

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 4, 2006**  
**Ballantine Hall 008**  
**3:30 - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Craig Bradley, John Carini, Richard Carr, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliott, Emily Fairchild, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, David Mackay, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Isabel Piedmont, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Alex Shortle, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** LTC Lori Bass, Katy Borner, Bonnie Brownlee, Jorge Chapa, Romualdo De Souza, Susan Jones, William Leckey, Gerald Marker, Dale McFadden, Alyce Miller, Harold Ogren, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, David Waterman, Maxine Watson,

**GUESTS:** Julia Aud (Student), John Graves (Faculty Council)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
March 21, 2006  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/03.21.06.htm>
2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)
4. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)
5. Bloomington Procedures for *Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct* (30 minutes) [FIRST READING]  
(Professors Sara Pryor and Deanna Reising, co-chairs, Student Affairs Committee; Pamela Freeman, Associate Dean of Students and Dick McKaig, Vice President for Student Affairs)
6. Search and Screen Policy for Senior Administrators (15 minutes) [ACTION ITEM]

(Professors Barbara Hawkins and Richard Carr, Faculty Affairs Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U13-2006.htm>

7. IUB Statement on General Education (30 minutes) [FIRST READING]  
(Professors William Wheeler and John Carini, co-chairs, Educational Policies Committee)  
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B35-2006.htm>

8. Constitutional Amendment: BFC Presiding Officer (10 minutes) [DISCUSSION]  
(Professor Theodore Miller, BFC President)

9. IU Foundation Updates and Foundation Relations Committee Report (20 minutes)  
[DISCUSSION]  
(Professors Lisa Bingham and Rex Stockton, co-chairs, Foundation Relations Committee and Curt Simic, Director and CEO, IU Foundation)

10. Standing Committee Reports

11. Old Business

12. New Business

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

**MCROBBIE:** Ladies and gentlemen... maybe we can start. The first item is the approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes please?

**HAWKINS:** I move the motion.

**MCROBBIE:** A motion from Barbara Hawkins, and a motion to second?

**TERRY:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Herb Terry?

**BROWNLEE:** Yes, we have the corrections.

**MCROBBIE:** All corrections in? All those in favor of approving the minutes from the last meeting as corrected, all those in favor? [AYE] Against? Approved unanimously I think.

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

**MCROBBIE:** Item 2 is Agenda Committee business, Ted.

**T. MILLER:** Thank you. We have a rather full agenda here today and one of the things we are going to try to do is to sort of keep our eye on the clock, so those of you who are making presentations, I'm looking generally over in this area here [laughter], please keep in mind that we are somewhat pressed.

I have a couple of items that I would like to bring to your attention. Number one, you'll recall that one of our items this year has been the Intellectual Property Policy. It now appears to me that this item is going to be carried over from this year to the next year. We have had recent heavy discussions surrounding the way software is treated in this particular policy. A number of people who are close to that kind of stuff have expressed their strong disapproval of the way this is treated in the policy and that, I think, whether it is possible for us to go in some other direction still remain to be seen I think. But in the face of this kind of concern, I don't think we are ready, given the importance of this to the faculty, I just don't think we are ready to press this forward. In addition to that, we have a number of campuses, this of course is a university wide policy, we have a number of campuses who are really not prepared at this point to vote on this policy in any event. So we're going to carry this over to the fall.

Second item regards the Calendar Committee. The Bloomington campus Calendar Committee met yesterday and had a, I thought, a very productive discussion of the calendar issues. It has committed itself to working beginning early next year to developing a calendar proposal for the BFC to consider. That will include consideration of the list of calendar issues that seem to confront us. Obviously one of those is Labor Day; the next time that Labor Day will be the first day of classes is in 2008, its 2 years from this coming fall. The university has, I think, committed itself to never having the first day of class fall on Labor Day again. And so this is going to require an adjustment of the academic calendar and the Calendar Committee is going to work on that issue and then there are two other issues that are kind of out there. One of them is the issue of the so-called fall break. It could be viewed that way; another way to view it is kind of the Thanksgiving Break problem; that would be an alternate way to kind of talk about that issue. So that's one of them that they are also going to consider. And then the third one is the issue of the asymmetric calendar; the fact that our fall semester calendar is a little bit different from our spring semester calendar. So those are the three big calendar issues that I think are there and the intent of the Calendar Committee is to address those and send us a proposal next year as soon as possible. So I think this is a promising development by the way.

Alright, those are the two major items. There are two other items that I want to mention, not having so much to do with BFC business. One of them has to do with a committee called the Little 500 Coordinating Committee. I'm not sure if there's anybody on the Council here who is close to Little 500 or who wants to be close to Little 500, is interested in Little 500, but if you are, there is an opening for a faculty representative to the Little 500 Coordinating Committee. Al Ruesink has done this apparently for many many years and he's ready to step out of that role and if somebody else would be interested in seeing what happens behind the scenes of Little 500 please let me know.

**HUNT:** Free beer with that?

**T. MILLER:** I'm sorry? [Laughter] Last item, I got a request from Doug Bauder who is the Director of the GLBT Student Support Services. He wanted me to remind you that April 11<sup>th</sup>, which is one week from today, is designated as the National Day of Silence. And he wanted me to remind you that you may encounter some students who are observing the National Day of Silence and he asks that you respect what they are doing. Thank you very much.

**BRADLEY:** National Silence for what, anything in particular?

**T. MILLER:** If I understand it, it is basically a sort of a protest recognizing those who have been silenced by prejudice or discrimination. That's the basic idea.

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

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Ted. I don't have any business. There are obviously some other matters to comment on. Sorry, I think I've now caught the cold that Ted had last time; he caught that from me from the one I had before that. So we're going to go on infecting each other like this until this meeting is finished. I just want to mention that, if this hasn't already been mentioned, that I think we're going to bring up Agenda Item 9 because Curt Simic has arrived for that already and I think we can take care of that item reasonably quickly as soon as we finish with questions.

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

**MCROBBIE:** So let me move on to the Question and Comment Period. Firstly, let me deal with a question that I got. I'll just read it quickly:

Could I take a moment to reflect on the Founder's Day event held on Saturday and share with the BFC my thoughts on faculty participation and the meaningfulness of the students walking across the stage being processed like, these are the words of the author, processed like eggs through an egg factory, the post-ceremony reception. I'd like them to speak about what the event represent about the faculty and administration of the university to the students and families who were in attendance. I've traditionally attended the event as a faculty member but this year I had the occasion to attend as a proud parent I had mixed feelings about some elements of the event. For example, should the faculty have greater involvement in planning and executing the event so that more parents and students feel greater individual connection?

I was also the proud parent of a child who, my daughter, my oldest daughter went up, she was an honors student, on the weekend. I think it is worth commenting that unfortunately the number of faculty who where there at Founder's Day was very very small, about 20, not including those who are on stage, out of whatever it is, roughly 1500 faculty on this campus. I think a couple of those may have been from IUPUI as well. I've sat through many Founder's Day, this is the first one in which I participated and it really I think is a big deal to parents and students who have accomplished the kinds of grades and other accomplishments that get them qualified for Founder's Day. A terrific diversity of students, they earn wonderful achievements by our students to have got there and I think that there's a lot to be said if faculty could possibly make that event. I think there are only three robed events a year; that one and the two commencement ceremonies, the spring and the winter commencement ceremonies. Sometimes there are some special ones but even if faculty made an attempt to get to at least one of those robed events a year I think this would have a great effect on the students who they've taught during the year and obviously the parents who are there as well. So that was something I think that was fairly evident to me and to the proud parent who wrote this note to me.

I think secondly, there probably is something to be said for us maybe having a look at these events, the way that we organize them, and I'll probably take that up with the President. I think the event was followed by a reception that was in the Mellencamp Pavilion and it was rather austere and spartan to say the least and it might be something we might look at to see whether we can do something a little more substantial than that in future, especially given these are the very best students in the university and I think among them I guess are the kinds of students we're trying to encourage to maybe become graduate students here at some point as well. And then maybe it's difficult to know what we can actually do about the egg processing process part of it because I think greeting a thousand odd students is something that's probably worth doing but I can't really think of any other way we could do that in a more personalized way where there's so many of them, that at least is one way we can give them some recognition. They meet the dean, and they meet the president and they meet me when they come up on the stage as well. Overall, I thought it was a fairly nice event but certainly those are the two areas where we can maybe look at how we might improve it. So if any faculty want to sort of volunteer to look at how we might improve that event, I think that would be a very good thing and they may be able to work directly with the—I think it's called the University Ceremonies Office, to maybe have some input on how to maybe improve that event as well as possibly the commencements as well. Does anybody want to comment on that at all? Ted.

**T. MILLER:** Well let me make a comment; I don't want to appear to be a total suck up here but Michael made a speech at Founder's Day and I wanted to compliment you Michael. I thought it was a very nice speech and I'm hoping that you will make those remarks public, perhaps post it on a webpage or something along those lines.

**MCROBBIE:** I was going to do that. In fact I was going to send it to you to see if you wanted to distribute it to the BFC the comments I made.

**T. MILLER:** I think it would be worth putting these remarks in front of the faculty, I really do.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you.

**THIBOS:** Can I make a suggestion as well as a father of a graduating senior this year who has declined to go to the graduation ceremony, another robed event, primarily on the basis of lack of modern connotation, so we say. I think it would be a good idea if students could be involved in the planning of these various ceremonies to help them make it seem more relevant to their lifestyle and make it meaningful to them in a way that may not be possible if older faculty members are the ones that are making the calls.

