

**Minutes of the  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
September 20, 2005  
Ballantine Hall 008  
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:** LTC Lori Bass, Julie Bobay, Katy Borner, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Jorge Chapa, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Sandra Dolby, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliot, Emily Fairchild, Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, David MacKay, Joss Marsh, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Joseph Near, Theresa Ochoa, John Odland, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Sara Pryor, Aarti Ramaswami, Richard Rubinger, Jodi Shepherd, Alex Shortle, Eugene R. Kintgen, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams, Eric Zeemering.

**Members Absent with Alternates Present:** Michael Hamburger for Jeanne Sept, Ann Gellis for Sarita Soni

**Members Absent:** Lisa Bingham, Richard Carr, William Hetrick, Susan Jones, Robert Kravchuk, William Leckey, Gerald Marker, Terrence Mason, Lisa Pratt, Amy Reynolds, Jerrold Stern, Cara Wellman,

**Visitors Present:** John Graves (Faculty Council Office), Steve Hinnefeld (Herald-Times), Herb Terry (Telecommunications; Co-Chair Budgetary Affairs Committee), Alan Bender (Biology), Don Hossler (Education), Roland Cote (Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services), Edwardo Rhodes (Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Diversity)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

September 6, 2005

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/09.06.05.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions (5 minutes)

Professor Emeritus Merrill J. Allen

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B7-2006.htm>

Professor Emeritus Carleton T. Hodge

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B6-2006.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Theodore Miller)

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor Theodore Miller)
6. Report from the Chancellor's Enrollment Committee (30 minutes)  
(Professor Don Hossler and Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services Roland Cote)
7. Policy on Undergraduate Admissions (30 minutes)  
(Professors William Wheeler and John Carini, Co-Chairs, Educational Policies Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B8-2006.pdf>
8. Resolution: Upgrading the Flagship (15 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller, Agenda Committee)
9. Standing Committee Updates
10. Old Business
11. New Business

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

**GROS LOUIS:** The first item on the agenda is the approval from the first meeting which was September 6. Are there any changes to those minutes or comments? If not I'll assume they'll be approved as distributed.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS**

**GROS LOUIS:** The next item, two memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus Merrill Allen and Professor Emeritus Carlton T. Hodge and Jeanne Sept is in Spain so the resolutions will be summarized by Associate Dean Michael Hamburger.

**HAMBURGER:** Thank you. We have these two memorial resolutions. First, Merrill J. Allen. Professor Emeritus of Optometry Merrill James Allen passed away December 28, 2003 in Bloomington. He had a long and distinguished career on the Indiana University Optometry faculty, joining it when the first professional optometry students were enrolled in 1953 and retiring in 1987. Merrill Allen was born August 2, 1918.

He was educated at the University of Texas and The Ohio State University. He received his optometry degree from Ohio State in 1941 and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in physiological optics from Ohio State in 1942 and 1949, respectively. During World War II, he worked for the National Defense Research Council then as a physicist at the Frankfort Arsenal in Philadelphia, and as a commissioned U.S. Naval Reserve officer at the West Coast Rocket Training Command in El Centro, California. Allen completed his dissertation research at The Ohio State University under the guidance of renowned vision scientist Glenn A. Fry. Allen was an assistant professor

at Ohio State from 1949 to 1953. In 1953 Allen was one of two faculty members hired by Division of Optometry Director Henry Hofstetter to start the optometry program at Indiana University.

Over his career at IU, Allen taught courses in physiological optics, vision science, clinical optometry, binocular vision, and vision therapy. He designed and built many pieces of laboratory teaching equipment. In the optometry clinic, he supervised patient encounters in the vision therapy specialty clinic. Allen published more than 200 research papers, over a wide range of topics in vision science. Early in his career many of his publications were in the area of ocular accommodation and binocular visual function. He designed a number of devices for remediation of binocular vision disorders. Many former students and faculty can tell stories of Allen's tinkering on various gadgets, tinkering which led to five patents.

