played a major editorial role as review editor and board member at the *Slavic and East European Journal*, the journal of AATSEEL, the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages. On the occasion of his 70th birthday Oinas was honored with an international *Festschrift* edited by V.E.Zygas and Peter Voorheis, *Folklorica: Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas*. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series vol.141 (Bloomington, 1982).

His colleagues in each of Professor Oinas' departments at Indiana University remember his unique and special contribution. In the Slavic Department, former students still recall the high standards of Professor Oinas' course in Old Church Slavonic, which was taught with intellectual rigor, but also a sense of humor. His unique courses in Slavic folklore are fondly remembered, especially since they have never been replaced since his retirement. Folklorists recall the unique role played by Professor Oinas, who served as a window into the folklore studies of Eastern Europe, thanks to his fluent knowledge of many of the languages of that region. Since his first training was as a Finno-Ugrist, his years in the Uralic- Altaic Department were an opportunity for him to make another unique contribution to Indiana University.

There were many basic themes of Felix Oinas' research. Some of the most important included Balto-Finnic and Slavic folklore, the relation of Balto-Finnic folklore as compared to Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian) folklore, the Estonian epic *Kalevipoeg* (including the study of Slavic parallels to that epic), mythology (including the study of spirits, ghosts, devils, and vampires), and the study of Slavic and Finnic etymologies.

A summary such as this cannot do justice to the image represented by Felix Oinas to those who knew him. People marveled at how he could put so much energy, enthusiasm, and hard work into each of the specialized areas of Slavic, Finno-Ugric, and folklore, let alone attain great renown in all of these areas. This combination, like Felix Oinas the man, was a truly unique entity, not likely to be repeated again. Those who knew him count themselves as very fortunate to have had the rare opportunity to have known a scholar of such uncommon breadth and knowledge.

Georges Edelen came to Bloomington in 1958, after almost a decade at Harvard during which he earned a doctorate with a dissertation in the literature of the English renaissance and taught for seven years, first as a teaching fellow and then as an instructor. He had interrupted his undergraduate study at Georgetown with three years of service in U. S. Army Air Corps (1943-46). He was assigned to a unit in India that supported the aircraft and pilots flying the Hump into China, and occasionally he hitched a ride on one of the planes so that he could know the sometimes dangerous experience of wartime flight over the Himalayas. After the war he returned to Georgetown to complete his undergraduate degree in 1949. Then to Harvard, and then a return to the Midwest – he was born in Great Lakes, a little north of Chicago – to begin what became a long and extraordinarily valuable career as a scholar, an administrator, and especially as a teacher at Indiana University.

Georges made a habit of including comments on his teaching in his annual reports, and without intending to do so over the years he wrote a short history of the making of a very fine teacher. After his first year in Bloomington he wrote that he had trouble finding a proper "pitch" in his address to students in classes that he found disturbingly large (thirty-five students in a first-year lecture-discussion course). He thought that he talked too much, and that the writing of his students was, to put it more gently than he did, unsophisticated in its conception and uncertain in its command of the conventions of standard English. So he set himself to ventilate his lectures with invitations for student responses and opinions, to devise frequent and various occasions for student writing, and to recognize what beginning writers could consistently and confidently do and how to move them ahead from that sure ground. By the end of his second year he was

“amazed” at the responsiveness of the students in his classes, and impressed by the quality of their writing at the end of the courses. When Georges began to lecture in really large classes (120-150 students), he wrote that “I am far from satisfied with the lectures: there was far too much Olympian criticism and far too little sheer glee over the plays [of Shakespeare]. There will be changes made.” Changes were made: by 1961 university counselors were reporting “rave notices” about Professor Edelen from the undergraduates with whom they talked, and one of his teaching assistants in a big lecture course wrote that he had never seen or studied in a class “where such effective dialogue between students had been so quickly established and so successfully sustained.”

Georges started to teach graduate courses near the end of the tumultuous 60s, and inevitably he met challenges to the traditional matter and methods of his seminars. He listened to students in long, informal sessions at his house, and again he learned to modulate the pitch of his teaching: graduate students began to remark his “disciplined, sensitive teaching” and its “balance of sympathy and professionalism.” But he remained firm in his convictions about the stature and worth of the writing he presented for study, and about the criteria by which literary scholarship and criticism are to be judged. “I bow to no one in my affection and respect for feisty students,” he wrote in one annual report, “but mass assaults on *standards* are out of court.”

In one of his annual reports Georges added up the number of student papers he and his teaching assistants had read that year: “460 formal papers, 286 shorter essays, 127 essay bluebooks, and the usual run of thesis proposals, chapters, etc.” He did this arithmetic not, as he wrote, “to claim heroic virtue, but because people . . . often do not recognize what ‘teaching writing’ really means.” For Georges it meant asking students to write frequently and requiring himself to read carefully. Undergraduate and graduate students praised him as a superb critic of student writing. In one of his important services to the campus Georges chaired a committee that in 1978-79 reviewed the intensive writing requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee report not only endorsed the idea that undergraduates in the College must enroll in a course beyond the first year that required writing. The report also urged – a principle then, as now, often neglected, but Georges didn’t give up – that these courses always be taught by a member of the faculty.

Georges never stopped regretting that the conditions of undergraduate education in a public university got in the way of his knowing all his students individually. But again he found ways to know at least some of them. Sometimes Georges would come into my office, or stop me in the hall, to tell me the name of a student who had enrolled in one of my courses in the coming semester. “You’re really going to like him,” he would say. Or: “She writes beautifully.” Georges was always right, but what impressed me was that he not only knew the character and quality of his students, but that he also knew what they were doing in the rest of their undergraduate study. In effect, he was giving them a letter of introduction to ease them on their way. I often thought that Georges had brought with him to Bloomington as much of Harvard College as of Harvard University.

His graduate education had trained Georges as an editor of texts written in the English Renaissance. In Bloomington he grew into a learned and skilful editor. He prepared an edition of William Harrison’s *A Description of England*, published in 1968 by the Cornell University

Press for the Folger Library. His principal achievement was an edition of Richard Hooker's *On the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, published in four volumes by the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press (1977-82). This work was assisted by the award of a fellowship in the Folger Library in 1962. He regularly attended the meetings of the board of editors of the edition of Hooker's writing, and he worked as an inspector for the Committee on Scholarly Editions of the Modern Language Association. He gave the same close and informed attention to his reading of scholarly manuscripts of his contemporaries as he did to Renaissance texts. The author of a manuscript on which Georges had reported for a university press wrote to him, "I don't expect to get any reviews as useful as your evaluation."

Early on in his time in Bloomington Georges also became interested in the study of literary style. He wrote an essay and some papers on Hooker's style, and he delivered another paper on the methods currently practiced in the field of stylistics. Some of the students in his seminars on Renaissance prose went on to write dissertations under his direction on the styles of Hooker, Milton, Thomas Browne, and other 16th- and 17th-century English prose writers. Once he collaborated with two of his colleagues, each of whom studied style from premises and by methods different from his own, to offer a graduate seminar in the study of prose style. Georges was, one of his collaborators in the seminar observed, a "constant voice of calm reasonableness," adept at weaving the information and lessons of his own considerable learning "adroitly into the fabric of the discourse," and possessed of an "unusual ability to provoke discussion and then guide it towards an insightful (and amicable!) conclusion." The excellence of Georges' teaching was recognized by his nomination for a Danforth teaching award in 1964, and his receipt of the Senior Class Faculty teaching award in 1982, and of a University teaching award in 1984.

Georges was also a thoughtful and effective teacher of teachers. On three occasions (1964-64, 1966-67, 1977-79) he served as the coordinator of the Department's first-year courses in literature and composition, and later as its director of graduate studies (1967-70). In these offices he conceived his fundamental responsibility to be to help graduate students learn to become good teachers and responsible members of the academy. He devised a course in the teaching of literature, pushed hard for the revision of the graduate curriculum to prepare students for the careers in teaching as well as literary scholarship into which they would most likely graduate, frequently visited the classes of associate instructors and his own colleagues, and spent hours in conversations in his office with graduate students. (The sign on the door of his office read: "Full Service Professor.") In large part because of his knowledge of and care for graduate students (his judicious temper also helped), in 1969 he was asked to chair a campus committee that reviewed the dismissal of a teaching associate active in the disruptive politics of the moment. The committee's recommendations, accepted by the Chancellor, redressed an injustice without compromising traditional standards of academic conduct and civility. One of the members of the committee, himself an eminent and practiced academic administrator, wrote to praise "the wisdom, the tact, the energy, the humaneness, the integrity, and the human directness of George's work on the committee," and concluded that "if the University came through rather well this past turbulent year, much more credit than anyone suspects is due to his sure, steady, and wise direction" of the committee and its inquiry.

Georges is often so described by students and colleagues. His was a measured and mediating presence. His bearing was dignified, composed, courteous, and collegial, characteristically

reserved but forward enough, and often wry, when he set out his opinions. (After he watched my sometimes hectic conduct of a session in a big undergraduate lecture course, his advice was succinct: Take your foot off the accelerator, he told me.) A man who in his youth had maneuvered to get a look at the Himalayas from the air, Georges always generated and responded to excitement (“glee”) in his own teaching; “he gets as much charge out of Spenser,” one of his undergraduate students wrote, “as I do from a soccer match.” But Georges knew, and would insist on, the difference between Spenser and soccer. He never doubted where the treasure lay – in canonical writers (“real texts,” as a graduate assistant who taught with him, and obviously learned from him, described his reading list), in clear writing, in disciplined thinking, in a generous but principled sorting through the complicated circumstances of learning and teaching, in and out of a classroom. Although his teaching, in matter and style, and his conduct of his profession were from beginning to end more formal and traditional than those of most of his colleagues, all of us who paid attention learned much from his idea of what was required of a university professor of literature and writing. Remembering and thinking about Georges can still teach us much about how to move, and, just as important, where to stand, within the best purposes of our work.