**MCROBBIE:** I'm reasonably certain and I stand corrected, I'm reasonably certain that with respect to the individual events that the schools all hold I think there is student involvement and that I think groups like the Student Alumni Association get involved. I'm not certain, in fact, Curt may even know the answer to this, but I think the committee that puts these events together does have some student representation on it as well. Maybe that could be enhanced in some way. One could get into a debate about whether these are the traditions we want to keep alive. I mean,

robed ceremonies I think is something that certainly seems to appeal to the students and speaking purely as a parent, I think that appeals to the parents too, I'm sure you would agree with that.

**THIBOS:** Indeed.

**MCROBBIE:** The second question is a question about the capital priorities proposal that went forward. It was going forward from the university to the trustees. The actual details of this predated my obviously taking over this position, it happened late last year and Neil Theobald was intimately involved and knows the background to it and I asked Neil if he could actually comment on this and respond to that question.

**THEOBALD:** Let me read the question first, it says: On behalf of Professor Tom Gieryn, the chair of the College of Arts and Sciences Building and Planning Committee, I seek clarification on the current status of the proposed Humanities Classroom/Office Building. The urgent need for this building has been recognized now for quite a long time. Ballantine Hall is bursting at the seams even as a number of humanities departments are operating out of old houses and teaching in inadequate spaces. The humanities which comprise 40 percent of college faculty are relegated to cramped dysfunctional and ugly classrooms. It is our understanding that a new humanities building is the College's top construction priority and it is also a campus priority. Why then has this top priority construction projection been supplanted in priority by the Information Technology Building, especially when the Humanities Classroom/Office Building is so central to the campus's teaching and research mission.

I want to go back to something I said three meetings ago. The purpose of the priority list that we develop is that it goes to university administration to compete with priority lists developed by IUPUI and the regional campuses for the single list that goes to the legislature. There's only one; we don't send campus-specific lists to the General Assembly. It was the judgment of Ken Gros Louis, and I agreed with him, that the Humanities Building would not have competed well in such a competition to be the number one priority of the campus. He felt that the Computational Information Building had a much better chance to be the top priority of the university going forward, and he was right. The list of priorities that went to Trustees last month has the Computational Information Building as the number one priority of the university. His thinking and again I totally agree with it, was that this campus cannot weather another biennium without funding for new construction. So, therefore, his thinking was to put forward the building that had the best chance to be funded. That is what we did and so far so good. So that's how it ended up with the Computational Information Building number one and the Humanities Building number two. Questions on that? It's more of a political process than an academic process.

**IVIE:** Neil can I follow up?

**MCROBBIE:** Yes.

**IVIE:** I submitted the question. Could you extend your comments now to talk about what the prospects are for this building in the future?

**THEOBALD:** The Humanities Building?

**IVIE:** Yes

**THEOBALD:** Michael probably has a better sense than me. Seriously, this is a university-level political discussion more than what our committee does.

**MCROBBIE:** The way that I would answer this at the moment is that assuming that we get at least some of what's on the list that will go to the legislature, assuming that we get at least some or maybe even all of it, then that will mean that in the last, at least the last two budgets—I think including the sort of special thing that the previous governor did, Governor O'Bannon did—this campus would have then got four science buildings, MSB1, Simon Hall, MSB2, the CIB building and possibly even a fourth building which would be a life sciences building. I think at that point, that is the budget after this one, there is a very good case to be made for there having been now a substantial investment in the life sciences and other sciences and that we should look to then make the case for a Humanities Building being a very high priority if not the top priority at that point. I think by that stage we will be in a position to demonstrate all those building hopefully being built and then be able to make that case. Yes Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** Michael I wonder if the label Humanities Building, while it's very useful for our purposes understanding the uses of such a building but it's quite well known that we have a screaming need for new classroom space here in Bloomington and I wonder if it wouldn't be appropriate to pitch this in Indianapolis as a classroom building.

**MCROBBIE:** Which one?

**KRAVCHUK:** The Humanities Building. Although it would also house faculty, I understand that, but I just think that the legislators that I speak to when they hear the word research, they think economic development and so they're thinking in terms of the kinds of things that will promote the economy. So if you say humanities I think for them that would be code for what they might regard as being sort of the softer aspects of what the university provides. I'm not passing judgment here I'm just listening to what I hear from legislators. If we pitch it as something that would be more broadly used across campus, whether or not we actually schedule it that way, I'm just making a suggestion.

**MCROBBIE:** I would, I understand the point you're making. I would think there would be a lot to be said for actually being a little more—taking a little more head on that issue and actually saying, look there's been this very substantial investment in the sciences and the humanities are one of the areas in which this campus has traditionally excelled and has great excellence and ...

**KRAVCHUK:** If you really want to take that tact, then I support you.

**MCROBBIE:** I think that it might not be quite as, one might not put it quite as directly as that but I don't think that one should try and disguise it and say oh no we really don't have any humanities here and they're all hidden away in the back or something. I think one should be a lot more direct on this.

**KRAVCHUK:** That would result in much broader, much larger conversation with Indianapolis. We would have to be very clear with them that we knew what we needed and we were going to press our case very forcefully.

**MCROBBIE:** I think mixing it together with the classroom space is fine but I don't think one should try and hide it away either.

**MACKAY:** Before weighing in political factors, do you have any metrics for deciding whether let's say a classroom, research or residential space should have priority?

**MCROBBIE:** Well I haven't yet had to adjudicate under any these issues though I will conceivably next time round and that will be the kind of thing that—I'm not certain it exists in detailed form, I'll defer to Neil on that, but it's obviously something we can look at next time around. I shouldn't underestimate how important the political climate is though in getting funding from the state, in getting from private sources is another manner. Maybe our last question, Herb.

**TERRY:** Just a comment on this issue. There are things you learn in the Budgetary Affairs Committee that you might not want to know and generally you keep them confidential note. But I want to speak on behalf of the fact that this computational facilities building is an important campus need as well. A couple of years ago in Dean McRobbie's budget conference as Vice President for Information Technology, I asked, because a new secure building like this had just been constructed in Indianapolis, I asked what would happen if a tornado went through the old university middle school complex up here where these facilities are currently located. The answer was a bit chilling in the sense that it would lead, among other things, to a rather long period of lack of networked computing on this campus, assuming that the servers that might be destroyed were available off the shelf and we could place an order for them.

I am a member of the College of Arts and Sciences. I have been a proponent here of classroom space but it's not the case that in putting this as the highest priority we're not putting something important at the top. It's a crucial, in my view, campus infrastructure matter and I hope it's successful.

**MCROBBIE:** Maybe we can move on. Sorry Ted, yes.

**T. MILLER:** Could I just say just one thing? One of the items on our agenda two weeks from today will be, we'll have Terry Clapacs and Bob Meadows here to talk about these matters and so if between now and then you can think some more about what you what to say to these folks, they will be here.

## **AGENDA ITEM #9: IU FOUNDATION UPDATES AND FOUNDATION RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT**

**MCROBBIE:** Ok I think we're going to move on now to the presentation of Curt and the members of the Foundations Relations Committee are going to do.

**BINGHAM:** I'd just like to very quickly introduce Curt Simic, a man who needs no introduction to this group. I co-chair the Foundation Relations Committee with Rex Stockton. It's been a wonderful experience. There's been just a tremendous open exchange of information between the committee and the Foundation. Members of the faculty have been able to sit in on Board of Directors committee meetings at each of the Board's meetings and any question we ask has been answered immediately which has been just a wonderful thing for me personally in terms of learning about the work of the Foundation. Curt works tirelessly, quietly, loyally and it seems to me all the time, I never see him stop, on our behalf and it's wonderful to have him here and actually get to hear some good news which is something I don't think we've had in much abundance this year. So with that, Curt Simic.

**SIMIC:** A nice introduction. I think the last time that, or maybe the first time I was introduced here was by Allen Grimshaw who was from the department of sociology and he said I'm just going to introduce you as just another suit. So here I am, just another suit. Recently I was at a meeting where my counter part at the University of Minnesota was reflecting on his sixteen years in the same kind of position at Minnesota and he cited some figures that I hadn't heard or at least I didn't hear them quite this way. But over that period of his time in this job, state support had increased per annum 4.9 percent and tuition had increased 5.1 percent per year and the gifts had increased by 9 percent per year over that time and I think we're in a period of time when if we're going to have any growth in our budget that the gifts side has to continue to grow on that basis. We've got quite a few images here to show and I apologize for not knowing that you would prefer not have PowerPoint. I prefer not to have them too but it's easier to talk if I can stay focused a little bit on what we're trying to do.

First of all our job in fundraising is to try to move the university closer, in total alignment actually, closer to the alignment that the Trustees and the President have indicated that they want to go and to provide some incremental funds for excellence and we're getting more on budget relief in recent times. That has not been the case that we've talked about in recent times but that's what the Trustees are saying to us more and more; we've got to figure out a way to create some budgetary relief. We've had some good years and especially this last year was an important year; \$301 million in total voluntary support. Michael chides me when I say "we" on this. I'm talking about "we" the university, I'm talking about the faculty in its efforts, I'm talking about the fundraisers and their efforts, I'm talking about chancellors and presidents and deans, all who are part of this; so the "we" includes everybody as we talk though it. And that second line there is an important line because that's the money that the faculty doesn't involve fundraisers in; that's the money that they go out and seek from whatever sources they might be that are private—they are not public monies they are private monies—but find those monies as well. And when we talk about this \$301 million of course we do include the Riley Children's Foundation because it's a dedicated foundation to the pediatrics program at the Medical School and this is money that the Foundation transfers directly from its resources to support of the program.