Allen initiated his noted research on motorist's vision in the early 1960s. His studies primarily looked at the many factors affecting visibility during the operation of an automobile. He published a book entitled "Vision and Highway Safety" in 1970. The book was revised and updated by Allen and three co-authors and published under the title "Forensic Aspects of Vision and Highway Safety" in 2001.

In addition to his research and writing on motorist's vision, Allen often served as an expert witness on visual factors in auto accidents in court cases. His research and testimony have been responsible for various improvements in motor vehicle and roadway design. His work led to the highly placed brake lights in automobiles today and an increase in the brightness of lights on railroad crossings. In the Foreword to the 2001 Allen et al. book, Ralph Nader stated, "Professor Merrill Allen has been in the forefront of technical and policy concern over the visual environment provided by the contemporary motor vehicle. His findings have stimulated legislative, motor vehicle manufacturer, and repair and maintenance action."

Merrill Allen was a Fellow of the American Academy of Optometry, a Fellow of the College of Optometrists in Vision Development, and a Diplomate of the Binocular Vision, Perception, and Pediatric Optometry section of the American Academy of Optometry. He received a number of recognitions, among them being the Distinguished Optometrist Award from the Iowa Optometric Association, the Distinguished Service Award from the Indiana Optometric Association, the Research Medal of the British Optical Association, the American Optometric Association Apollo Award, and the Indiana Public Health Foundation Tony and Mary Hulman Health Achievement Award in Environmental Health.

We also remember Professor Emeritus Carlton T. Hodge. Carleton Hodge, Professor Emeritus of Linguistics and Anthropology at Indiana University, passed away at his home in Bloomington on September 8, 1998. He was an unpretentious individual who was warmly appreciated for his sincerity and his wit. He was survived by his wife, Pat (Sutcliffe) Hodge, and four children, daughter Nina, and sons Philip, Nicholas and Charles, and two grandchildren.

Hodge was born in Springfield, Illinois, and received his B.A. in 1939 from DePauw University. He did his graduate work in linguistics, near eastern studies and Ancient Egyptian at the University of Pennsylvania. From 1946 to 1963, Hodge worked for the Foreign Service Institute,

where he supervised courses in foreign language training and prepared pedagogical materials on languages as varied as Serbo-Croatian, Greek, Bulgarian, Persian and Hausa.

After a visiting appointment at Brandeis in 1963-64, Hodge took up a tenured position at Indiana University in 1964. At IU, Hodge taught linguistics and helped to found both the Department of Linguistics and the African Studies Program, in both of which he was one of the original members. Drawing on his breadth of knowledge about the languages of the world, Hodge was director of the Intensive Language Training Center until 1968. He supervised development of teaching materials for Susu, Temne, Tunisian Arabic, Moroccan Arabic and Dyula. From 1969 to 1972 he served as Associate Chairman of the Research Center for the Language Sciences. He subsequently went on to fulltime teaching of linguistics, holding a joint appointment in Linguistics and Anthropology. In this period, Hodge directed dissertations not only on African languages but also on numerous Asian languages.

As an Africanist, the focus of Hodge's linguistic work was the analysis of Hausa and Ancient Egyptian. He is best known in the field, however, as a comparative-historical linguist. Much of his lifelong research program was concerned with the classification and reconstruction of the language phylum that includes Semitic, Chadic, Ancient Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic. He also devoted his extensive energy and knowledge to the problem of establishing an even larger grouping of Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European into a linguistic super-phylum.

Hodge remained extremely active and productive as a scholar during the 15 years following his retirement in 1983. During this time, he attended numerous linguistic meetings and produced a steady stream of articles and book reviews.

His major hobby was the collection of a very large and impressive library that included many historical and rare volumes. Hodge was a member of the Linguistic Society of America, the American Oriental Society and the Linguistic Society of India. In Bloomington, he was a member of St. Mark's United Methodist Church and was active as a lay member of Methodist ministry throughout his life. He also served as a volunteer at the Monroe County Public Library, the American Red Cross and Opportunity House.