Be it resolved that this memorial resolution be presented to a meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and that a copy be deposited in the Archives of the University. Be it further resolved that copies of the resolution be sent to Virginia Edelen, Georges’ wife, to his children and to Albrecht Strauss and Mr. and Mrs. David French, friends of Georges’ from his graduate school days.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Jeanne. Could we stand for a moment for our departed colleagues? Thank you all very much.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Agenda Item 3, Ted.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much. Basically my report today will be a preview of our agenda today. I have a few comments to make regarding several of the items. Before getting to that however, I would like to also say that the Intellectual Property Policy, which is one of the main sort of items on the BFC agenda this year, is making its way to you. There was a time when we thought a first reading would be on this agenda; but that turned out not to work out. There still are some discussions going on over some rather important points in the proposal and I’m hoping that we can have something for you at our next meeting on this topic. This is clearly a very important policy for Indiana University and some people seem to think that we’re rushing it somehow—although, I think if anybody actually would look at the history of this it’s quite clear that it’s not being rushed. But that item is coming toward you.

Today on our agenda we have a Policy for Undergraduate Admissions for the Bloomington Campus. This is clearly one of the really important items of our business this year. And you’ll see on the agenda this is an Action Item. It’s my hope that we will approve this today. The Trustees, I believe, are ready to talk about admissions at their March meeting and I think it would be very good if we could go to that meeting with something in hand.

Item #7 Search and Screen Procedures for Senior Administrators—this item, many of you may think it is kind of coming out of the blue so to speak. It's important to understand what this document represents. You are aware that the Trustees have ideas about search and screen; I believe you have all received a copy of some comments that they have prepared regarding search and screen procedures. They are interested in a revision of the search and screen procedures that the faculty has approved. Now it turns out that we have search and screen procedures currently at the university-level which bear on certain positions in the university; we have search and screen procedures at the campus-level which bear on other positions. This document, Circular U13-2006, is a draft and really the notation on the agenda that this is a First Reading, even that may be too strong a statement, this is really a pre-reading because this document was prepared by maybe two or three people and it purports to consolidate into one search and screen policy all of our existing search and screen policies. So this policy is supposed, as it has been prepared, the intent of it is to govern search and screen at the university-level and at the campus-level. And as I say it's had very little, very few eyes have sort of gone over this yet, so if you have harsh things to say about this please do not refrain from saying them because it may be that this is something that we should put aside and try a different approach.

DAVILA: Ted, if one has harsh things to say, and I'm sure we won't, who are the two or three persons...?

T. MILLER: Well, I will confess to being one of them. Mary Fisher from Indianapolis has seen this and made some comments on it, although she was not, she could not attend the meeting where this was actually sort of structured. And then there was a third person, Ron Finkbine from the Southeast campus was a person who was on the phone with Kelly and I and Ron and basically sat down and looked at what the Trustees had to say, looked at what our policy said, we had various other example policies from different institutions—the University of Minnesota was one that we were looking at pretty carefully. And we tried to put something together that seemed to meet the needs that are out there. And so it's been a very small group so far.

DAVILA: And may I ask who Ron is?

T. MILLER: Ron? He's a representative to the UFC Agenda Committee from the regional campuses. This subcommittee was actually a subcommittee structured by the UFC Agenda Committee for the purpose of looking at this search and screen business. The existing policies are all in your packet here on one of these white sheets labeled Academic Handbook; you can see the Search and Screen procedures, that's the university-level one first and then the Bloomington one is attached as a second part of that and Indianapolis too.

Item #8 the document Guidelines for Developing New Graduate Programs at Indiana University. This is one of the items coming out of the Mission Differentiation Project. There were recommendations from that Project about developing new graduate degree programs at Indiana University. This is a document that was developed within the Graduate School and the intent of this is to implement the recommendations—although my sense is that at least in part this document really parts company with the recommendations that were made. This is something that the Trustees have talked some about and I think they want to talk about it some more at their

next meeting, possibly approve it at their next meeting, I don't know. So we'd like to have some feedback from this group. I don't think we can spend a great deal of time on this but we want some feedback from this group. We'll do a little bit more at the UFC level next week and then hopefully be ready to discuss it with the Trustees in early March.

So that's Item #8. Item #9, BFC Presiding Officer. As many of you know the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty specifies that the presiding officer of the Bloomington Faculty Council will be the chancellor. And of course we now have an administrative structure where there is no chancellor; the Agenda Committee has interpreted the Constitution in a way that leads us to have Michael as the presiding officer here today and I think for the rest of the year we're planning on that. But it's clear that we are going to have to amend the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty in this regard and actually there are several places where it probably needs to be amended and we'll try to collect those together, but this is one of them. So the intent of Item #9 here today is simply to have a discussion about what the members of the Faculty Council feel would be appropriate in terms of the BFC presiding officer. And it seems to me there really are three main options available, there may be others but there seem to be three main ones—one would be to have the provost of the Bloomington campus be the presiding officer of the Bloomington campus—maybe there are four. A second would be to have the President of the Bloomington campus be the presiding officer of the BFC. A third would be to have the President and the Provost jointly be the presiding officer, perhaps the president would come some times and the provost would come some other times and they could work their schedules out and they could do that in a collaborative way and that would be an option. And then of course the fourth option would be to tell the president and the provost that we would prefer that they don't come.

MCROBBIE: You seem to have all the options.

T. MILLER: Anyway, so there are a variety of choices that could be made and this Item #9 is kind of starting us toward a consideration of what would be in the best interests of the Bloomington campus from that point of view.

BRADLEY: Ted, could I just make a brief addendum to that. There's actually, since as usual we probably won't get to Item #9, there's a fifth option which is probably more interesting than telling them not to come and that is telling them to come but relieving them of being the presiding officer. The presiding officer is somewhat constrained about participating in discussions and that sort of thing, as a matter of custom at least, so one option would be to have the president, Ted in this case, be the presiding officer, but invite and strongly encourage either the president or the provost or both to come to participate more robustly in discussions than is currently the case. So that's another thing to think about.

T. MILLER: Thank you, Craig.

AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Well with that confidence building preamble let me just make a couple of comments under the next agenda item. I've had a number of discussions with the President about

structural issues which I think were discussed here last time and I think those are pretty much complete from my point of view but I know that I believe he wants to discuss with the Agenda Committee some of the matters that he's thinking about as well and I don't think those discussions have taken place yet. It is the case that the research office will report to the provost's office and I've had that discussion with the Agenda Committee and hopefully within the next week I can make an announcement about an arrangement there to handle that. The one qualification is that there will be a review of compliance issues that will be run through the University Counsels' office, through Dottie Frapwell's office, of compliance that will be done by some external groups over the next three to four months I guess. And one of the options that may be looked at is for compliance to move its reporting line from the research office to the president's office; the analogy being something like internal audit. But that will also be one of the things that will be considered by the review groups from outside and I would assume that this body would get a chance to comment on any changes that are proposed in that area.

So I think some of the details, or most of the details are getting sorted out at least between myself and the president. Now I think it's up to him to have those discussions with Ted and the rest of the Agenda Committee before he maybe looks to finalize this.

T. MILLER: The Agenda Committee, this is something I should have said in my report, the Agenda Committee is scheduled to meet with the President and with Michael on Thursday so discuss these matters. So that is ongoing. I would expect really that we will be hearing at the next Trustees meeting in early March we will probably be hearing some more about the kinds of decisions that have been made.

MCROBBIE: Second thing I just wanted to comment on is that I've been on the job three weeks and a big chunk of it was taken up with previously scheduled travels, scheduled some time ago. But the one thing I did want to comment on was that I was a member of the reaccreditation committee, the NCA reaccreditation committee for the University of Chicago; it struck me as kind of strange that the University of Chicago has to go through such a process but they do, as do we. And this was headed by Mark Wrighton, the Chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis. It was an extremely useful exercise given that we are going to have to go through this exercise next year in March that Jeanne and others are leading that process up. I was struck with the amount of effort that the University of Chicago put into this. We had a room where we worked in the evenings, in terms of preparing our report, that had a table about as long as this one that was completely covered in files that had all the material for us to delve into if we wanted to delve into stuff at that level of detail. But the level of detail of the presentations and the schedule was considerable and it made me realize, if you like, what the standard is that we will need to make sure we match when our turn comes.

The pattern of these reaccreditation visits is they tend to focus on a theme that you can specify, with their agreement. And we have specified globalization as our theme. There certainly is no time to be lost I think in pulling together all of the material we have to put together; there's a very substantial self-study document that we need to prepare and then a major schedule of interviews with key people throughout the campus. It is the campus that as Chancellor Wrighton said, it's extremely unusual for any institution—in fact no institution has ever been de-accredited. But he said, of course, as probably many of you know, that the NCA can cause issues

for universities. That is they can require yearly follow-up visits if there's some issue they are concerned about or further full-scale reviews and so on. And of course the document is public and so if the document is less than flattering in certain areas this is obviously something we want to try to guard against. So I know quite a few of you are involved in that, probably quite a few more of you will become involved in that. We did have one lunch with the University of Chicago equivalent of the Agenda Committee there as well, which was also very useful. So I think Ted, will it be you Ted next March, so you and your colleagues will need to meet with them as well.