And of course the record number of donors is a good thing. I'll give you a little bit more about that as we go forward. We've also had some very large gifts that you've read about recently. None of those gifts are a part of that ranking that we were 9<sup>th</sup> in the country and 2<sup>nd</sup> among public institutions; none of those because the cash wasn't in at the end of the fiscal year and it will take a little bit of time for that to come in. One was the Glaubinger gift for athletic

endowment, you know about that. The Godfrey gift which is largely scholarship money but it also includes some money for bricks and mortars for the Business School, the Executive Education Center. The \$15 million from Jesse and Beulah Cox for the scholarships that are going to be two-thirds to Bloomington campus and one-third to the Indianapolis campus; in fact the first class is already in place. And then the \$40 million from the Jacobs' for the Music School and the \$70 million anonymous which parallels the uses of the Cox scholarships. So those are good numbers.

One of the things I would emphasize is that most of them have been in process or gestation for ten or fifteen years; these are not dollars that turn around in no time. These are people that we know well who have been long-time supporters who have supported us in a variety of ways across the breadth of the institution and who continue to be involved. Barbara and David Jacobs, for example, when I came to the job I looked at the Foundation Board and I found it a really fine, good old boy network; there weren't very many women, there weren't people of color, and one of the questions I asked my predecessor is where do we go to find this? He said you should go to Cleveland and talk to Barbara Jacobs I think she'd really be interested because she's had some students here, some children here, and you should go see her. So the very first call I made was to go to see Barbara in Cleveland and she said yes she would come on the board. She became a donor, she co-chaired the campaign for the Academic Endowment Campaign we finished a few years ago for this campus. So this \$40 million is not a surprise, not at all. It's a passion of hers.

By the way, if we go to donors and we say this is what the university needs they will be loyal and they will support us. They will give in capital campaigns out of loyalty, out of devotion, out of just a desire to do what the institution wants to do. But if we want gifts of these sizes we have to get on their page of their dream. And Barbara's dream was to support the Music School in a very substantial way. Jesse Cox' dream is articulated in one little sentence when he addressed his first class of Cox scholars he said I've been thinking about you since before you were born. And we're not a public meeting but don't be surprised if that \$70 million takes on the same character.

In direction over the last ten years in terms of fundraising, ten years ago we were raising \$50 million a year and this last year \$150 million which was gift funds, not the other categories that I mentioned. Our target for 2010 is almost \$200 million. That's a target that we set some five years ago and planned to 2010 for the Foundation and for fundraising in general and we've been exceeding those goals. I suspect we will exceed these goals as well. The number of donors is an important thing: 75,000 ten years ago, 107,000 now. Interesting because usually in a given year you get people to repeat about 73 or 74 percent; so if you're at 100,000 donors you have to make up that 26 or 27,000 donors and if you have any growth it's on top of that. Now people come back. They come and go from year to year. They don't consistently give every year. A lot of them do but not all of them. So that number is a pretty good number and it's an extension of what we believe and that is this: we have to get people started giving before we're going to get that big gift. And we have to develop the kind of relationship with the institution that Barbara developed over that period of time that ultimately got us to the point of that \$40 million gift. So it's a long-term thing.

What I'm going to talk with you now is a little bit about what President of the Board of Trustees Steve Ferguson gave the Foundation Board just recently. It's an iteration of what he did as far as

the Board of Trustees publicly. But he specifically came to the Foundation Board to say this is what we're facing, this is what we have to have happen. So here are the assumptions: no increase in state funding, fee income 5.5 percent, and other income no significant growth. And then he talked a bit about the current facilities funding gap and I was listening to the humanities discussion back and forth as well because if you look at this list of things, that's not on our list. That's one of the items that's not on our list yet so somewhere along the line, whatever the process is, it needs to filter to us. The fundraisers cannot and do not make a decision about what's to be out there as the objective for fundraising. The institution has to tell us that. And for several years we've been saying to the Trustees where are you going? We're steering an aircraft carrier here; it doesn't make left and right turns by 90 degrees, it goes gradually. So we need some long advanced warning about where you're trying to go so that we can fashion a campaign to move it in the direction that you want it to move.

But here are some of the numbers and they're really very sobering. And that is both the deferred maintenance--\$77 million requested over the last several years and only \$15 million received. You are sitting among and in buildings now that are swimming in a sea of deferred maintenance if you will. And then the cost-sharing that's been involved in a variety of buildings you begin to see that few of our buildings are fully state funded; they're always a combination of things. There are some federal funds in them as well as some gift funds. But by and large we haven't built buildings recently that were totally funded by the state or totally funded with public funds. We've actually done that.

And you can see the very last point the operating costs are a frightening thing too because if you go by the square footage formula, and it's \$57 million over the last three biennia that you should have had to run the buildings with \$6 million actual. So you're being squeezed in a variety of ways.

Judy Palmer went through the baseline funding conversations but I'm going to move this pretty quickly but if you go to the next one, Barb, you see that this is what Judy Palmer is projecting as the gap in funding as we go forward just to do what we continue to do. That's all below the line and again very, very sobering.

But these are the kinds of things that the Trustees are saying to us that they want us to work toward and that is more funding for faculty obviously; I think that started really when we did the academic endowment campaign and did the endowed chairs and professorships that worked out very well about a decade ago. We never stopped doing that and we continue to have conversations and we continue to have people who give on this basis and it's good. The student focus in this campaign is reflected in this second item. If we work with faculty in the last campaign we moved it toward students—we, the institution moved it toward students—in this campaign. And I think one of the most important things that happened as we prepared for this campaign was the decision that was made to make the income match a part of this which was a part of the campaign for endowed chairs and professorships. The income match, there will be a little bit more on that a little bit later. But basically it says if you give \$50,000 for an undergraduate scholarship the payout of the endowment of that is 5 percent. The income is larger but part of that is plowed back into the endowment so that it maintains its purchasing power going forward. Out of the CTE monies, 5 percent is made available in perpetuity to match that

money. That's a very big inducement. One of the places we failed in the last campaign was on graduate fellowships. We just didn't succeed in attracting graduate fellowships. So that's in this campaign with the match as well. The minimum level to get a 1-1 match on the income is \$250,000 because a graduate fellowship that yields less than that is less than a full graduate fellowship so that's where it came from. We worked on that—Michael and I started that conversation six or eight years ago—how can we move this up and one of the things that happened was that you agreed or the institution agreed that the income match would be important. So those are the three pieces.

The research thing we are getting tremendous amount of interest in that. We simply have fallen behind, not only on this campus but on the IUPUI campus as far as the laboratory space and the research space, those things that are concern. To be more specific, these are the things that the Trustees talked with us about at the last Board meeting: analytical chemistry, cancer research and clinical care, diabetes and metabolic disorders, etc. the things that you can see and then in the neurosciences in general. Those are the things and then this next page continues to talk about how we're trying to move forward with the life sciences initiative. It's a daunting agenda and one of the things that causes some anxiety among some of constituents is our job to develop Indiana's economy is that a primary objective. It's kind of a secondary objective but right now it's a, speaking candidly, it's a good buzz word in Indianapolis and so it's one of those things that you try to figure out how that objective of the state, obviously it's a good thing, can be brought into alignment with what the institution is trying to do and this is one of the ways that it's going to be.

Here are some, again, big numbers. Just in special R & R, there's a dragon's tale out there of \$207 million and then new construction and desire for another \$488 million. Just to make the life sciences initiative move forward, the desire is to have two new facilities each biennium, one in Indianapolis, one in Bloomington. I think that's the plan as we've talked about it and again pretty daunting. Go ahead. Again, this is the gap again and it's the same story, it's just a little different graph.

So, here's the summary of what we were given by the Board of Trustees; ambitious and clear cut priorities, collaborative efforts to secure funding from all sources, gift funds become a larger share of the budget for scholarships, fellowships etc., accessible funding to respond to new investment opportunities. I'm not sure what that means to be perfectly honest with you. One of the things that I'm concerned about is if we have a billion dollars in endowment that money has to function on endowment. It can't all be used to leverage all the money and I think what we're saying is a casting about to see whether there are resources that can help move the thing forward. And one of the concerns that I have is that we not look at that endowment as something simply to leverage other money if it gets to the point of jeopardizing the ability of that endowment to continue to produce kinds things. So that's a piece of the conversation yet to be worked out. The internal resource allocation and reallocation I think is big thing. One of the things that will happen as we go out and we ask people for money they're going to say, are you living within your means now, are you making decisions about what you want to do first in priority rather than just saying let's get incremental funding on a continuing basis. So that's something that we have to have further conversations about because any sophisticated donor will ask that question and that's perfectly appropriate and then of course facilities to do some things.

Lisa promised some good news so we'll talk a little bit about the campaign as we stand right now. First of all, the campaign working goal is a billion dollars. We started out talking about \$750 million a year or two ago. We're confident that a billion is there. I suspect before the goal is completed it will be more than a billion dollars because I think it's there. The ongoing support reflects money that's already coming in and it can't be stopped because we're in a campaign mode. Your units across the institution are spending money that comes in from gift sources. So that can't be stopped, so there's the ongoing piece. The ongoing need for non-governmental grants is critical, that has to continue. That is faculty generated. By in large the rest of us don't have much to do with it; faculty and deans and provosts and presidents etc. the new money in any campaign is generally about 40 percent. What you're trying to do is move from a level that you are 40 percent higher and that's what we did in the last campaign and we'll do it again in this campaign. But the 40 percent is where all these new initiatives that are being talked about will have to come from. 400 million is a lot of money.