Carleton's cheerful nature and dedication to academic achievement are missed by his many colleagues and friends throughout the world. His many practical contributions in the form of teaching materials plus important basic research contributions on the grammar and historical relationships of the languages of Africa, Europe and Asia, remain as significant legacies to his life's work.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you. Will members of the Council and guests please stand for a moment of silence for these two colleagues? Thank you.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**GROS LOUIS:** We move to item 3 which is the Agenda Committee business.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much Ken. Let me begin today by welcoming Gene Kintgen who is

joining us. Gene is taking the spot that John Slattery held on the Council and I hesitate to say exactly what your title is now Gene but so far as to say that he is a high official of the Graduate School. So we welcome you, Gene, and we're very happy to have you with us.

One week from today, the first meeting of the University Faculty Council for the year will occur. This will be a meeting in Bloomington. One of the issues that will be on the rather brief agenda of that meeting will have to do with the Mission Differentiation Project. There will be some discussion of a mission statement for Indiana University. You'll recall that during the course of this project, each campus developed a mission statement and those have all been approved by their respective councils and they have been reviewed by various groups. But there now is going to be an effort to develop a mission statement for Indiana University as the one university, I guess. So you may want to pay some attention to that.

A related matter has to do with the Bloomington mission statement. Some of you know and others of you should know that the Bloomington mission statement has come under substantial attack for proclaiming Bloomington to be the flagship campus of Indiana University. There are those of our colleagues who do not appreciate our proclamation and this is something that seems to come up in every discussion that I have now heard of this general project. People are complaining, primarily people from Indianapolis, complaining about Bloomington as the flagship campus. So this something as you may hear more of as we go along.

The main business of the UFC meeting next week will be the state of the university address by President Herbert and I would encourage all of you who have an opportunity to come by the union, at the Frangipani Room is the location of the UFC meeting and of the speech and I think the speech is scheduled to start at about 3p.m. So please if you can manage to do that you'd be very welcome to come and listen to the President in terms of what he's going to say.

The second item that I would like to say just a few words about is the Chancellor's search process. As you know, or at least I presume you know, the interviews of candidates have commenced. There was a newspaper article announcing the identity of one of the candidates a few days ago. There is a good bit of confidentiality surrounding this search. I just wanted to report to you that the members of the BFC Agenda Committee are meeting with these candidates for a period of time and we are on the schedule of people who are interviewing these candidates. So if you are wondering whether there are any faculty members who are interviewing these candidates I just wanted you to know that at least your elected representatives are involved in these interviews.

The third item has to do with our next meeting. This will be on October 4<sup>th</sup>, is that correct, October 4<sup>th</sup>. That is a meeting when President Herbert will be, I guess we called him our guest at that time. He's planning to spend the entire two-hour period with us and he's coming to... I presume he'll have some things to say but he's also expecting to hear comments, hear questions, respond to questions and so I encourage you to give some thought to that event and what you would like to say and what you would like to ask him. It's something that we don't have numerous opportunities to do something like this and so we should take full advantage of this one.

Now, with regard to today's agenda: the topics on this agenda are related to each other. We have a report from the Chancellor's Enrollment Committee, we have a draft policy on undergraduate admissions and then we have a resolution titled "Upgrading the Flagship." Now, this resolution is something that the Agenda Committee has been working on over the last period of time; a week, a week and a half. Although, it really picked up recently and we've been going back and forth and as a result of this we really haven't been able to distribute this resolution to you until right now. It is in your pile. I think it is probably the bottom document in your pile, "Upgrading the Flagship." I think it should be there now Bill. No?

**KISH:** We just didn't give it to Bill. [Laughter]

**MILLER:** Oh yes, okay. It's for his own good. Anyway, given that we haven't really been able to distribute this in time for you to actually have some time to sit and read it, I thought at this... in the Agenda Committee business I might just try to orient you to this document so that you can think about it a little bit as we kind of go through the rest of our agenda and then when we come to the point of discussion of this perhaps we'll be able to do something useful.

I've been in Bloomington for many years and one of the things that I believe is true is that the faculty of this campus have for a long time felt that what we call here in this document "the undergraduate profile" is really not what it could be or what it should be given that Bloomington is a very good university with a very good faculty. We have all seen, I think, the articles in the newspaper recently which suggest that there is a kind of a struggle going on. A struggle between the Trustees on the one hand, the university administration, the campus administration on the other, over where Bloomington is going in terms of its undergraduate student quality and the purpose of this resolution is to try to put the faculty into the middle of this debate, if you will. We would like to be significant contributors to charting the direction that this campus is going to take in this regard. And that's really what this resolution is about.