The third thing, oh I should also mention by the way in terms of the last three weeks that I've been meeting pretty extensively with a whole range of groups including the deans—I'm about half way through those meetings and we've just started all the budget committee meetings as well so I'm trying; I think I've got about six weeks of fairly substantial schedule of meetings with various groups and deans and other senior officials in the university basically getting up to speed on all their issues and concerns as well.

A third thing I wanted to mention was the Office of Enrollment Services search; Bonnie is chairing that committee and she has just recommended, well her committee has recommended four finalists to us and we have accepted all four of those for interviews and they will be visiting the campus over the next two to three weeks for interviews in the traditional way that we've always done interviews like that. I think they are four pretty good candidates and obviously again, some people in this room will probably be involved in those interviews. Hopefully we can make an appointment, certainly before the end of the semester of a key senior person in that area which I guess in particular, given agenda Item #6 is going to become even more important as well.

And finally I wanted to mention that, some of you at least I have mentioned this to as well. I had an interest in research space in my previous role and I guess I've expanded that to space more generally. One of the first things I did was ask Neil to put together a list of all space projects—there's about a dozen major projects, obviously a couple of them are obvious like Simon Hall and MSB2, but put together a full list of space projects and I have received at least one message from one of the members here concerned about progress on one of those projects. So Neil put that list together and then Neil and I met with Terry Clapacs and Bob Meadows and Paul Sullivan last week. We had a long meeting where we reviewed every one of those projects and tried to identify in certain cases what the hold-ups were in making progress. I think we've now got a way forward on every one of those projects; some of them obviously were moving, some I think maybe weren't moving quite as fast as some of us had hoped. So that I think is now in good shape. Neil and Bob Meadows are going to meet every month to review those projects and then the bigger group, myself and Terry and the rest of them will meet about every three months to review where we are. Rather than read through that list which I think would not be particularly enlightening, what I've suggested to Bob Meadows, obviously with your agreement, is that it might actually be useful for him to come along and give the BFC a presentation on all those projects. It's actually a quite impressive list of them when you see them altogether and they impinge on pretty much the whole range of academic areas of the university as well. They're not as good as ten new buildings but nevertheless when you see them in their totality they really are quite substantial and I think that might be something you might find helpful to see the progress that hopefully we're going to start accelerating in both the renovation and development of new

space for research and teaching on this campus. So that is something hopefully we can do before the end of the semester. And that's pretty much all I wanted to say by way of my comments.

AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: So I think we move to the question period and I guess that's where people can ask questions of Ted or me. Questions? Well if there aren't any and no one is bursting to ask a question...

AGENDA ITEM #6: INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

MCROBBIE: ...why don't we then move onto Agenda Item #6 the Undergraduate Admissions document. And who would like to start this?

T. MILLER: Bill Wheeler and John Carini.

WHEELER: Good afternoon. We are pleased on behalf of the Educational Policies Committee to bring to the floor of the Council for your action the Circular B13-2006 the proposed Undergraduate Admissions Policy for the Fall of 2011 for the Bloomington campus. You have before you, when you came in, today's draft—make certain you are looking at something which is dated February 21, not February 20. We, in fulfilling our charge from the president are trying to be nimble. The one that you had on the table before you came in is a version in which the changes since the February 7th version are identified; the additions, some substantial, some just a matter of prose are in italics. The things that have been struck out are crossed out. You are being given at this moment a polished version which includes the net changes. So the items, the new text that is in the first copy in italics is simply in ordinary font and those portions that have been dropped are in fact dropped from the polished version. So you may want to, during the course of discussion, look back and forth between the two of them. In a few minutes we will walk you through those changes.

For the moment I want to begin by first thanking my co-chair, John Carini, for his excellent work on this policy. I also want to thank the members of the Educational Policies Committee; this has been a matter that the committee has worked on for three years and in foot note #1 you will see the list of all the members. I especially want to thank Alan Bender and Dennis Senchuk on this year's committee. And also by way of indicating that we have been working on this for three years have placed this to indicate to you that this policy stands apart from the more recent discussions that may have emerged at the Board of Trustees and at the state level. We have been working on this for some time. I want to thank the Council members who have shared their comments with us—both in the discussion last time and afterwards. In particular, Professor Chapa and Luis Davila concerning the Texas Ten Percent Plan. I want to thank the senior administrators who have contributed, particularly here at the end: Vice President Charlie Nelms, University Counsel Dottie Frapwell, the Director of Affirmative Action Julie Knost, the Director of Admissions Mary Ellen Anderson, other members of Vice President Nelms' office Professor Eduardo Rhodes and Professor Kevin Brown.

The thrust of the policy is to assert the primacy of academic preparation and the relevance of a wide-range of other factors in an holistic evaluation of individual applicants. We are all aware of the wide range of views on admissions and dissention in those views, even between members of our Board of Trustees. We have aimed, throughout this past three years, at the central ground and we certainly hope that any proposed amendments would preserve that locus. John is going to say a few words and then we'll walk you through the changes.

CARINI: So I would just say that, as you'll see in a minute, the core of this proposal is in the course requirements. We've tried to carefully choose those to be appropriate to preparing students for success here in Bloomington.

WHEELER: Thank you. The first thing I need to bring to your attention are the two notes, the two paragraphs in the small font at the beginning. The first is to place this document in its context. This document, the policy portion of this document, will for this campus be a replacement for the sections on pages 156-157 of the 2005 Indiana University Academic Handbook. If you look at this circular online you'll actually see a link to the PDF file. We have reproduced for your immediate reference the two relevant pages, pages 156-157, and what would be replaced—now this would not actually go into the IU Academic Handbook because that is a university-wide handbook. What will go into the university –wide handbook is the statement adopted by the UFC that states that individual campuses shall have authority to establish their own campus admission policies.

The policy that we're passing today might eventually appear in the Bloomington Academic Guide which has Bloomington-specific policies in it. It will be a policy document, though, that guides all of the officers, the faculty and staff, of the Bloomington campus. What's being replaced there would be the entirety of page 156 and on the flip side you'll see page 157 and it's the first column of that page that is being replaced. The section beginning with the title "Principles and Procedures for Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers" remains; that is primarily procedures rather than policy. And a careful reading of that will show that it's complimentary to what we are adopting today.

Also to mention that the footnotes in this document are part of the circular and therefore, part of the legislative history of this proposal, but they are not part of the policy itself. When we vote we are not voting on the footnotes. Rather, that is to provide the context, the legislative history, the rationale for the policy and some earlier documents I have prepared for consideration by this Council and the other Council a separate Commentary. But the experience has been that the Commentaries tend to get lost in comparison to the policy statement itself and so by putting the commentary into the footnotes we will be able to preserve the entire history in one place while at the same time being clear about what the policy is that we are adopting.

Now if I can direct your attention perhaps to some of the changes. Some of the changes actually appear in the footnotes and some of those are very important. For example, at the last meeting there were questions about the statement of full diversity in the first paragraph where we say what our goals are. "Indiana University is committed to the goals of quality, full diversity, and access in its admissions policies. The University will strive to have an undergraduate student

body whose members are well-qualified for the University's courses and programs and who represent the full range of diversity within our state, nation, and world." Those are our goals, those goals are taken from the mission statement from the Bloomington campus. The footnotes clarify the meaning of full diversity and Kevin Brown provided us with the further rationale in statement number four about the rationale for diversity and its importance to the mission of the university.

The next point to which I'd like to draw your attention would be in the section on Academic Preparation at the top of page 2. Some of you are aware from newspaper reports or from other discussions that have gone on here, in the draft that was before you at the last meeting the courses that were listed there were designed for, it was a listing that applied both to residents and to non-residents and because of its relevance to non-residents it did not coincide exactly with the Core 40. It rather is one which took into account the high school graduation requirements and the admission requirements of our neighboring states, in particular Illinois and Ohio. At this point in time their high school graduation requirements, even through 2012, are much weaker than our own; requiring, for example, only two years of science and three years of English in one instance. It may well be that Ohio is considering strengthening their requirements and it may well be that by 2011-2012 there's will be the same as ours. At any rate though that was the rationale for the list that appeared last time—it was a list that applied both to non-residents and to residents. There has always been the additional stipulation that Indiana residents must, as specified by Senate Bill 200, complete the Core 40 curriculum or equivalent or a Core 40 academic honors curriculum or equivalent as a condition for regular admission. We have since then modified the list of courses so now it does subsume all of the college-prep courses of the Core 40 curriculum. It is very closely paralleled actually to the college-prep requirement of the Core 40 academic honors. The change was to increase from 33 credits to 34 credits.

The other primary change was in item number four increasing to six credits the number of credits in science required specifying that at least four of those need to be in the laboratory sciences—biology, chemistry, physics. There is an ongoing concern that some high schools in Indiana may not be able to make adequate set number of sections of all of those lab courses available to all of their students who want to pursue higher education because there is a significant cost to providing lab space and so that's the reason why it says six credits of sciences including at least four of the laboratory sciences. That was an increase from four to six. And so in item number six there is a corresponding decrease from four to three. One might say well if you increase by two in one place, to have a zero-sum situation, you should be decreasing from four to two—so this is not a zero-sum change. We had gone ahead to provide direct comparability with the Core 40 and the Core 40 academic honors degrees changed six from saying four to saying three with emphasis on trigonometry and additional mathematical credits for students intending to pursue a science degree, additional world language credits for all other students.