Here are the objectives that we have so far and this is where I mentioned a moment ago that the Humanities Building is not on it so the process has to grind forward. Endowed chairs, endowed scholarships, endowed fellowships, a president's enrichment fund. One of the things that we were budgeted is the money is distributed and then taxed back. That's not a good feeling if you're in the middle trying to tax the money back. So what the president has asked and the Trustees endorsed is some sort of a fund where we could generate an endowment that would basically give the president some money so that the president could influence the direction of the institution by putting money there. You come in and you ask for money and the president doesn't have any money, it can't move forward, at least not from that source. So creating that kind of a fund is an important thing, that's a long time thing. That's a long term thing. I think it's possible to be done, but it's one of those things that has to be out there all the time.

Then the construction list is very long. MSB1 which is Simon hall, MSB2, the Kelley School of Business renovation, that's the part that's on the east side of Fee lane, the Musical Arts Center renovation, the Law School renovation, athletic facilities, information technology and the Hutton Honors College. Some of these will be targets of opportunity. The Honors College is strictly a target of opportunity. Ed gave us the money for international experience program; nine million dollars up front. He's committing from his foundation a million dollars a year for the next twenty years, half of which can be expended and half of which goes in the endowment and he looked at the home of the Honor's College and said gee if it's going to have my name on it I'd like to have a nicer building, I'll pay for it. We didn't ask him for it, it wasn't what we were looking for necessarily but he was in the office on Friday, we were talking it through and he's already put the money on deposit with the Foundation. So we have the ability, that's a target of opportunity, that's not something we anticipated as we went forward.

Where are we now? We're 48 percent there; 48 percent of the way there. Those are all the pieces in documented gifts and pledges where somebody said we're going to give this money and here's a document that ties me to that. Expectancies are when somebody says I'm putting you in my will for 'X' amount or I'm establishing a trust for 'X' amount. Someday that's going to come. We don't know what the timing is, we don't want to be a predictor of when that will come, but it's one of the categories when we say this is how the money is coming in. And then of course

the non-governmental grants. So we're at 48 percent of the goal. I don't know when the public announcement is going to be. Now that we have a provost in place, that discussion has to go on even further to find out when is the right time to announce this campaign. It's not a well kept secret. We don't want it to be a well kept secret. We're talking to a lot of people all the time about lead gifts before we go public. Why don't we want it to be well kept—why are we even in that conversation. Number one we have to get the leadership gifts in place before we go public. We can't do a campaign where we think there's any danger that we won't reach the goal. We have to reach the goal. I'd rather have a lower goal and go through the top of it than a very high goal and not make the goal because the only thing that will be remembered is that we didn't make the goal. If we made the goal two billion dollars and said we raised one billion nine hundred and fifty million dollars and we failed. But if we have a billion three goal and we go to a billion four, then we have all kinds of success. So part of it is building a sense of confidence that we will succeed.

You'll recall the IUPUI goal was \$750 million. It wasn't very long that we were into that that we felt that we would exceed that. But it went to a billion dollars and that was a good thing. Why? The community said, we can raise real money for this campus, we can make things happen and our confidence is up, so the next time we do an IUPUI campaign, there's that confidence based just as there is on this campus when we did the academic endowment campaign. The goal was \$350 million for endowment; it went to \$500 million. Confidence is an important part of this.

We're establishing campaign and unit goals. That's not all together, together. Today I met with the Dean of the Kelley School and we talked through some of that. I met with Dean of the Law School and we talked through some of that and part of it has to be to get the volunteer structure positioned in a way that they'll accept the goal and take responsibility for helping to raise it. And the conversation today with the Dean of the Law School was to prepare to meet with her board of advisors on Friday to talk about this and the psychology of moving the thing forward in a positive way. It's not all done yet. We are raising funds in a silent phase and we are forming the donor volunteer executive committees. There'll be committees both within the units and for the overall program as we go forward. Here's what's happened so far with that 48 million, 19.1 has come in for endowed faculty positions over this cycle. You see the numbers, the 393, but that's across the breadth of the university, not just this campus and you can see what happened to Bloomington in the last campaign. We've moved from 72 to 200; all this is confidence building. All this is making people believe that this is going to happen and can really happen.

The income match, I've already talked about that. It does apply to the scholarships and fellowships and they are out of the base budget and out of that excellence money and I presume that you were consulted in some form or another when the campus went forward with that. By the way I heard people say, gee I want to do the same thing at IUPUI, do I get the match and the answer is no because they are campus-based funds. The campus has to decide that they want to do those things that so that's where that comes from and why. [End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost] ...that qualified for the match, so this one is going along very well. And this is the fellowships and \$35 million in match there. But don't forget that of that \$35 million, twenty is music. Twenty is that music gift from Jacobs' family.

Now, what's our challenge? This is a paradigm shift. We have been able to get buildings, at least in large part, from the state and really what were saying and what the Trustees are saying to us, we're going to have to get our buildings from gift funds more and more. There's a conversation going around that is basically to a dean that says if you can find the lead gift that will move you up on the list with the legislature. That's not an entirely workable strategy because we can't have everybody running around saying we have to get the lead gift. Our constituencies that make major gifts of a proportion of ten to twenty to thirty million dollars is not large and if we are competing with ourselves, if the institution hasn't said this is what we need to do, then we're going to have some trouble with that. So I have to have a further conversation with the president, with provost and with the deans about what does make sense as we go forward in this. And then the life sciences piece, there's a lot of educating to be done there.

I've just said this, these two little circles at the bottom, if one circle is the university's needs and one circle is donor interest, they have to overlap somewhere and where they overlap is where the opportunity is. Now let's say the institution says we have to do this no matter what and they don't overlap, then we have to take the time to educate the constituencies, the donor public, about why this is so important and those of you that went through this when I was at the trustees, we described what happened at my last assignment at Berkeley. The first day I got to the job, the biologists rang my office saying where is my fifty million dollars and I thought, what the heck are we talking about here. Well it turned out that if we raised fifty million dollars, the state would give us a hundred million dollars. So we did a feasibility study. We went to the 33 top donors for Cal; for the University of California at Berkeley and one said he thought that biology was critical to the university's future. The university said we have to do this, figure it out. So we took the next year to talk about biology at Berkeley and every time the chancellor spoke, every time the faculty spoke, every publication talked about biology at Berkeley, a year and a half later we did a feasibility study, we interviewed a hundred people, we sent ten thousand feasibility questionnaires to people, got three thousand back, thirty one hundred in total. Seventy three percent said we have to do biology at Berkeley. So we can do it, but takes education, and it takes time and it takes in institution saying this is the number one task. And that's what worries me about saying to any dean or any group, if you get the gift it is fine, that dilutes what we're doing. So it's a challenge; it's a challenge to get it focused.

The other thing is our big gifts have come in various deferred kinds of ways; they are in trusts with life income agreements, there are estates etc. We can't build buildings on pledges or commitments; we have to have cash to build buildings. So that's a big issue as we look at this thing as well. I think we have to be able to explain to any donor what we're doing with our other income and why we're coming in to them for gifts. So if you have a list of projects that you want to get done that could go to the bottom of the floor and you look at the various sources of support, one of the things that the institution does do is say "okay, we can this from here, we can this from there, we can this from there" and eventually on the far end, the gifts funds fall out, everything else isn't covered. That doesn't necessarily mean we can raise money for that. The parking garage might be the most important thing to do, but if we take that out to a donor group, they're going to say that's not too exciting. But if we take it alongside something else they're going to say "I'd do this but I wouldn't do this". That's information we have to bring back to the decision makers in the institution that causes us to take out to the donating public what it is that we think can be supported. So that's the feasibility study; what's your interests in the projects,

will you make a gift, how much, will you work and what effect will this have on other things that you are doing. Then we take that information back to the decision makers and say this is what we know, this will help shape where we go.

I've spoken of this already. The university determines the priorities. The university and the Foundation advocate and educate and make the ask and the donor will decide ultimately where it goes. So as much of a challenge as it is to deal with the legislature, it's a challenge to deal with donors too. Faculty ask me time and time again, what can I do to help with fundraising. Rarely does a student come up and say "gee, I remember the assistant vice chancellor for X or Y or Dean of Students Dickey might remember the dean of student no question", but mostly what the donor does is say, I remember professor so and so, I remember the care that she took when I had a question. I remember the time that they took to do thus and so. What the faculty can do is do what you do well and that is to teach in the classroom so well, do your research and pay attention to the students in a very personal humane kind of a way because that's what they remember. I think I'll stop Michael and take whatever questions there might be.

**T. MILLER:** I think we have very limited time for questions actually. If there are one or two key questions we can do it, but we have very limited time.

**THIBOS:** To what extent corporate donors figure into the campaign, the high profiles are always going to be private donors?

**SIMIC:** Well the corporate world is changing. There are very few gifts that don't support the corporate objective now. It almost has to be such that it will help them make the case for their profit and loss statement. There was a time when there a lot more corporate philanthropy, if you will, it was really philanthropy but now it aligns itself with the corporate objectives. But we go to them all, we don't miss them. We still go to them and ask for their support and we have an ongoing program so that we have a pretty good idea of what they will and they won't support. For example, the Lilly Company accepts from us on a quarterly basis a whole list of things that have come forward that people have a desire to get before the Lilly Company. And then they will go through it and say, okay, this we'll fund and that we won't fund. We just had a list of those, I think Michael of about half a dozen that they agreed to fund across the institution both in Bloomington, Indianapolis and on one of the regionals too. So they're in the mix; corporate and foundations and individuals as well.