It basically says in the first couple of paragraphs that we think we have a problem. In the third paragraph there is discussion of the Chancellor's Enrollment Committee that has made some recommendations in terms of how far it thinks we should go to address these problems. The Agenda Committee here is basically saying that we are not at all convinced that the objectives stated in that committee's report go far enough. We specify here what we think we should try to accomplish over a fairly long period of time. So that's what paragraph three is about.

Paragraph 4 talks a little bit about how this is going to be done. The Chancellor's Enrollment Committee sees financial aid as being a primary mechanism to try to elevate the quality of the undergraduate student body in Bloomington and we are fine with that although we are not really convinced that there is going to be enough money, really, to do what we would like to do and therefore we have a recommendation for a strategy that involved basically reducing the size of the freshman group and then also increasing the number of transfer students that come to Bloomington, basically to sort of balance the budget if you will that would need to be balanced if we reduced the number of freshmen. We saw last year what happens when we don't have enough freshmen, when we don't have as many freshmen as we think we need; and if we reduce the number of freshmen, clearly we would have to do something to balance this. So we're suggesting that a transfer student strategy will at least be something that could be pursued. We all know that

transfer students do come to Bloomington, but it is also I think true that the Bloomington campus has really never tried in any serious way to recruit transfer students. Our focus has historically been on the freshmen incoming group and if transfer students come, that's fine, they've been welcomed. So our idea here is that this freshmen class size, this transfer student strategy is really kind of a compliment to the financial aid strategy that might help us meet a goal of raising the undergraduate profile. So that's what the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph is about.

And then the 5<sup>th</sup> one in bold down at the bottom is just kind of general resolution which basically says that the faculty is interested in pursuing a project along these lines and we are encouraging the administration of the university to do things that will help us achieve the goal that we want.

So, that's the overall structure of this document and later in the agenda we'll have a chance to talk in more detail about it perhaps. That's my report Ken.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**GROS LOUIS:** I would just like to mention that the academic deans, because of the size of the student body, the undergraduate student body, is larger than we had budgeted for, there is excess income and the academic deans have agreed to use a substantial portion of that income to recruit high ability Indiana residents to come to Bloomington in fall of '06. They also at a meeting this morning agreed to, for the first time ever really, to try over the next 12 to 18 months an aggressive recruiting of international students. We've never actively recruited them. We've been very responsive in the admissions office. Patrick O'Meara pays for two admissions individuals who work solely with international students, both undergraduate and graduate, and we've taken some steps. But the enrollment of international students has declined, in part because of the difficulties international students have getting visas and in part because Great Britain and Australia have become very aggressive in their recruitment of especially students from Asia. So essentially, and some European countries too, essentially taking advantage of the fact that they know how difficult it is for some students to get visas, they picked up their recruiting significantly. So the deans agreed to hire an individual who will focus solely on international admissions and also to pay for, and this is very expensive, to pay for admissions individuals to go to various countries on...those countries where we've had success getting students. It's an expensive proposition but as the deans discussed this morning, either we're a globalized campus or we're not and if we don't become more aggressive in recruiting more international students, the decline we've seen over the last several years will simply continue for the reasons I've mentioned. So they have agreed to work on this at least for the next 12 to 18 months and see what the outcome is. But much of the large amount is going to go towards recruiting high achieving Indiana residents, adding to the amount that we already have. So I think it's very wise of the deans but also the alternative would have been for the deans to divvy up the money. I think it's an indication of their concern for the several things that Ted talked about but also for the international admissions that they are willing not to take the money but to use it for these other purposes instead. It runs counter, I think, to what some people believe is true of RCM and that the deans have seen this on other occasions, will spend their money on common goods if they are

persuaded those common goods are a benefit either to the faculty or to the students or to the campus. So, that's my comment.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