Again, the focus on Academic Preparation is to prepare the student to take courses on this campus. We're not so much making a statement about what is or what we would like every high school graduate to have, rather it's what do you need to have in terms of your academic preparation to be prepared to take our courses without having to do any remediation.

There are new paragraphs there, if I may direct your attention to the middle of the page, there is a new paragraph that says if honors, dual-credit, advanced placement, and/or advanced college project courses are available and appropriate then we do recommend them but we don't require them. And students who do not take such courses, either because they are not available or because they are taking a range of courses that, perhaps their schedules conflict with them or for any other reason, the student—whatever the reason may be that students don't take it—that should not be a disadvantage to them with regard to admission. So we encourage but we do not disadvantage anyone.

We have, as a result of some clarification from the Director of Admissions, Mary Ellen Anderson, been able to simplify the statement concerning the Core 40. First there is in Senate Bill 200 and therefore in Indiana Code Section Chapter 20-12-17.5 there is a slight problem that it's based on an incorrect sequence of how admissions are actually made. The law presumes that offers of admission are not made until after people graduate from high school. As we are all aware for most traditional students those offers of admission are made during the senior year before students graduate from high school. And so it's necessary to respond to the law in a way that's consistent with current practices and the needs of the university and with students and their families to be able to make plans in the spring of their senior year for what they are actually going to be able to do in the fall, the university make plans considering its budget for the next year. So that's why it's now phrased "Indiana residents must have completed, or if still in high school, must be on track to complete a Core 40 curriculum or equivalent or a Core 40 academic honors curriculum or equivalent as a condition to be offered regular admission.

The next sentence then in response to Ted's request if we go and consider carefully where we say should and where we say must now says "Indiana residents must complete a Core 40 curriculum or equivalent or a Core 40 academic honors curriculum or equivalent before matriculating. And that's discussed in footnote number eleven.

There were suggestions for just rearranging some words and some paragraphs in section three. And although it appears that something was struck out and something was added in the middle of the paragraph, that was just moving the paragraph concerning aptitude from being before the one on academic achievement to being after the one on academic achievement. I don't believe there were any changes in the words.

In response to President Herbert's question we in the percentages for whom preference would be given in terms of class rank are for the top 40 percent for Indiana residents and the top 30 percent for non-residents. Also, last time there was a suggestion that we should explicitly include the word "unweighted" in front of the word four-point scale. Again, that's clarified.

As long as I mentioned the President, it reminds me I should back up to page two item number two in the list the President asked if every high school in the state actually offer precalculus. And so I have had, what actually turned out to be a rewarding experience, I have looked at the teaching assignment rosters for every public high school in the state for last fall and looked at all of the assignments of all of those teachers and I now feel that I have first hand knowledge of all of the high school math teachings and what they are teaching in the state of Indiana. I have also consulted with members of the faculty who are involved and engaged, both with the State Board

of Education and with high schools across the state, and I can assure you that last fall every school was teaching precalculus, trigonometry, or calculus. Some of the smaller schools perhaps were teaching trigonometry which is a one semester course and calculus; and the expectation is that some of those may be teaching precalculus this spring. That was the sequence in which I took those courses in my senior year as well although it is a little strange to see precalculus after one had started calculus but there is content in that course...well, I shouldn't go into the mathematics. Let me just assure you that there is content in precalculus that is more relevant to the latter portion of calculus (End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost)...high schools to make AP Calculus course available either in the high school itself or by an exchange program with another high school. So it is the case that we can say with confidence that that coursework is available to every student attending a public high school in the state of Indiana.

Now returning then to page three the, we appreciate the suggestions from Vice President Nelms' office and from University Counsel, and from the Director of the Office of Affirmative Action on how best to phrase the commitment to diversity in addition to that which appears as a goal in the first paragraph. And in consultation with Kevin Brown on behalf of Eduardo Rhodes and Vice President Nelms did send a proposal today. In consultation with Julie Knost the Affirmative Action Officer, what we have done is we have taken some of the things suggested by Kevin and put them into the policy section. And we have taken substantial portions of the rationales and other suggestions and put those into the footnotes. So now in Section 4 First Time Undergraduate Students there's a new third paragraph that articulates how, it addresses the goal of diversity, with the assertion that admissions decisions may also take account of an applicant's potential contribution to a diverse educational environment as one factor in an individualized holistic evaluation for admission.

In terms of the logical structure for this paragraph Section One is a statement of goals, Section Two is a statement of Academic Preparation—what we believe students need to know before they come to Bloomington in order to be ready to take immediate advantage of our programs. Section Three then is concerned more generally with achievements, abilities, motivation, and maturity, academic in all those cases. And so those are laying out various types of considerations. It's in Sections 4, 5, and 6 that we have the details for how all those things are to be brought together in actually making admissions decisions. And so there it says in the first paragraph that applicants for admission as first-time undergraduate students must have followed or be following the program of study that will meet the standards, that is the course requirements, and have satisfied the guidelines in Section Three. But then in this section we also go on to articulate some, but by no means all, of the other factors that are components of a holistic evaluation. An admissions decision may also take account of the known strengths and weaknesses of an applicant's college preparation program and of the trend of an applicant's grades in college-preparatory courses. An admission decision may also take account of an applicant's potential contribution to a diverse educational environment as one factor in an individualized holistic evaluation for admission. We then have a paragraph, the assertion that all U.S. residents who are not home-schooled should be completing a high school diploma. That's always been implicit, this is making it explicit. We then have the paragraph on applicants who are at least 21 years old or who have been out of high school for three or more years that is in large measure taken from what is the current policy.

As a result of Harold's suggestion at the first reading we have put in a separate paragraph on home school. In response to President Herbert's question as to whether conditional admission is related to probationary admission we had noted at our last meeting that we view conditional admission as a form of probationary admission. But in order to...and we've put that into footnotes but in order to put that into the policy itself rather than the footnotes we have now said explicitly that you can admit a student on a probationary or conditional basis.

The last paragraph then follows from Kevin Brown's suggestions and also discussions in the Educational Policies Committee, particularly ones that were initiated by Alan Bender and Dennis Senchuk. When you're looking at putting together the undergraduate class on the one hand you have your admission decision process; that's a process for granting admission. But there's also along with that the issue of outreach programs and scholarship programs. And one does need to maintain the distinction, and not in the admissions policy when you're trying to establish the criteria that must be met for admission, to confuse that with scholarship and outreach programs that may take into account other types of factors or other types of criteria or standards. So we have put in a specific mention of scholarship and outreach programs may, independent of the admission process, take into account factors not mentioned here. And again we should thank Kevin for that suggestion.

Going further down the other changes are actually in Section 8. It previously was just called—this is the bottom of page four and the top of page five—in the February 7th draft this was simply the section on Accountability but questions were raised as to when does this policy actually go into effect. It was clear we hoped from the title that this was a policy for the fall of 2011 but that apparently was not perceived by everyone. So we have put in specific things for implementation and then once having such a paragraph we have put in other things as well. So this policy should go into effect beginning with applicants who apply to matriculate at Indiana University either as first-time students or as external or inter-campus transfer students for the summer and fall 2011. The reason for saying the summer is that students who matriculate as new freshman during the summer are for all reporting purposes and other purposes of the university, combined with those who actually come to campus beginning with the fall semester. And so the fall class of 2011 consists of the students who matriculate, new freshman, who matriculate in the summer and the fall of that semester.

The second one is that the Office of Admissions will, as soon as reasonable, begin encouraging prospective students to meet the course requirements in Section Two and that the office should applying the criteria in Section Three as soon as is reasonable. You know we, in recognition that it takes students, the proposal affects the entire high school period, program of studies of high school students, we have to give students sufficient advance notice of these changes. John has pointed to me that students in the local high schools have already signed up for courses for next year. And since this cannot be adopted by the Trustees and circulated to students and to high schools until the summer the earliest time when students would have a chance to plan their four-year academic program on the basis of this would be spring of next year which would mean they would be freshmen for the fall of next year which would mean if they graduate in four years in the spring of 2011. And so that's the reason why there is a five-year period before the policy becomes fully effective. At the same time it is the case that many of our students, well over 60 percent of our students, already do satisfy all of the requirements in Section Two and we

certainly want to encourage students who are currently in high school, people who are sophomores who are going to be juniors and then seniors to, if they were in some doubt as to how to prepare to come to Indiana University, to begin taking the criteria in Section Two and Section Three into account if at all possible. So that's why it says as soon as is reasonable. But the policy does not take full effect until the fall of 2011.

And then in terms of implementation we've had to revise the original draft from last November that said that the chancellor of Indiana University Bloomington, and of course we no longer have such a position, and so it is now phrased that the president and the provost of Indiana University Bloomington shall be held responsible for the admission procedures followed on the campus, for insuring compliance with the goals and guidelines herein set forth, and for achieving satisfactory levels of student academic quality and success. And then new text, following on from discussions that have occurred within the last week and a half, "During the period, from 2006-2010 they shall monitor the progress towards implementing this policy and consult with the Bloomington Faculty Council if any temporary adjustments are needed." That was added at the same time that item number two was added about applying these things as soon as is reasonable.