**MCROBBIE:** Maybe one more question?

**SIMIC:** I put them to sleep.

**MACKAY:** What's your return on investment income and how do you rank in say the top 100 institutions?

**SIMIC:** We're at 9.6 percent over the last ten years. We're not at the top; we have been at the top of our comparison group which is the Big Ten, the Pac 10, and selective public universities, because we're more conservative. We haven't been willing to take the risk to get what the Harvard's and the Yale's have gotten with alternative investments but we're moving in that

direction. I can't remember exactly where we are in terms of the annual report but across the country the last ten years have been about 9 percent and we've been at 9.6 percent. We've been as high as number one at over 20 percent for 2004 and 2003 and as low as below water during the bear market. So we're, I would say, we're middle-upper third. I can give you specifics on it and will if you'd like to have that. But basically we try to avoid jeopardizing the corpus itself. So preservation of capital is absolutely critical. Our hurdle rate is made up of the following: 5 percent payout, 2.5 percent for inflation, 1 percent for fees. So that's an 8.5 percent hurdle rate. So that's our objective is to make that every time. We've been over that, 9.6 percent, and we've been happy with it because it doesn't jeopardize us, it doesn't put us too far out so that if something really goes bad. We probably have 18 portfolio managers and they are all across all the asset allocation classes. They are all across international, now what we can alternative investments, as well as indexed funds. And the whole idea is to spread the risk so that you don't lose the corpus. That costs you something in terms of what your return can be on a good time but we think it's the right way to go. And by the way it isn't staff driven, it is driven by a group of people who are on our Board who are in the investment world and understand the dynamic of an institutional investment. Having said that we are moving toward 28 percent in alternative investments because as you've seen from the numbers that come from the East Coast they are at 50 and 51 percent; there are some differences, they have access for private placement that we don't have necessarily. And it has to do with what the constituency is and their access to that private placement. We haven't found that we have that but having said that when we found that we could not get into the top tier venture funds we pulled together six of our alumni who happened to be on the west coast and said these are the top tier funds we'd like to get into them can you help us? Well they went through the process; we had a long dinner meeting and they went through the process and said you don't want to be in this one and then another one would say you do want to be in this one and I know so and so. So now we're getting into the top tier venture funds as a result of our alums. And the good part of that is when that was all over with one of them said to me you finally asked me to do something I can do to help. And part of our desire is to connect with the family in such a way that not only will they have faith in us and give us their expertise they will give us their money and this man, the one who got us into one of those funds, has given us close to half-million dollars in the last year. So I can give you the specifics and will and I will bring it back to the Committee, Ted or Bonnie?

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Curt.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: BLOOMINGTON PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT CODE OF RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND CONDUCT**

**MCROBBIE:** Let's move to Agenda Item #5. The first reading of the Procedures for the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

**PRYOR:** My name is Sara Pryor and I present to you today the revised version of the IU Bloomington campus-specific procedures for the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. I do so on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee that I co-chair with Deanna Reising who is sitting at the back here trying to look inoffensive. These modifications have been discussed during three of our monthly meetings and were developed in collaboration with

Associate Dean Pam Freeman, who regrettably has left, and Dick McKaig, who is Vice President for Student Affairs. Dick is that right?

**MCKAIG:** Comma, Bloomington.

**PRYOR:** Oh, comma, Bloomington. And indeed has been very important to us. The principle reasons for the alteration of the Code that you have before you: first to bring it into compliance with the system-wide Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, this blue book that was approved by the Trustees last year, to make it compliant with some changes in the administrative structure of our campus, and to clarify the Code. So, for example if you look at the version that you have there are flow charts now that are included in the main text. For example on page 21 there is a flow chart that is designed to try and demonstrate to the student these are the steps that are going to be conducted. They were previously in an appendix so we've pulled them forward to make it more straight-forward. As an example of the changes in administrative structure wherever the Code said the chancellor will appoint or etc. we have said the President or designee.

There are other perhaps more substantive changes and they are as follows. The most important is that according to this document that was approved by the Trustees an advisor cannot speak for the student, they can advise the student but they cannot speak for them. So we made our procedures compliant with that. In the case of academic misconduct the final appeal against the decision can now only be made in light of a procedural error that can be made by both the accused student and the faculty member. So on page 25 it says after it goes through this judicial process and at the end the faculty who has reported the misconduct and the student who has allegedly conducted the misconduct they have the right to challenge the decision only if they can say that a procedural error has occurred. Not just, I didn't really like the decision very much.

Moving quickly on. In the case of personal misconduct text has been added to page 30 that says that the judicial process clearly isn't the only mechanism that might be appropriate. So for example mediation might be a more appropriate tool to be invoked. So it just clarifies that every act doesn't necessarily have to initiate a judicial process. Page 32, additional language has been added to indicate that a victim who has participated in a judicial conference may ask for a delay in the approval of that decision at the conference or the recommendation of that conference if they can say that a procedural error has occurred or there is some new evidence. So a victim does have a right to say I'd like to pause proceedings because I now have a friend who stepped forward who says yes I saw the same thing—or an enemy who steps forward and says yes I saw the same thing.

Page 36 there is now a clear specification of the period of time for which a record of deferred sanction—and a deferred sanction is just when a decision is made to sanction a student but instead of it being enacted immediately it might be at the end of the semester that the sanction is invoked—so that deferred sanction will remain part of the students' record for five years after their graduation.

And last but not least in the case of the student being summarily suspended, so this is basically they've done something so egregious that the university, the campus says we wish you to vacate

the campus immediately, we're not going to wait until a judicial process has occurred, it used to be that when that happened automatically a hearing commission was initiated. Now we're saying that a student has to request such a hearing commission. Sorry this is page 40. And this is simply that those cases are so unusual and so egregious; typically the student is in jail and they have much bigger concerns than what the IU Bloomington campus is doing to them. So only if they ask for a hearing commission will one be established. Otherwise, not.

Ok. So we're asking you to consider this document in terms of content, and I would really underline content. The formatting will be addressed in the final version. I would say some of the grammar will also possibly be cleared up. So please don't say these headings don't line up because professionals will make sure that those headings do line up. We've shown all the items that have been deleted and all the items that have been inserted. And the final draft you'll get on the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting that will be cleaned up and will read as a continuous text. We've flagged them here so you know exactly how we've modified the text. We would like you to approve the document. Well ideally today I'd like you to give us a rousing round of applause and otherwise we'll vote on this next meeting. We would like at that point for you also to authorize us to, in the fall, go back and make sure that none of the ongoing administrative changes don't need to be addressed. So basically if we need to change president and/or designee to provost that you would just allow us to do that without having to come back to you. So we'd like those two approvals if possible. So again, don't worry about formatting and grammar issues. But of course we'd be happy to answer your questions, although insincerely. [Laughter]

**MCROBBIE:** Yes?

**TERRY:** I have one quick suggestion for Appendix B. I make this because I've served on those hearing commissions for a long time. The Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities not so long ago initiated a proceeding where when they are trying to form a hearing commission faculty who might serve on that commission are told the name of the person who is asking for the commission to review their case. The reason for that was that we had a couple of instances where there was a conflict of interest. Suddenly you got the commission together and some faculty member feels, or the student feels that it wouldn't be a good idea to continue. I wouldn't mind seeing something in Appendix B that would say that these conflicts of interest will be avoided some way or another and the current mechanism for doing that is to notify the faculty who are asked to serve, once they sort of agree to the time, to confirm that they don't have a conflict with that student.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? I think, given this is a first reading, if I understand it if there are no more comments we can move on to the next agenda item. Yes?

**WHEELER:** Question. This is a first reading. It was unclear to me whether we would be asked to vote on this at the next meeting or whether we are waiting to the fall?

**PRYOR:** No we would be asking you to vote on April 18<sup>th</sup>.

**MCROBBIE:** If there are additional comments if those comments could be sent to Professor

Pryor and any of the others who have been involved after people get a chance to look at this more carefully. There being no further comments let's move on to agenda item #6.

## **AGENDA ITEM #6: SEARCH AND SCREEN POLICY FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

**MCROBBIE:** Barb are you going to take this?

**HAWKINS:** As you know at our last meeting we sent along the Search and Screen Policy for Senior Administrators to the Faculty Affairs Committee. And during the interim of two weeks we have worked solely on this item and in front of you you have Circular U13-2006 as the proposed replacement from the prior U13. There are a couple of edits that you need to make that we've picked up. Line 45 after the word "issues" should have a comma. Line 58 after the word "conditions" should be the word "must". And on line 102 it should at the very end of the sentence it should be "one year" not "one semester". I want to thank Dick Carr who was the subcommittee chairperson for the group that worked on this and we also had help from Julie Knost and from Maxine Watson. They were tremendous in their help. And Dick is going to give us a very brief overview of what we did to change the previous version.