**GROS LOUIS:** I've received no questions in advance; I don't think Ted did. So the floor is open for any questions or comments and I know that Kevin Hunt has one.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Ken. Ken, when I chaired the College of Arts and Sciences College Policy Committee, when we went to a paperless registration and paperless schedule of classes and eliminated the paper copy, we had more comments on that than any other issue in the year that had a lot of contiguous issues and none of them were really very positive. We were given the understanding that the advantage of the paperless, of the electronic version only, without a paper version of the schedule of classes, was that first you get rid of all the printing costs. So, that's a substantial saving. And the paper version of the schedule of classes is obsolete by the time the ink is dry on it because things change so rapidly. But acknowledging those arguments against the paper schedule of classes, faculty felt that the electronic version was clumsy and awkward to use. It wasn't very good for advising and it's not very browsable compared to a paper copy and it's not very portable. It ties you to a computer while you're doing advising. This issue of the disadvantages of the electronic version must continue because just, I don't know if saw in the College Policy Committee minutes just a week ago, there have been further complaints about the lack of a paper copy of the schedule of classes. And in the minutes someone pointed out that to browse all the offerings in Biology, it required opening 53 separate pages, web pages, in order to look at all the offerings and so that clumsiness and awkwardness is something that many faculty feel is a disadvantage to having done away with the paper copy.

When the Policy Committee considered all these complaints well over a year ago, when we suggested four ways to maybe reduce or offset some of the cost for the paper copy, one things like advertising, or printing it in a cheaper format like a tabloid format or printing it as a special copy, special issue, of the IDS or selling it for just a small amount at the bookstore. And we thought all these things might be a better solution than doing away with the paper copy altogether. And so I do have questions; I have several questions. First is, has there been a thorough examination of what the savings were once the paper schedules were eliminated? And second, was there any procedure put in place to measure the impact of eliminating the paper schedule, that is, have we tried to assess the satisfaction of students and faculty and staff with the new electronic schedule? And third, were the alternatives to ceasing the paper publication of the schedule considered and if so why were the paper schedule of classes deemed to be impractical?

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you. Kevin was thoughtful enough to share this with me in advance so I forwarded it to Roland Cote who is the Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services and he indicated that he would be able to provide a fuller answer between now and the next meeting although I don't know if at the next meeting we'll be able to do that with the President here. It might be the meeting after that. But anyway, he will get an answer back to you, to all of you.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Ken.

**GROS LOUIS:** As I mentioned to Kevin before, too, at the Agenda Committee meeting, it's interesting to me that the complaints that came to me came primarily from the director of the Wells Scholars Program, Tim Londergan, and the dean of the Hutton Honors College, Karen Hanson, whose students were very disappointed not to have the paper copy because they felt that whenever they got the schedule of classes it was like getting a Christmas present and they enjoyed going through all of the offerings that were available on the Bloomington campus and this is very difficult to do obviously if its on the web and maybe the other students feel the same way. Obviously I don't know but certainly those students really enjoy going through the offer. Alex, have you heard anything about this issue?

**SHORTLE:** I haven't, to be honest I didn't recognize that we didn't have the paper copies of the schedule of classes. I wasn't aware of the change last year, I didn't sit in on these meetings but I will be looking into it because that is some concern because I just realized right now how difficult it is to look through classes. I know there has been some concern from many students but I couldn't pin point a reason why and this might be the reason why.

**GROS LOUIS:** We'll have the answer at a subsequent meeting. It may not be the 4<sup>th</sup> because the President will be here but it may be the one after that. Any other questions or comments, Bill?

**WHEELER:** Just one observation listening to Ted; I look forward to discussing this resolution but I'm reminded that at least during the Second World War that at least three flagships were sunk.

**GROS LOUIS:** As I mentioned at the Trustee retreat when several of the Trustees indicated that they were uncertain about the flagship word, Charles Bantz, Chancellor of IUPUI, points out to me that the flagship is always the first ship to be sunk and that the commander of the flagship is the first person to be killed. [Laughter]

**BRADLEY:** Well, that's because they weren't upgraded. [Laughter]

**GROS LOUIS:** I think Charles indicated that in a friendly manner. Any other comments or questions? If not then we'll move... yes, I'm sorry.