And then there's finally a matter of the state law, Senate Bill 200 which says that four-year Indiana institutions must require the Core 40 as a condition for regular admission and list all the exceptions to regular admission, list all the exceptions to it. We don't actually envision any exceptions to requiring the Core 40, except as actually listed back in Section Two. But University Counsel Dottie Frapwell said well but we should always bear in mind that you may have to from time to time make some exceptions even if you aren't able at this time to anticipate those. And that's the reason for the next sentence that says "They may approve exceptions for a few individuals from time to time. If a need for a policy exception should arise as opposed to exceptions for a few individuals, then that matter must be brought back to the Bloomington Faculty Council for consideration and approval."

So there you have a summary of the proposal and of its changes. Of course every footnote is dear to us but I won't take your time to go through the footnotes but I do recommend them to you because they provide rationale and context over this proposal. John?

CARINI: I think you said it all, Bill.

BRADLEY: Bill turning your attention to page two about two-thirds of the way down the page it says if "honors, dual-credit, advanced placement and honor advanced placement are available and appropriate then such courses are recommended but not required." It's the next sentence that I question, "However students who have not taken such courses shall not be disadvantaged with regard to admission." The negative implication of that is that if you have taken such courses you won't be advantaged with regard to admission. It seems to me we ought to more actively encourage people to take such courses and eliminate that sentence. We've already said it's not required perhaps because some schools don't have it. Why must we go further and say taking these courses is going to do you no good at all as far as we're concerned?

WHEELER: Well it prepares you to do well here.

BRADLEY: Maybe, but it doesn't say that.

WHEELER: It will advantage you in your education here. So the issue is with regards to the admission decision.

BRADLEY: Right, right.

WHEELER: And it was the case that the first version of this paragraph ended at the word "are recommended but not required." But members of the Educational Policies Committee felt that it was important to reassure students, such as home schooled students who may not have the opportunity to take advanced placement courses, that their not having taken courses will not disadvantage them. And so as a matter of logic, that sentence is not required but there were strong feelings on the committee that in order to reassure students who are home schooled or students who go to rural schools that aren't able to offer a full range of advanced placement courses at times that are compatible with the schedules. We are all aware that sometimes you have two courses that you would like to take but they meet at the same time and you have to make a decision between them. The question is, we want to encourage people to do it but at the same time for the people who are unable to do it, we don't want to suggest that they are in anyway disadvantaged with regard to admission itself.

MCROBBIE: Sorry...

DAVILA: Bill, I'd like to follow up on this comment after this.

MCCORMICK: This is a follow-up. By using an un-weighted GPA though aren't we disadvantaging academic honors courses, in other words a B- in honors English is actually a lower score than a B in regular high school English. But with the weighting of an academic honors program, those might be considered equal. So following up on Professor Bradley's comment, it almost seems like using an un-weighted grade point average we are in fact disadvantaging academic honors courses.

WHEELER: There's a wide range of practices on those types of things and we want to—we're saying that, you know, one can speculate, one can speculate that perhaps grades are lower in the student who took advanced placement course might have a lower grade than a student who didn't take an advanced placement course. But you know, we aren't really able to say with certainty what's going on there and I feel quite confident that the admissions staff is going to be capable of doing the right things.

CARINI: Can I make one point? We do explicitly say that we'll take the APA exam results into account as far as it demonstrates proficiency.

MCCORMICK: But in terms of preference there's no—by using an un-weighted grade, the preference is there no preference in terms of academic honors. In other words ...

WHEELER: That's correct. That was the committee's judgment as to how it should be done. We recognized the argument on both sides but at the same time it is was felt like—at the same

time we should not unduly advantage them either. It is possible if you make straight As in all those cases to have better than a 4.0 average and even at this university we don't—A+ are only 4.0, they're not 4.2 or 4.3 and so ...

MCCORMICK: But if I took—if I got As in my advanced placement, wouldn't you have held that as a higher than As in regular high school courses.

WHEELER: Not in terms of computing your average, no. But if it's in terms of the holistic evaluation, yes.

MCCORMICK: It's an issue of preference and there's no preference for academic honors degrees in this policy anyway because it's stated that it's not preferential and as well any sort of weighting in grade point average is not considered so there really is no preference in this policy for an honors diploma. You might as well take the CORE 40 and do the best you can on the regular courses.

WHEELER: Well of course you're required to take all the courses for the academic honors. The academic honors, the only difference between the requirements with regards to the college prep courses, the only difference between what this proposal asks and what the academic honors degree asks is that the new version of academic honors requires you to take two academic—to take two advanced placement courses or two ACP courses or one ACP course and one advanced college—one AP course or take two AP exams or have very sufficiently high SAT, combined SAT score or something like that and as I said it's already the case that a significant majority of our students do all those things and those students are, I think we can all be quite confident that those students do very well and I would be surprised if any such students currently has been denied admission. We do need to bear in mind that we're Berkley, we're not Harvard, and we're not Princeton. For example, Professor Chapa who was instrumental in the design of the Texas Ten Percent Plan and its implementation in Texas and also has written on this corresponding theme for the University of California system raised the issue of implementing a Top Ten Percent Plan at the University of Texas. Anyone who finishes in the top 10% of their high school class is automatically granted admission. To put this in context—and that made a significant impact at the University of Texas on their diversity profile. The data here is that during the past two years, of the Indiana residents who applied who were in the top 10%, there have been 2700 to 3000 of those students each year, only one each year has been denied admission. So, in the context, although hypothetically if we were Michigan or Wisconsin or Princeton or Harvard or Berkley, the issues that you mention would be very significant, in our context, I think the practical fact of that would not be noticeable.

MCCORMICK: It's just...

MCROBBIE: Professor Davila?

DAVILA: Thank you, Bill for first of all mentioning that Jorge Chapa and myself on this matter when we exchanged email over the Top Ten Percent Plan out of Texas and thank you for giving now all of this, this fact of the last two years only one student being turned down. That's amazing and that's very comforting. I wanted to just on this matter that we're discussing now, I

think that for me introducing the idea of disadvantaged versus advantaging or privileging over not privileging introduces a rhetorical twist that is prickly and noisome and I think we all agreed that we want to flexible and if need be sufficiently, and I mean this word in the right sense, plastic and I think this document attests to that. But why not delete, why not pull out the word disadvantage and be more declarative and merely state that no one will be denied admission for this exclusive reason or for this one and only reason and that takes out rather explosive vocabulary that is more associated with what we in minority, if you like, movements see as a special diction that is not intended here in terms of disadvantaging or advantaging or privileging. So this is just in terms of a friendly amendment to the noisome word I think, the prickly word that appears here and I think it would mean exactly what you're saying.

WHEELER: So may I phrase your suggestion as replacing the words disadvantaged with regard to admission because it would certainly...

DAVILA: "Would not be denied admission for this exclusive reason"

WHEELER: So "shall not be denied admission on these grounds"

DAVILA: Right, "on these grounds" that's fine.

WHEELER: Because certainly I appreciate you saying that because it was certainly not the intention to connect—by use of this word to make any connections to issues of diversity. The real concern was really assuring home schooled students that the fact that they are unable to take these advanced placement courses is not going to be held against them.

MCROBBIE: I want to...

DE SOUZA: So Bill, first of all congratulations to you and the committee for the hard work that you all have done in coming up with this and I was drawn also to this sort of negative connotation with respect to the statement about AP and ACP courses and I wonder if the paragraph or the sentence that actually talks about academic motivation maturity is not the appropriate place to deal with it because I cannot think of any better evidence of academic motivation or maturity than the student seeking to take advanced placement or honors courses. So I think that could be introduced in that paragraph in a very natural way that successful completion of advanced placement or ACP or honors courses provides evidence for the academic motivation and maturity of the student.

WHEELER: So I take yours as being one of two possible suggestions. One possibility would be simply to the last paragraph of Section Three that says that essays, advanced placement, dual-credit, advanced college credit courses, extra curricular activities, letters of recommendation etcetera, may also be considered as evidence of academic motivation and maturity; to certainly add that in. What is a little unclear to me is whether you're suggesting to strike the paragraph in Section Two all together?

DE SOUZA: No, I was not.

WHEELER: Ok. So I do think that's a friendly amendment then. The exact phrasing we might have to polish a little bit but it's to insert after the word essays, a reference to dual-credit, advanced placement and advanced college partial courses.

MCROBBIE: Kevin?

HUNT: I want to suggest a slightly different version of what Luis because I was afraid that lost some of the meaning that you had meant to put in there; that's students that can't take these classes should not be disadvantaged. According to how many frowns and sour looks I get I might suggest this as a resolution. In that sentence put in Section Two that says "however students who have not taken such courses," would it be better for your meaning if it said "students who have not had access to such courses," because then that would take care of the home schooling problem and at the same time I think it would answer—you can imagine two students, both of whom have nearly identical GPAs and one's taken all honors courses and the other one hasn't and the student with the honors courses gets admitted and other one doesn't and if that student were to query us, well I see that I shouldn't be disadvantaged for this but I was. I think we'd have a difficult time explaining that but if we said students who don't have access to those courses shall not be disadvantaged, I think that might convey the meaning a little better.