**CARR:** Thanks, Barb. The version you have in front of you tries to pull together three different texts. You may recall these, they were distributed I believe when we first discussed this in February. Basic to this was the faculty council program which appears in the present Academic Handbook. This was the statement of procedure that was passed back on 1987. Obviously there were a few little problems that appeared last semester because the second document with which we were trying to was a lengthy memo from the Trustees who had a number of suggestions on how to better the process. The third document was that which enlisted a fair number of response when we discussed this issue in February and that was the original U13-2006 document. You may have all three of those somewhere in your file from back in February. I suppose I should have to say that there's a fourth element that enters into this; the expertise of Barbara, Julie Knost and Maxine Watson and the insight of course and common sense of Ted and Kelly Kish.

Let me just draw your attention to a few of the items, some of which were contentious when we discussed this a couple of months ago and which we hope we have resolved. One of the important issues of the 1987 document, that was which was, I think, the single most important issue was the fact that any search and screen committee for a senior official holds a majority of faculty members. This obviously drew a certain amount of ire from the trustees because they found that the committees were getting terribly large and unwieldy. Large and unwieldy because if you're going to have a majority of faculty members on any committee and if that committee is going to represent all of the constituencies that the particular officer is going to touch upon, you can imagine we are speaking about the president of the university, this is going to extent to a very great extent. The trustees want to limit this committee to five to nine people. This becomes somewhat awkward as we found in our discussion and therefore you see down in line 35 the very wise recommendation of nine to fifteen, leaving the option point obviously for this committee to be larger if certain constituencies have to be represented. However we would have to dispute the trustees feeling that everything over nine is unwieldy and we have the experience of committee members this last fall who found it to work quite comfortably.

A second area in which, well, an area in which we had a great deal of discussion back in February was if you recall exceptions from regular search and screen procedures. There were certain procedures which bothered a number of you. I cite Hiring a Senior Administrator Without a Search and Exceptional Hires, Emergency Hires and so forth. The committee has resolved these contentious paragraphs by eliminating them entirely. There is a search and screen process which you have outlined here and as we are suggesting in line 14, any variation from the search and screen process, that would be the case in which there might be an emergency move or something like that, but it would be a variation from these regular search and screen processes. Any variation would force the consultation of the appointing officer with the appropriate faculty governance bodies and I think to this extent if they found that some sort of move had to be made in the area of an emergency appointment, it would at least have the temporary sanction of the faculty until the regular search and screen for that position could be put into place.

Another area, if you turn to the second page that caused a fair amount of comment this last year was a whole question of confidentiality. As you see from the section that we have here, it's felt that this is absolutely essential that the proceedings do continue with complete confidentiality on the part of the search committee and all those who are involved. But there comes a time when even those who do not care for their application for the appointment to become known, this has to become known never the less and that is the point which we call in the last line of this last sentence of this paragraph, the point in which these candidates are finalists and that is to say that the list has been whittled down and the final candidates, final two or three or whatever they be, have been invited to campus, they have agreed to come to campus for an interview, at that time the names of those finalists will be made public.

I believe that is all of the major changes. I've talked about the exceptions to the regular search and screen policy and as you can see the four which we had in the original version had been reduced to one, leaving solely interim appointments as an exception to these regular rules. There are the four major points, the discussions in the committee went much further, tried to resolve details, but since Ted allows us only 15 minutes for this item, I'll skip the details and just leave the broad outline. Barb will be happy to answer any questions that you have.

**HAWKINS:** Dick will be happy to answer any questions.

**MCROBBIE:** Questions?

**KRAVCHUK:** With respect to confidentiality I'd like to point that on line 67 to 68, it seems to me that those 3 sentences conflict with each other; "all stages of the search and screen processes shall remain confidential", the on-campus interviews are a stage of the search and screen process. So perhaps you want to say something to the effect that all stages of the search and screen process up to the final on-campus interviews shall remain confidential. I don't want to provide any escape. When somebody comes for an interview, I want to know who they are and see them in the flesh and blood.

**CARR:** The reason for this and you're absolutely right to point that out, this particular section has gone through a great deal of reworking and rewording. I know because I was complaining as

a language teacher about the placement of the restrictive only at one time and now it's been split into two sentences. They don't really link together very comfortably but that's a point worth revising. Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Herb?

**TERRY:** Actually I wanted to turn to that point in part. It creates a huge loop hole. The loop hole is not to hold the interviews on-campus and for senior folks we have interview not conducted on-campus. So I'm rather uncomfortable with this, I mean, it doesn't accomplish your purpose which is that once they become finalists we know who they are. So I think it's very badly written in that respect and quickly I want to ask two other questions. I think you've left something in line 104 which you intended to delete. I believe since you've reduced things only to interim appointments that you wanted or could have taken out the word acting in line 104; "urging appointing officers to minimize the use of interim appointments". That's one are and I'd like you to explain why you want to do that again. And finally I guess I'm asking, since given that we are headed for a presidential search...

**KNOST:** Let me respond to that; acting and interim are not the same term and the reason in part might be for other reasons including immigration status, an acting person may not be an interim person. Jeanne may have some comment on this as well but it is a different term.

**TERRY:** Can you do acting without search and screen?

**KNOST:** Yes.

**TERRY:** Then I think line 86 should say acting and interim appointments so it is consistent one way or the other. And then I'm wondering how line 37 applies to upcoming presidential search? President says he's the chief executive officer, CEO, of the Bloomington campus. Are we telling the trustees that that search committee must be majority of the faculty?

**CARR:** I'm sorry, I don't understand your question or I didn't hear it.

**TERRY:** You said that the trustees were concerned about the size and unwieldy nature of committees and all the constituencies they had to represent and so forth. I don't believe our last presidential search committee was composed of a majority of which was faculty, the president of the system. But line 37 says that if we're searching for a chief executive officer for a campus, a majority of the members have to be drawn from faculty. So we're saying that this next presidential search should have a majority members of the faculty?

**CARR:** That is correct.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**HAWKINS:** The important change that we made there though is that we added in on line 38 those faculty who do not hold administrative appointments because on the last committee we did have a majority of faculty but some were both faculty and administrators. So we clarified that.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** I recently was involved in, for the first time, a search and screen process. Ted, on the confidentiality section, I just want to express a concern that came from my reaction there that it seemed to me that the person who might be rated as the top candidate would in fact probably not have come if there hadn't been confidentiality associated with it. So I'm wondering if the committee considered at all where there might be any circumstances under which there might emergency exclusions of the non-confidentiality portion because I genuinely believe that best candidate would not have been drawn to the interviews.

**HAWKINS:** Actually what we are trying to do here is state this as the policy but we've left the opportunity back on line 14 and 15 for any variation. So in the exceptional case then the faculty governance body or bodies and from the Affirmative Action Officer can be consulted. So there is an opportunity for the exception but this is the standard of practice.

**WHEELER:** Thank you Barbara it's an important clarification.

**HAWKINS:** We have typically had the standard of practice and we didn't want to lose it.

**MCROBBIE:** There was someone with a comment, yes?

**JOHNSON:** On Line 93 and 97, it says that the interim appointment must not exceed a period of two years but then it says that a search committee must be appointed for a permanent replacement within 60 of the appointment of an interim. That seems like too long a time and if you've got someone appointed in an interim position for two years, to have a search committee start earlier than the year that's specified in number one under the guidelines for search and screen. It seems there's got to be a way to combine those two. If you're saying for an interim, you have to appoint a search committee for a permanent replacement within 60 days but if the period of appointment is two years...

**HAWKINS:** It should not exceed a period of two years and the search for the permanent position will take place right away.

**JOHNSON:** Even if it's two years?

**HAWKINS:** It said it will not exceed a period of two years.

**JOHNSON:** I know that but say the period is in a year...

**HAWKINS:** It will not exceed a period of two years and the search for the...

**JOHNSON:** But that's too early to do an appointment search.

**HAWKINS:** If you have an open position why would it be too early?

**JOHNSON:** Well, it's not really open if there is a stated interim appointment of two years.

**HAWKINS:** We didn't say stated interim, we said it won't exceed two years and we also said that the person who is in the interim appointment, this on line 96 and 97, can move into the permanent appointment by being part of the regular search and screen process that will start right away. So it's putting interim in a context of interim.

**JOHNSON:** But interim appointments are often made with a fixed link that it's going to be earlier if we find somebody, they're often for a period of time. The Libraries has one now.

**HAWKINS:** What we're recommending in this document is that it be no longer than two years.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill, yeah?

**WHEELER:** Would the exception you've reached in line 14 and 15, apply also then to the provisions of 95 to 97?

**HAWKINS:** It could. I think that the point that we are trying to make here on interim is that we want to put some boundaries around it and get on to the business of having a full-time appointee in there and so these are just some of those parameters.

**MCROBBIE:** I think you were next, Murray.

**MCGIBBON:** I've just got two small things on consistency and clarity in line 109 you talk about policy on search and screen capitalized and I would suggest that phrase in line 13 as well just doesn't read easily. The formal process referred to search and screen that's capitalized, that would be easier. Under guidelines for search and screen implementation, line 110, following you talk about the search committee, previously you talked about the search and screen committee, I just think they need to be consistent.

**HAWKINS:** We didn't have the luxury of time to edit our work but we will take your edits, thank you.

**MCGIBBON:** Friendly amendment.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes?

**PIEDMONT:** On line 47 on the top of the second change, this paragraph begins "To this end" and that refers to having students on the committee but this paragraph actually refers to students and staff bodies. So I request that "To this end" be deleted because I believe the intension is to involve relevant staff bodies in addition to students. That may just be editing oversight.

**HAWKINS:** I see.

**CARR:** It has been broken up too many times.

**HAWKINS:** Well it is a lack of editing because we added in this stronger language in terms of students and student life. So you're right, it does need to be consistent between those two points I believe.