**PIEDMONT:** Just as a reaction to the comments regarding the lack of a paper printed schedule of classes, and you may be aware of this, but the same format that we used to have printed is available as a PDF from the Registrar web site and it's very easy to navigate I find when talking with students.

**GROS LOUIS:** Did you hear that comment?

**HUNT:** Yes, yes I knew that. One of the things that I find with students is their way of coping is to just print out the schedule of classes. So I don't know if any of you visit the computer clusters very often, but at the beginning of the semesters there's always a bunch of chunks of... when people accidentally print out, it's very difficult to print out part of it and so people print out the whole darn thing and so I think that the idea of reducing cost by not having this newsprint version of paper schedule is sort of a false economy because students end up printing it out on

high grade paper on laser printers. And often they print it out accidentally and don't even pick things up. I got faculty comments that they often print it out just for the purpose of advising. But it was much more convenient when both the advisor and the advisee were looking at exactly the same thing and you could say "look down 3 lines below that and you'll see something else." Whereas when you've each printed out your own copy you're left shuffling through papers trying to find a point of reference.

**GROS LOUIS:** Other comments or questions, on this or any other topic?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6: REPORT FROM THE CHANCELLOR'S ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE**

**GROS LOUIS:** Okay, if not then we move to the next item on the agenda which as Ted indicated is a report from the Chancellor's Enrollment Committee. Don Hossler, as you know was the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services and Roland Cote is here as the Interim Vice Chancellor.

**HOSSLER:** Can you hear me in the back okay, do I need the mic? At the risk of repeating a bad joke twice, when I agreed earlier late this spring, to agree to kind of serve and help out in the background at least through October on the condition that I won't have to make presentations to deans or faculty meetings, and I had to make a presentations to the deans this mornings and now I have to make a presentation to faculty this afternoon, so much for my tough stance.

What I'm going to do is give you just an overview of the Chancellor's Enrollment Committee plan. It's a plan that Ken gave to this committee about a year ago. Ken?

**GROS LOUIS:** Year ago, May.

**HOSSLER:** About a year ago and on that committee, it is comprised of Neil Theobald, Doug Priest, Herb Terry, Bill Wheeler, Swamy, Dave Gallahue, Edwardo Rhodes and Ray Smith, and myself. I've been chairing that committee and it's really a committee that was about four years in the making. I first started to recommend the creation of a group like this probably four years ago and through the transition of Chancellor Brehm and Ken it just took a while to get up and going. So we've been meeting for about a year and we've produced a set of recommendations. It's a five-year plan, an attempt to address a number of issues related to enrollment on the Bloomington campus. One of them, and in many ways and the one that precipitated the creation of the committee, was the issue of quality. I'm just going to go over the high points on this plan and really try to convey the kind of tensions that we dealt with on the committee that I think campus administrators and I think ultimately faculty have to deal with in looking at these issues. It's a bit of juggling act.

We want to increase quality, there's always an emphasis to increase diversity. Increasingly, there's an emphasis on increasing access. Access meaning as our prices rise, our tuition price increases, access refers to making sure that low and moderate income Hoosiers can afford to attend the Bloomington campus; and if you read the Chronicle you know that Chapel Hill, University of Virginia, University of Illinois, they are all variations of plans, University of

Nebraska, have all enacted plans to assure sufficient financial aid, to assure access to low and moderate income students of those states.

To increase our rankings; I think in some respects much of the push, not all, but certainly much of the push is... U.S. news has really taken, I think, on a life of its own in terms of making something that I think is far more intangible than tangible, it has given it the appearance of being tangible. You can look up on the chart and immediately know exactly how good every institution is at country at the undergraduate level even though unlike rankings at the graduate level, whether or not faculty that are highly regarded actually teach any of the classes that undergraduates take is irrelevant. We all know that it's very relative at the graduate level, it's irrelevant at the undergraduate level and yet, as I just repeat, U.S. News has taken something that I think is quite intangible and turned it into a tangible product to be sold, and that drives a lot of behaviors. I'm not suggesting that they are not real, they are very very real in terms of some of its consequences for students' decisions and I've even seen state governing groups, the leaders of the state government groups propose that states should begin to allocate state appropriations on the basis of the rankings of the individual state institutions according to U.S. News. I mean, that's the kind of impact that U.S. News has started to have and so we simply can't ignore the rankings.