WHEELER: I appreciate that. Let me bring another thing into it. We also though need to be sensitive that it may be that a person has access to such courses but their real interest is in perhaps the fine arts, music, painting, sculpture or something of that nature and it might well be the case that when they come to their senior year, they're really hoping to apply to the school of music or to go into the school of fine arts when they arrive here and it happens that the course they need, the fine arts course, is scheduled for exactly the same time as advanced placement calculus. Now in that situation, I personally do not want to be in the position of saying that that student then should opt for the advance placement course in order to try and be even more certain that they will be admitted. So that's why, although that sentence was originally suggested in the context of home schooled students, when you look at the range of majors that we offer here, it is, it might be if your interest is in foreign languages that again you want to take the fourth year of the foreign language; we would certainly support that. If the fourth year of French happened to conflict again with an advanced calculus course, I personally would not want to be in the position of saying that that student should take the advanced placement calculus as opposed to the none advanced placement of fourth year French. And so that was the reason why we need to convey that if it is appropriate to take, if they are available and appropriate in terms of your later academic interests and the courses that are actually available in terms of not only are they taught but also what times are they taught, that we need to say that if it's appropriate and available then we certainly recommend that you take it. But if the courses are not available or if it should be the case that because of scheduling conflicts and your own later academic interests, its more appropriate for you to take some other course that the advanced placement course I certainly do not want to be in the position of disadvantaging a fine arts student because they opted to take music rather than advanced placement calculus. I don't want to be in the position of disadvantaging a person who wants to major in the foreign languages with an expectation of going into the foreign service, to disadvantage them, to tilt them toward advanced placement —of course calculus is dear to my heart being a mathematician. But you know, I want to be very careful that I don't influence their selection of courses in a way which actually is not, I think, in

their long term interest. And that of course was the reason for that original language and not restricting it just to the ones a matter of access, it's also the issue of is it appropriate. Is it appropriate for you in your context?

MCROBBIE: You've probably made your point Bill, yeah.

KRAVCHUK: Bill and John, I want to ask a question that is something that we've talked about in the committee but I think it would be useful for our faculty council colleagues if you would address it here. What would you say the certain members of the Trustees who might feel that this admissions policy is not aggressive enough and that it does not set minimum SAT standards?

WHEELER: Thank you for asking [laughter]. One of our goals is certainly to improve the profile of our undergraduate student body. If one would look back to the minutes of the meeting last fall when we discussed this, there is because of the Carnegie Commission's relatively arbitrary decision as to how it would classify research university— universities and colleges in the U.S. as a whole. They apparently have arbitrarily fixed upon a number of 1020 for the 25th percentile, to distinguish between the more selective universities versus the selective universities. And of our peer institutions in the Big Ten, we're the only one for whom the 25th percentile falls below 1020. If we are to strive to be comparable to our peers then we need to address that. At the same time, in addressing that, it's very important that we do not penalize our diversity mission. Some have proposed that the way to achieve an increase in the SAT profile, which I want to emphasize is an important but only one dimension, only one of many dimensions in the evaluation of the undergraduate student body and the evaluation of each individual, some people suggest that one way to improve that profile is to simply cut off the bottom end.

I would suggest to you and I apologize for being a mathematician in this but if one were to look at the distribution of SAT scores, it is something like a bell shaped curve. This is your scale, from your perspective, I guess this is the low end and this is the high. Normally I write on black boards so we have the same perspective. But you know, it is a bell shaped curve to some extent and the mean of that distribution is about, for last year's freshman class, is about 1105. The 25th percentile is 990. So, one proposal is that you just cut off the bottom end of that tail. You set a minimum score and just cut off the entire thing. If we wanted to take such an approach, that would correspond to eliminating 500 students from the freshman class. If you're trying to move the 25th percentile to a higher number by cutting things off, then you have to cut it by 500 students and that has impacts of both budgetary and in terms of our access and diversity goals.

And so I think the approach that we favor more is rather than trying to have a curve that has a tail cut off, having it come down than it being cut off, what we need to do is to undertake, to shift that from being a normal one to redistributing that tail so that rather than it being a bell shaped, it's among some of the other distributions, a Beta distribution or something like that so that it has a smaller tail but still a tail down there that permits us to address issues of access and diversity. And also, it turns out that just because of the way statistics works, that if one looks at trying to change the shape of that rather than cutting it off, that rather than having—where if you're going to cut things off, you need to get rid of 500 students, if you're going to shift, you only need to shift 400 students. It's an issue of shifting 6% or cutting off 8%.

So we have designed this policy to provide the policy framework to try and improve the SAT profile, the class rank profile, the quality profile of the undergraduate student body but at the same time preserving the flexibility to address ...

KRAVCHUK: What I thought you were going to say was that people who are better prepared academically tend to have higher SAT scores.

MCROBBIE: Professor Waterman?

WATERMAN: Well I was going to comment on the advanced placement paragraph. I didn't know if that had been resolved. It seems to me the more I've listened to this discussion, that paragraph just seems to open a can of worms and doesn't fit in there and I would move that that be eliminated and that the end of Section Three, the wording could be, this is following up on the comment made before, "essays, extra-curricular activities," even though I don't know what this word essays mean, "letters of recommendations and advanced placement courses, community service and work experience might also be considered as evidence of academic motivation and maturity and ability to succeed at Indiana University." I think that would take care of it.

TERRY: Second.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

WHEELER: The reason for keeping it brief is as one compares our policies to those of our university...

BRADLEY: We have a motion and now we can have a discussion of the motion.

TERRY: Second

MCROBBIE: Seconded, any discussion on this motion, this particular motion? We have a discussion on it. Yes Bill but keep it short.

WHEELER: The reason for placing it here was based upon an analysis of the statements of our peer institutions and how they dealt with it and they always include such discussions, such mentions with the list of courses. Now it is the case that in the others they don't have that last sentence there. That is to say, if you look at our peer institutions, they almost always include a statement such as honors, dual credit, advanced placement, so on and so forth available when appropriate then they'll recommend it. They usually do not include that last sentence there and again, logically it doesn't need to be there, it wouldn't change the policy not to have it there but at the same time some members of the committee spoke quite forcefully that they thought that there needed to be something like the last sentence there.

BRADLEY: So you're talking about the sentence that says however students who have not taken such courses.

WHEELER: That's right.

BRADLEY: But that's not what the motion is about.

WHEELER: No but it was about to strike this entire paragraph.

BRADLEY: No, he's talking about adding something at the end of number 3 I believe.

WHEELER: No we've already done that.

WATERMAN: That motion is to strike the paragraph starting "if honors".

BRADLEY: Oh okay.

WATERMAN: And to modify the paragraph at the end of Section Three.

CARINI: So the reason it's there is that this is the section on Academic Preparation and it's our opinion that those courses increase the preparation of students to do well.

HAWKINS: I would like to call the question.

MCROBBIE: Alright, let's move the motion. All those in favor of that...

BRADLEY: Of calling the question...

MCROBBIE: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead with your question. Right, right. How does that work procedurally, forgive me for asking?

BRADLEY: So we need to have a vote on whether we want to cut off the debate and vote on the motion.

MCROBBIE: That was just moved, is that right?

BRADLEY: Right.

MCROBBIE: So that's all those in favor of cutting off the discussion, correct?

TERRY: On this motion.

MCROBBIE: On this motion. All those in favor, those against? Okay so now we put the motion. All those in favor of the motion which is to strike that paragraph and replace it with the sentence mentioned? Is that clear? Do we need to go over that again? All those in favor of doing that? And those against? I think ayes have it. So that change has been made to the document. So I gather we now continue with the discussion of the document as amended. Herb?

TERRY: Bill I want to make sure there's not a conflict in two parts here, I just noticed that

actually. What kind of admission do we give students who are home schooled, who have not graduated from high school?

WHEELER: Well if it says for the Core 40 criteria and the other criteria they would have a regular admission.

TERRY: So does the state regard someone who is home schooled as automatically fulfilling Core 40?

WHEELER: No.

TERRY: And certainly someone who has not gone to high school would not fulfill Core 40?

WHEELER: Presumably.

TERRY: Therefore I'm concerned about your "must" in the second to last paragraph of Section Two.

WHEELER: Which section?

TERRY: Section Two, end of it, "Indiana residents must have completed..."

WHEELER: What it says is you don't have to have a Core 40 degree but you have to complete the Core 40 curriculum. And that is state law and that state law applies to home schooled students and applies to if one's...

TERRY: So then we cannot do what is in the sixth paragraph of Section Four.

WHEELER: The sixth paragraph of Section Four?

TERRY: Beginning "for applicants who were home schooled or who do not graduate".

WHEELER: That requirement only applies to students who are under 21. The state law provides that that requirement of Core 40 doesn't apply for students who are over the age of 21. And of course that one also...

TERRY: No, next paragraph.

WHEELER: Oh. Well, of course—remember this one, this paragraph applies both to Indiana residents and non-residents and so certainly this paragraph as stated could apply to home schooled students from the state of Illinois who are not required to take...

TERRY: So this would prohibit us because of state law from admitting an Indiana resident who did not graduate from high school?

CARINI: No, you're confusing graduating and completing a curriculum which is, I think, the intent of the state law; with the words "or equivalent" to specifically put that exception in there. We've been told that, I think by Stan Jones.

WHEELER: So when you combine the paragraph in Section Two that begins Indiana residents must have completed with the paragraph of "for applicants who are home schooled or did not graduate from high school." that means that if a person is an Indiana resident, they are under the age of 21 so that the exception for students who are over the age of 21 doesn't apply and those students have not completed a Core 40 curriculum, then the paragraph in Section Four cannot be used as a basis for admitting them because you must satisfy all of the criteria in this in order to be admitted. So you must both satisfy the paragraph "Indiana residents who have to have the Core 40" and you have to satisfy for applicants who are home schooled and then you join those two together. Then it means if you're home schooled under the age of 21 and an Indiana resident and have not graduated from high school and have not completed a Core 40 curriculum, then you cannot be given regular admission.