**CARR:** Yes, the previous sentence was a late edition.

**MCROBBIE:** I recognized Bob on the first. Yes Bob?

**IVIE:** I had the same concern about the language that was written presuming the final interview would be on-campus and I wondered if that couldn't be clarified but my other point is that I was wondering if you could—regarding line 112 and 114, explain why if there's a change in the job description that's been written by the appointing officer, made by the search committee, whether that change might be discussed by the appropriate faculty governance bodies when previously the document refers to consulting with the leader of the appropriate faculty governance bodies and I was wondering why you didn't just use that same strategy in lines 112 to 113 and if the appointing officer writes the job description and the search committee wants to make a modification, why wouldn't they just consult the leader of that governance body rather than go back to the whole governance body. There must be logic there but I didn't see it.

**HAWKINS:** Well you know, there's actually an answer or an explanation in that we didn't word smith a lot of this very carefully. So that's a friendly amendment on editing consistency, I know nobody wants it to be like this down here.

**MCROBBIE:** Kevin?

**HUNT:** You didn't get to Bob's question about 67, 68 and 69. So I just wondered, and Herb I think mentioned this also, I think this all stages of the search and screen process shall remain confidential. So I find that problematical. But I wanted to ask, do I remember right that in the text before it said that the candidates who are finalists and you didn't...

**CARR:** Yes and that was the reason for this sentence which several of you were asking about, because the trustees asked in their memo "please define finalist and what you mean by finalist" and this is what we came up with. It was that last final group of people that were invited to come to campus and at that time the names would be released. Now, we're trying to make that specific and I see that we need a little bit more in this paragraph to lead on to it simply because the previous versions insisted upon confidentiality to encourage the application from people who were afraid to go public with that application. There are other reasons for confidentiality quite obviously but we had to get into this sense of when it would be known to the campus or the university.

**HUNT:** Maybe a solution, I'm sorry...

**HAWKINS:** Just an amendment to that, one of the problems we had in previous versions is that there was too much mixture of terms: candidates, finalists, applicants and so what we're trying to do is pair it down and simplify it and get rid of the multiple conflicting use. We tried to look at the process. We probably didn't put all of the specific details that we should have. We're looking

at the importance of confidentiality. The fact that during the search and screening process, prior to the people who will come and be considered the final candidates wherever they are being interviewed and selected, that there is a process in there that is confidential. That confidentiality in principle should end at the time that the committee advances names to the appointing officer and those people are asked “would you be willing to be interviewed at the final phase”, we considered it coming to campus “and if so, we will be making your name public”. And so they have a last chance to stay in or get out.

**HUNT:** Yes, it’s clear that that was the intention here on as you pointed out these words don’t exactly do that. Maybe it would be better to do something to sort of define what finalist is along the way to say “when the candidates are whittled down to the final few, who normally pay campus visits, then the names would be made public and that makes it clear that it’s down to the final few that it doesn’t leave the option of ignoring the fact that this is plural and bringing only one candidate to campus or two.

**HAWKINS:** Maybe some of the members of the previous search committee would comment because Julie and I felt that during that process, there were multiple times where we might be dealing with possible finalists. So what we wanted to do is be very specific. Those candidates who are at the very end, where at that case, the president was calling and saying we would like to bring you to campus.

**HUNT:** Would adding this phrase “whittled down to the final few who are expected to pay campus visits”, would that make it clear that that’s the final few that we’re talking about?

**HAWKINS:** I’m not sure I know why we had to say finalist versus candidates.

**MCROBBIE:** Let’s see here, this is going to take—we have another really important matter to get to, could you just make one quick comment. Let me suggest a way to wind this up after that.

**TERRY:** Would the language on or off-campus final interviews help?

**HAWKINS:** Yes, we could fix, I think we can fix them. The problem is that this is going to the UFC next week so we...

**TERRY:** This is an action item so the language will matter.

**HAWKINS:** ... so we’re just trying to get our input in there.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me make the final comment. The chances of getting the language exactly right to everybody’s satisfaction so that this can be voted on and approved strikes me as being impossible unless we just continue on the rest of the time and even then it’s probably going to be impossible. One way to proceed is to ask that, I guess the Agenda Committee through Ted, would take this forward, the general sense of these comments and try to incorporate them and to take that forward to the UFC from the BFC. It seems to me that is the only way we can proceed unless we just abandon the rest of the agenda and continue on to this. Does anybody object to

that? Do people think that the sense of some of the concerns is being voiced here? I'm sure Barbara and so on can take of that. Is that ok?

**T. MILLER:** It's clear that the issue in this confidentiality section—we need some new wording in the confidentiality section. I think we know what we want to say, it's just that we haven't quite gotten there yet.

**MCROBBIE:** Does it seem like this is roughly a direction the BFC wants to go and as I said take this forward as advisory to the UFC, is that agreeable? [End of Tape 1, Side B, some comments lost]...

**HAWKINS:** ... UFC so we would want the whole.

**DAVILA:** I would like to move that we expeditiously process this and move it on to University Faculty Council with the understanding that this is tentative and it can be properly worded in due time to meet our satisfaction.

**CARR:** Will it be done so by next Tuesday?

**HAWKINS:** Probably Kelly's already done it.

**DAVILA:** But I didn't mean immediately before...

**HAWKINS:** I just want, if there are any substantive issues. I mean I think we've gotten the substantive issues that need some real clarification and that was very helpful for us. We couldn't see the trees from the forest anymore. And if that's acceptable than a motion to do that would be appreciated.

**MCROBBIE:** Bob, yes?

**KRAVCHUK:** I just want to say there is a substantive issue we haven't discussed but we don't have time for it. The faculty majority. If you, well, in selecting a president if you put three chancellors, three vice presidents, three deans, you are already up to nine and the maximum is fifteen. By definition we will not have a faculty majority. Now unless the trustees define themselves as the appropriate governing body and suspend this then you could have nine trustees to the exclusion of all faculty to select the next president. I think we're going to see this again.

**HAWKINS:** I think Bob it's not that devastating. In that case you've got line 14 and 15.

**DAVILA:** And isn't this going to be aired at University Faculty Council and ultimately?

**KRAVCHUK:** If you want to kick it upstairs sure.

**HAWKINS:** But it's already there. It came back here. This is our shot to change what was up there.

**MCROBBIE:** As I said to try to avoid, unless Luis wants to continue with that motion, to try to avoid a motion that's going to be difficult to formulate anyway is it reasonable to take the sense of the meeting back that by and large the document with the kinds of comments that are being made captures the general sense of the meeting and that could be taken forward, as I said, as advisory to the UFC. It probably will go through one more iteration. Is that a reasonable way to proceed? Otherwise we're going to have no time to discuss general education?

**KRAVCHUK:** I'll second that.

**DAVILA:** I would abide by that. I think we need to move toward some resolution and then we can trust the trustees and others.

**MCROBBIE:** Is the motion just to basically move this forward to the UFC?

**DAVILA:** Yes. I think that's my sense.

**HAWKINS:** Michael, I think it's important for the Council to realize that what's at UFC right now is the prior U13 that was very disturbing. So that will get replaced with this as our input if the Council so supports, with the corrections that Kelly's probably already made.

**BINGHAM:** I think you've done a masterful job here and I'd like when we move it forward to have it move forward with some expression of support from the BFC and I'm not confident that the way we worded this reflects that.

**HAWKINS:** Worded what, this?

**BINGHAM:** The motion.

**WHEELER:** A friendly amendment? The BFC supports the direction that this revised version has gone and we'd like to move it forward. So we strongly support the direction this is going.

**DAVILA:** I would second that.

**MCROBBIE:** Without having a perfect copper-plate version of that motion in front of us do people have a good enough sense of what's being said I think to maybe vote on that without any further debate?

**IVIE:** Aren't we just going to vote—it's an action item—isn't this really just calling for the question for us to vote for what we now understand this policy to be .

**HAWKINS:** Yes, it is.

**MCROBBIE:** I think so.

**IVIE:** And that would give you the affirmation that you're talking about if it passes.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok let's take a vote on this. All those in favor please say aye [Aye] against? I think that's carried without dissent. Let's move on to general education with just over 15 minutes to go.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7: IUB STATEMENT ON GENERAL EDUCATION**

**WHEELER:** I would like to begin by asking Ted to make a few introductory comments.

**T. MILLER:** Well I would just try to emphasize what I think is the importance of this item. We have been trying, as many of you know, over a period of maybe ten years in Bloomington, to structure a campus-level general education program. We have failed on three or four notable occasions. And the Educational Policies Committee, however, has worked very hard on this and has produced a new proposal. It is a fairly general proposal. It is a discussion draft. It's meant to be an interim statement; it is not meant to be the final thing. It's an interim statement. And Bill and John will describe the details of it.

I would just point out to you that one of the really significant changes in this document as it stands right now is that this document contemplates that the general education program for Bloomington will be approved by the campus faculty. Right? It will not be approved by each individual unit faculty. Prior to this all of our efforts have focused on trying to persuade individual unit faculties to vote to approve a common program. This proposal is based on a somewhat different view of the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty which basically says that the Bloomington Faculty has the authority to do this. I think that's a very important point to keep in mind as we go forward here.