TERRY: Somebody from the School of Music may have to speak to this, but, don't we admit students who or is that the occasional exception.

WHEELER: Well students are sometimes admitted conditionally or probationary and that's not a regular admission.

MCROBBIE: Professor Davila?

DAVILA: Thank you, first just going back to the question about the Trustees and how do we face them. I think it's good to keep in mind that the Trustees are not monolithic. Their reservations about how we should approach the admissions situation and I know there is certainly a drive to upgrade the SAT and other quality signifiers of our student body. But I think the thing is to point out that we do have an honors college and this goes all the way back to post-Sputnik where American universities begin the trend of being more Ivy League-ish when we never can be when we're involved with mass education, state schools and all. And the separate colleges such as Michigan State put up for honors students and all, are reflected in the way we have been growing in the honors college and I have great experience with that. I've been teaching through the years and the last data that we have from Ken Gros Louis' report about over the last year regarding the Hutton Honors College is that we easily exceeded a 10% growth possibly because of the resources now available to us and all. But 15% it looks like on this data. So, I think that this is important to keep before the Trustees because we can't be a Butler University and we can't be an Ivy League school where one of the Trustees emanates from and we know that Ivy League schools were modeled on Oxford and Cambridge and so forth.

KRAVCHUK: Luis, my question was intended to elicit response that could have been answered in two sentences which was that implicitly this policy takes into account the Trustees concerns by linking SAT scores and academic preparation. By focusing on preparation we don't cut off the bottom of the tail but it's really all here. And in fact, this is a very very well crafted policy. But it sort of got lost in the response.

DAVILA: I agree. So we do as we have been advised, we need to be laconic and get to the essence of things. But I think, philosophically anyway, it is important to remind our—at least some Trustees know it, others possibly know it differently but we are a public state institution and that is one of the last best hope for minorities and for the future.

Another thing is, after—and then I won't speak out anymore but if I could ask for the attention of Council on the item that addresses world languages, being in languages myself. It's on page 2 and it is item 5. I think this is a code, talk about 4 credits of world languages, maybe the linguists have inserted it at some point or another, but in terms of the precision, certainly English is a world language. So we ought to at least consider specifying non-English world languages and we ought to, if we don't get too wordy, we might want to insert something, this I leave to the committee's pleasure, that they can be classical languages, which is wonderful and a good throw back to the good old times, and modern languages. So that would include an anthropological view of languages per say, including even sign languages because there are some Indian languages that are sign languages and that is certainly a modest proposal. But then we ought to also include, possibly, the insertion, at some point or another someone will try to present computer languages as a possibility. And we at the graduate level we consider this in a very justified way but we should also think of whether we want to exclude or include computer languages. I think this flashes out the whole business that's a little esoteric by just calling them world languages.

If need be, it would be good to also advise that we don't want people taking four different semesters of four different languages. That is not very productive. So maybe some language there about the contingency of at least two semesters of related languages per say. So I offer all those for your consideration. [Tape 1, Side B ends; some comments lost]

WHEELER: ... used by the State Board for Education and Core 40 and if one clicks on that link, one will see that in the syllabi for what they consider to be world languages and they are non-English, both ancient and current and in the case of current, spoken as opposed to computer languages. So, we had originally actually in the very first draft, we used to say foreign languages but then we were told that wasn't the current terminology to use. Certainly having taken Latin myself, I strongly recommend ancient world languages.

T. MILLER: Bill could we have a footnote to make those points, it seems like a perfect footnote to me?

WHEELER: Would that be satisfactory with you?

DAVILA: It would be nice to have it in old fashioned black and white.

WHEELER: Old fashioned black and white can enumerate what you've just said. The one thing that we might want to attend to is the issue of four credits for world language, the 4 credits of whether that needs to be of the same world language.

DAVILA: It's not very likely but still that's a permutation that's possible.

MCROBBIE: Without doing it formerly, I assume people are agreeing to doing this by a footnote, is that a possibility?

HARBISON: This is less about the specific document and more about the implementation. In the Athletics Committee there's a subcommittee on sponsorship and in several places we talk about admitting a student through faculty sponsorship. I was told by the chair of the committee Bruce Jaffee, that currently the office of admissions will allow admission to override marginal test scores, marginal class rank, marginal grade point average through sponsorship but they will not override not having taken all of the enumerated college preparatory courses. Now as we increase the number of courses that we're requiring, I can see that having a real impact especially sometimes in access and diversity and perhaps the Office of Admissions assuming we accept some slightly modified form of this document that they consider flexibility in what faculty sponsorship will actually encompass.

WHEELER: Faculty sponsorship is a form of probationary admission, not a regular admission and it requires a specific agreement about what the student is going to do and about the participation of the faculty member in overseeing that and supervising it. So as a non-regular form of admission it does—and I must say, I'm told it's a fairly small number.

HARBISON: Yes it is.

WHEELER: We asked the director of admissions how many faculty sponsorships there were and I think I was told it might be in the order of maybe a dozen a year. It's a very heavy responsibility on the faculty member because the faculty member has to be directly involved and only the director of admissions is authorized to approve such arrangements. And so I think that in terms of academic preparation, we do need for everyone to have this academic preparation. I don't think we want to see athletes failing here...

HARBISON: If it's available of course it's...

WHEELER: ...athletes failing here because they haven't had enough preparation in high school.

HARBISON: Well and there are about 12-20 athletes per year admitted but that's less than one quarter of the students campus wide who are admitted to this program.

MCROBBIE: Professor Hetrick?

HETRICK: My question is about implementation and not the policy itself. I'm wondering what has been considered or what thoughts have been given to what happens when the policy is adopted. I say this is in the context of understanding the mission differentiation, understanding the need to increase the profile, academic profile of the student body, but I'm wondering if the policy is implemented, what would the effects be on the size of the student body?

WHEELER: On what?

HETRICK: On the size of the student body? If the student body were to decrease in size, which seems like it would be the natural result of sort of changing the tail of the distribution as you described, are there mechanisms in place that the Trustees would support that had to do with improving scholarship funding, ways to bring more top students in rather than only looking at it from dropping of the bottom side? And if the student body where is to decrease in size and there weren't these other mechanisms, we are accustomed to, I think, a student body of a certain size and given one of the figures we saw at the last meeting that suggested that 40% of our general fund comes from tuition dollars, is there a plan for making this transition to a university or a campus that has a slightly different student profile with a different mission? And I think of that also in the context of the freedom of the provost to make decisions financially about the campus to allow this mission to proceed. So I guess my question is, what about the implementation, I envision that may be it would be ideal to have something along the lines of an enrollment management committee or plan, do we need a war chest in place to accommodate any changes that may happen?

CARINI: Well that exists of course, the Chancellor with the Enrollment Committee started two years ago and they've already started.

WHEELER: And we do not anticipate, given the five-year lead time, we do not anticipate a significant change in the size of the campus enrollment. I think with a five-year lead time, the high schools and the students and the parents in the state will respond and prepare their student and as my colleague Professor Kravchuk had hoped I would say that in terms of increasing the profile, the more courses you take, the better you will be. When I went through we didn't have SAT prep courses and things like that. We prepared for SAT exam by taking math courses, by taking English courses, by taking a solid academic curriculum and with a five-year lead time we really don't foresee a significant impact on the size of the freshman class. It may be indeed that there are things to be dealt with. Now that is though your concern there is why in this item number—in the last section, Section Eight, item number 3 it says that the addition, it's the new sentence there that begins “during the period of 2006-2010, they shall monitor the progress toward implementing this goal and consulting with the faculty council if any temporary adjustments are needed.” And that was sentence was put in there specifically for the concern that you've just voiced. That it is the responsibility of the president and provost and they would of course taking what we've said or not to monitor, to make certain that the financial viability of the Bloomington campus is protected that if it should turn out that our expectations are wrong, to come back to us in a timely manner and that's why it says during the 2006-2010 period because if there were going to be any need for adjustments it would be in the spring of 2010 when the provost is concerned with building the budget in the spring of 2010 that there are in some senses a final go and no-go period at least as far as the budgetary consequences are concerned because the Council would have to act in the spring of 2010 if they were going to make any modifications that were affecting people who were going to be applying for matriculation in the fall of 2011, a year and a half later. You can't wait until the fall of 2010 to begin making contemporary adjustment. So that's why that date 2006-2010 is as it is. The provost at that point in time in about February of 2010 has to look at the situation and say okay, do things look the way we expected them to, if so, if not, I better go back to the faculty council and apprise them and see how we deal with that.

MCROBBIE: Yes sir.

IVIE: I'd like to ask a question about the other side of the coin that we looked at earlier on regarding the question about whether it's an unweighted 4.0 scale or not. You provided a part of the answer but I was wondering, what is the disadvantage of a weighted scale or just not saying anything about it at all? If one of the consequences is that honor students don't get anything in credit for the extra work and they even actually be punished because they got a B- in a demanding course than a person who took a less demanding course, there must be other things involved in weighting that just that that's caused you to want to use this language. So, the question is what's wrong with a weighted scale? How does that skew things badly? For example do some schools give A+ and therefore you get a 4.3 instead of a 4.0 for an A and?