**WHEELER:** I'd like to ask my co-chair to give a minute introduction.

**CARINI:** Well alright, so I thought I would be the follow-up person. I just wanted to say that when we started this process maybe a month ago I actually didn't think it was possible to be here today with a draft. But I think if nothing more this shows that it is possible to get a campus-wide general education policy. You can do it without disrupting everybody's major. We can agree on the categories that at least should be included in the general education, maybe not all of them at the moment. We can have fairly good transferability of general education courses that a student can take from one school to another. We can simplify our incoming students' lives and give some relief to the University Division and finally we can certainly get a better plan than this but probably not this year.

**WHEELER:** I think those are two excellent introductions and the floor is open for your discussion.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you, Bill. Masterfully brief.

**T. MILLER:** I would simply focus your attention on the two parts of this proposal that are clearly the most controversial. They are on Page 2 of the document under Technicalities and Supplementary Provisions. Technicality #1 is one that you should focus your attention on. And Technicality #5 is one that you should focus your attention on. These, I think, are, and really the

interplay between these two things, is clearly I think one of the key areas where the discussion will focus, or should focus in my opinion.

**WHEELER:** Other discussion?

**MCROBBIE:** Other discussion? Kevin?

**BROWN:** This is just a point of order because I'm not a member of the Council so I'm not sure if I'm allowed to speak.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, go ahead.

**BROWN:** The only reason I'm here is that I happen to run into Bill yesterday and he informed me that this was coming in front of the Council and Edwardo Rhodes, Charlie Nelms, and I had met with the leaders of the committee and at least I want to, at least raise an issue because we haven't had time to really look at this draft. This is actually the first time I've seen it but one of the things that we talked about was kind of a recognition that given the fact that American society is fundamentally changing, it certainly has over the last ten years, and that the percentage of Black, Latino, Native American, Asians, in the US is growing and will continue to grow I think we were raising an issue about the possibility of having a separate sort of American ethnic studies requirement that would include the under-represented diverse cultures, Asian, and women's studies as one potential requirement that students would have to take. So I just want to raise that in kind of a friendly way because I am a little concerned that that kind of language didn't get in here.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me stress, Kevin that this is not for voting today. This is the first reading so it's just for discussion.

**T. MILLER:** Could I also say something about that? The purpose of this document generally, you'll note the title please Interim Statement on General Education. If we approve this at our next meeting we will approve an interim statement on general education. The idea of this statement is basically to get the sense of the Council that a general education program for the Bloomington campus is something that we want to pursue. There's a description of such a program in this document but the vote on this particular proposal will not put this particular description into place as the campus general education program. The idea of this is to somehow get a sense of the feeling of the faculty about whether we should indeed go forward with this. The details of this proposal are to be studied further, to be developed further. Some of the things that are in here now may disappear. Things that are not in here now will perhaps appear. We have another proposal from HPER I believe for another category that they think is important. So this kind of stuff is going to happen as we go forward into the next year. But right now what we're trying to do, after this rather lengthy history of failure, we are trying to get a sense of whether the Bloomington campus is actually ready to do something like this.

**BROWN:** Ted, I don't want to stop this because I agree. I believe it's high time that we have this kind of requirement. So I don't want to prevent that from going forward at all.

**T. MILLER:** I think we hear what you're saying, Kevin.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes?

**TERRY:** I've been around this issue for most of the 31 years I've been here and I've said for a long time that we would only have a general education requirement if the president imposed it. I want to applaud you for finding a way in which the faculty can impose it. As I understand the policy which is consistent with what Ted is saying, that we can bring back amendments. We get another shot at it as well as the Bloomington faculty, as I read the last three lines on the first page. When this comes back it needs to be approved, not only by the Bloomington faculty, but also by the Bloomington Faculty Council. So that we will have another shot to nit-pick it to death if we wish to do so. But hopefully instead of doing that we will participate in the EPCs deliberations over this within the framework, that we have bitten the bullet and decided we are going to have a general education plan. And I support that.

**MCCORMICK:** Could you talk a little bit about the seven categories were actually decided upon? Where do these seven elements on the top of page two come from?

**WHEELER:** Thank you. So the goal this time, well to begin with, one of the reasons it's difficult to find a general education program is because W131 is the only course which is common to all the degree requirements of all the baccalaureate degrees on this campus. And so the goal in this effort was to try to begin with that very small, single course, and to expand it to find the largest coherent set of agreements on which we could all agree. And to begin in that direction we started with the paper that David Nordloh had written for the Campus Curriculum Committee called "General Education for the Bloomington Campus: Coherence and Distinctions". We then met with, we formed a drafting committee consisting of David, Bob Ivie, John, and myself we met with Vice President Gros Louis and he gave us the first version of the chart that you see on page three.

And so we took, we began with David's draft, we began with the chart and our discussions with Gros Louis and then we studied all of the degree requirements of all the baccalaureate degrees on this campus and from that we tried to move to a coherent set of requirements which was as large as it could possibly be. In that regard, items #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are fairly straightforward. #1 and #2—all degrees on campus do have something about English and they have something about mathematics. For the most part all have something about arts and humanities, something about social and historical—although not necessarily with those titles—and something about natural sciences. We began to see a variance between degrees when you get to item #6 World Languages and Cultures. In the College you have both World Languages and Cultures, in Music Performance or Vocal Performance you have world language, in some other schools you will have culture but not foreign language. We have a number of programs which feel that overseas studies are very important. And so there is a coherency between that group of things—foreign language, cultural diversity studies, and overseas studies—there is a coherence among all those things.

In response to our meeting with Kevin and Vice President Nelms and Edwardo Rhodes the earlier version had simply said two cultural diversity courses and in response to their concerns

we then followed the language from the College of Arts and Sciences by saying that two cultural diversity courses, at least one of which focuses on one more cultures other than the dominant cultures of the United States and modern Western Europe. That is the phrasing that appears in the College's current requirements. And to restrict it down from that to something closer to what Kevin is proposing requires massive changes in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Then there remained a further group of things that are not common, any one of them common to all of the degrees but all of which occur in large segments of the campus, and that's this item #7 where there are these several different things. In a number of schools there is a considerable emphasis on internships, service learning, or civic engagement. In other schools there is a considerable emphasis on research or research methodologies or creative activity type of items. And then the third item there which actually allows it to stand as a requirement that we could do across campus is based upon the comments from outside the university that your general education program should reflect both your students and also the unique aspects of your campus. We have seen that type of thing in an earlier proposal. One of the things that is truly unique about our campus is we have an outstanding array of professional schools. We have top ranked professional schools in education, business, music, SPEA—it's really remarkable if you look at our professional schools they are almost, they are all outstanding.

It is the case if you read the footnotes that in this item #7 Professional Engagement is not necessarily the right description of it but this a thing that touches on something that's important to almost all segments. If you drop any one of the disjunctions—this does have a disjunctive aspect to it. And you can't drop any one of them without dropping the entire requirement.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks. Bob?

**IVIE:** I, to sort of respond to that, Bill and John, one way to conceptualize what they have done is that they have consulted very intensely across a wide array and they have been in search of the essence of consensus and I think in a way they've expressed as sufficiently as it possibly can. While I agree a lot with what Ted said I'd like to put the emphasis on a slightly different syllable. I think what they have here is a document that if we can ultimately vote for it we can give a presumption to something here that will provide us with the kind of momentum on which we can build this curriculum that we've found so difficult to find a common agreement on. They have achieved something incredibly remarkable here. So if we do vote on it—and I hope we do—in favor of it the next time it comes up I would say that it goes forward with the possibility of continued tinkering and refinement and development but with a very strong presumption.

**DAVILA:** I think, myself, very heartily agree with your cautionary remark and suggestion for the future. I work in ethnic studies myself with world cultures and languages and I feel that we have fine-tuned this to a degree where it is not precarious at all for the next two years and we have an umbrella of coverage and a safeguard in terms of making it interim. So I fully agree with your sentiments and yet I much would like to agree with what Bob Ivie has suggested that we move forward this now.

**MCROBBIE:** I think we can take maybe two more brief questions and comments. Yes?

**OCHOA:** This is more a procedural question as a representative from the School of Education. I have already, or we have already started to get some concerns voiced to us. If this is in fact the first reading what mechanism outside of the Oncourse site you have set up is there for anyone within any unit to express concerns or provide us with information, either to support it or counter it. How many more readings are we going to have?

**WHEELER:** Well the first thing you should do is go to your associate dean, go to Diana Lambdin and to Peter Kloosterman. We will be making the rounds discussing with them all again. Diana Lambdin is a member of the Educational Policies Committee and we have been consulting with them. In this next round there may be a need for limited exceptions for students in particular schools—in the School of Music we have several exceptions we need to consider for vocal performance and things of that nature. In the School of Education we also have a fairly short list of possible exceptions that are needed for elementary education and so you should go to...if you look on the website and you click on the one that says References and then Origins you will see a list of all of the associate deans and directors of undergraduate studies with whom we've consulted. You will find in your school the appropriate party. Take your concerns directly there and then they will come to us. Or you can put them on the website or you can contact us by email. But I would say the most certain thing to get your interest heard is to go to your associate dean.

**MCROBBIE:** I think we're done. It's 5:30. Ted wants to say one thing.

**T. MILLER:** I will simply call your attention to Circular B36-2006 which is in your packet. We didn't get to this today. It will be on the agenda next time. It pertains to the changes in the Faculty Constitution and the BFC Bylaws surrounding the fact that we no longer have a chancellor. We now have a president, we have a provost and we're trying to distribute the duties of the president and provost across the previous duties of the chancellor. It's all written out there. Please look it over and we'll discuss it next time.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you Bill and thank you John for your heroic labors.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.