WHEELER: Well, some places we give the equivalent of a 5 for an A and in advanced placement or an honors course. And so, again, as I indicated earlier, there can be reasons in terms of academic interest why one would take certain courses and perhaps not take other courses and so to provide a weighting of that magnitude for honors courses—I mean, people take—remember, we aren't using a simple formula doing this. You know, each student is going to be evaluated so it's a holistic evaluation.

IVIE: I got that part.

WHEELER: In the context of a holistic evaluation, one doesn't need a weighted scale in order to take an account of honors course. If there were going to be a formula then we were just going to plug in the formula, then you might say that in order to take account of the honors courses and the advanced basic courses, because we're not going to take read the transcript, they're only going to look at the GPA, well then that would be the case for doing such a thing. But in a situation where we are going to be looking holistically at the entire application, at the list of courses, we don't need a weighted scale and in order to recognize that a student has taken an honors course. Now Professor Harbison was the one who suggested...

HARBISON: Before we moved here my son attended a high school that used a weighted GPA, at that high school if you took an honors course, you automatically got one point added to the grade when they averaged it. If you took an AP course you got two points added. Somebody could pull a C in an AP course and it would average in as a 4. And I'm just—while that is obviously a more rigorous course, you don't want somebody coming in with a 4.0 average on paper who's gotten Cs in all AP courses.

MCCORMICK: Julie?

BOBAY: I'd like to call the question.

WHEELER: The question is the entire document.

BOBAY: Right.

WHEELER: The motion on the floor is the policy.

MCROBBIE: Ok all those in favor of calling the question.

REYNOLDS: I second.

MCROBBIE: Second, all in favor? Against? Alright, so now we call the question without further debate. All those in favor of adopting the policy as amended, with the one amendment we made, all in favor, against? I think it's carried anonymously, without dissent.

T. MILLER: Bravo Bill and John, well done.

MCROBBIE: Very significant change.

AGENDA ITEM #7: SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

MCROBBIE: Now we move to agenda item 7, Search and Screen Procedures for Senior Administrators, who wants to—Ted do you want to start this one.

T. MILLER: Well, actually, I think given the time, why don't we skip item 7 and just focus a bit on item 8.

AGENDA ITEM #8: POLICY ON DEVELOPING NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

T. MILLER: This item— this on one of the blue sheets that you have. This is an item I think in all likelihood the Trustees will take some action on this item in early March. Their meeting I think is on March 3rd or 4th, something in that period. And so to the extent that there are concerns emanating from the Bloomington campus regarding this proposal, I think it would be useful for them to be aired at least briefly. I would just point out to you what seems to me to be the most significant issue.

In the Mission Differentiation Report, there was a recommendation made that new graduate programs approved for a regional campus of Indiana University must be structured jointly with either Indianapolis or Bloomington. In other words, if there was a proposal to create a master's degree say in education at the East campus, and this is one of the current proposals, the idea coming out of the Mission Differentiation was that that would—in order for that degree to be approved, it would have to be offered jointly in cooperation with Bloomington or Indianapolis. This document, and Gene Kintgen is one of the authors of this document and Gene correct me if I have don't have right, but in this document as you go down to the very last paragraph, the first sentence of the last paragraph, "criteria for new programs may be met by resources on a single campus" right. And then it goes on to say that there are other ways you can do it as well, that is that you can do it jointly and so forth is you want to. But under this proposal, it will be possible

for a regional campus to propose a stand alone graduate degree. That's my understanding of what this proposal says.

KINTGEN: Well, I think that you can always propose stand alone graduate degrees. What this says three lines up in the bottom is that if they can't work out an internal partnership, they are free to look for an external partnership.

T. MILLER: Well but the first phrase Gene to me says that they don't have to have a partnership.

KINTGEN: Right, well they don't have to have a partnership now.

T. MILLER: Well, but the Mission Differentiation report implied that they would have to have one and so this document is somewhat at odds with the Mission Differentiation. Do I have that wrong Charlie?

NELMS: You have that quite wrong, okay. The regional campuses, with the exception IU East, all of the regional campuses in their mission, by definition, are authorized to offer master's degrees once they've gone through the appropriate vetting process within the university. I think what you may be referring to is when we talked about doctoral degrees we said that the core campus concept should prevail and that all of those degrees, if they were to be offered, would be done in concert with Bloomington and Indianapolis. I think that's the part you may be confusing here. It was not master's degrees; it was not master's degrees broadly.

T. MILLER: Thank you. Comments?

TERRY: I have a question about faculty resources. One time I believe I see a request for improvement plans for new faculty, where what is interesting to the new faculty member is that there be a certain graduate program in place. That when something comes through and somebody would say this is the key person, and then they can start offering a new graduate program in X or whatever it is. Yet this document seems to presume that you have to have the faculty in place before you create the degree program. I'm wondering if this is sufficiently flexible to not retard our recruitment efforts or the creation of new programs where we want to promise somebody that if they come, they will head whatever it is.

T. MILLER: Gene?

KINTGEN: I think the intention here is that the faculty resources have to be sufficient and if there aren't sufficient faculty already present, additional faculty can be called for in the proposal itself.

TERRY: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

JAGODZINSKI: I would like to see the addition of the L-word, the library resources word in

this proposal because I think there's a presumption that if there is an undergraduate major and then a sequence, a master's program and eventually a PhD, then the library has of course been building in these areas all this time and I think that there needs—just as it's set for faculty support, facility support, we need to specify support for library resources.

MCROBBIE: Pat?

HARBISON: Under mission alignment it mentions PhD proposals will be limited etc. IU offers other doctoral level degrees besides PhDs and we should include all doctoral level degrees.

KINTGEN: The reason that we limit this to PhD is that other campuses want to have professional doctoral programs and there are some professional schools that are considering extending professional doctorates to these other campuses. So it's the research degrees where you in fact need large library holdings that are really dependant on larger campuses.

HARBISON: I would be a little squeamish about IU Fort Wayne being able to offer the DM (Doctor of Music).

MCROBBIE: Other comments, Charlie.

NELMS: I know I'm not supposed to speak but since I sort of provided the leadership for the Mission Differentiation Project, the issues at Fort Wayne as I recall and I was almost run out of town over it had to do with the doctorate in education, educational leadership. That's the issue seemingly there and the question is whether or not Indiana University would be willing to offer it or whether they partner with Ball State. So it gets pretty dicey there in some respects and so that is one of those live issues still out there. But it's the doctorate in educational leadership at IPFW. That's the degree.

MCFADDEN: Charlie, I think you answered this, my question is does each campus have the right to form its own master's program if it so chooses?

NELMS: They're authorized through their mission and their accreditation by the North Central Association to offer master's degrees as long as it has gone through the appropriate faculty governance procedure on each of the campuses', University Faculty Council, the Chancellor, the Trustees and the Higher Education Commission. So yes if they've taken it through a proposal.

MCFADDEN: How does a particular department on this campus that already has a master's degree play into that? I know in our department and also speaking for the college, there was a situation where Indianapolis wanted to create a master of fine arts degree in our area and there were discussions with people from the department and the college about that and to my knowledge that's not happened after that discussion. But that was about four years ago.

NELMS: That would be handled through the remonstrance process. Through the remonstrance process is the way that that would get handled. So if there's a degree that's being proposed by another campus, there's the academic—I think it's called the Academic Leadership Council, it's been renamed, I think it's called the Academic Leadership Council and that is a group of vice

chancellors for academic affairs which had been convened in the past by the chancellor and the senior vice president for academic affairs. So I'm assuming that's one of those issues that would get worked about who is going to chair between now the provost and the president and Charles Bantz.

MCFADDEN: I would just say based on that experience it was a pretty covert operation that we found out about very late in the game and so I don't see anything in here about who has the responsibility to inform departments on this campus is they're trying to create a similar degree program.

NELMS: I'm not trying to defend them; I'm just saying that it's through the remonstrance process.

MCFADDEN: I understand that. But there seems to be this protection. There seems to be not anything in here about that process, about how this campus is informed that another campus wants the same degree.

BRADLEY: It does say at the end of the second paragraph about this remonstrance process.

MCFADDEN: It doesn't say who's to contact whom or how that information is to be put out.

MCROBBIE: Yes Herb?

TERRY: We are about reach about our adjournment time. This didn't come from the committee, Ted to whom should we direct comments so that when it comes back it takes all of us into account?

T. MILLER: Well, it's unlikely that it's going to come back to us actually because the Trustees are probably going to move—I'm not sure about this but they may. They were close to approving it last month. So I think maybe if Gene would be willing to— Gene was one of the co-authors of this so if you have suggestions, maybe a revised version could be in hand for the Trustees meeting next time and...

KINTGEN: Although this is also going to the UFC.

T. MILLER: Well, yes, I guess that's true. We're going to do something about this at the UFC meeting next week. So that would be another opportunity. So you can send comments to me perhaps under that circumstance and I'll be in touch with Gene after that to see where we should go from there.

MCROBBIE: It's pretty much 5:30, I think according to the laws as I understand them, in about 30 seconds we're finished. So if there's any final comment on this matter otherwise I think Gene will take care of those changes, consider those changes.

T. MILLER: I would like to personally thank the co-chairs of the Educational Policies Committees=, the various members of the committee, over the past three years, I was one of

them, I would like to thank all of them and congratulate them on a job well done. Thank you very much, thank you all.

Meeting adjourned at 5:29 pm.