And also, not least of which, is to maintain a revenue stream from undergraduate enrollments to support the academic programs. As much as we might like, we can't simultaneously try to optimize on every one of those goals. The Bloomington campus is not a well endowed institution and so every one of those goals to some extent competes with the other in terms of jockeying for resources to achieve those goals. If we choose to only emphasize one of those goals, there should be no mistake about it, if we're going to only focus on one of those, it will come at the expense of the others. Thus we have to satisfy, so on a range of goals, have realistic long range plans but be flexible and adjust the plan as both the internal and external environments change, because both will change. Anything from the decision by the state to increase its appropriation to us, to a Trustees decision to increase tuition or to not increase tuition or to push in some of these other directions or what our competitors do, can all affect this goal. So it's really important that it not become kind of cast in bronze and... and here's the plan and we're going to do exactly what it says in the next five years or beyond that and achieve what we want to achieve.

Let me just share a few of the tensions that we all have to keep in mind. There are a finite number of top students in this state. Everyone is recruiting them. One of the things I often think of that I describe as structural issue for any state, but for states like Indiana-- any place where you have a relatively... let's say any state where there is not a large population base and you have two public flagships, you're going to have an increased level of competition. I think it's no accident that except for the University of Michigan and Michigan State-- The University of Michigan is a real outlier here because University of Michigan is the only public university in the country that has a much larger degree of control over its state appropriation because they have their own control over the rates they charge. So the University of Michigan is really an outlier in this. It's no accident that in the Big Ten for example and the Pac Ten-- I'm leaving out the University of California because there is a demography of California and the structure of the University of California system makes it unlike any other, it's really a universe unto itself in terms of what the higher education scene is like in California.

So my point is simply that Indiana, Iowa, Colorado, Arizona, you go across the states; it's no accident that in states that do not have heavy population bases and have two public flagships that those institutions uniformly tend to be somewhat less selective than the public flagships in states that are densely populated like Illinois with one public flagship. So we need to keep those structural issues in mind as we get realistic, as we try to identify our goals and what is achievable.

Coming back to this point, there are a finite number of top students in this state. Everybody is recruiting them and the institutions that compete for them in most cases are offering them scholarships. Also a statement of fact: there is a strong correlation between socio-economic status and being a top student. As income rises, students have both the cultural and economic capital to go where they will. So to even think we're only competing with Purdue for those students is simply naïve. Some of you know from your own children that a student can be offered a very large scholarship from IU and Purdue and choose to go to neither one to attend an Ivy League institution of no scholarship. Just to emphasize the kind of complexity of this. And, again, I repeat, since we don't have a large endowment, every scholarship we offer to the top student adds to our discount rate. That is, the money that we give back from tuition to provide scholarships and those dollars are then not available to pay faculty, improve facilities, add books to the library and so forth. Our analysis, for example, is that for top students within the state, and we do lots of logistic regression models to come up with these kind of things. In fact, there is as much science as there is art anymore in the recruitment of students especially when it comes to using financial aid. Our model suggests that it would take a financial aid offer of a minimum between \$7,000 to \$10,000 dollars to significantly increase the probability that a high ability student would come to the Bloomington campus. If you do the math on that and what our tuition rates are, it means we are going to pay every top student that we recruit, more money than it costs to attend that we receive in tuition revenue in order to make sure we increase their probability of coming.

There are real tradeoffs in the area of diversity. This is the most recent year that I have data and I have no reason to think this has changed dramatically. In the year 2002-2003, there were 366 African American students in the entire state with SATs over 1000. There were 324 Latino students with SATs over 1000. And again, everyone is going after those students with scholarships. They are highly recruited students. This is going to sound rather bleak but I think it's really important as a group if we're going to get serious about this, that we understand the complexities and not over simplify them. In 2003-2004, if we were going to establish a goal of meeting all, and I underscore all, unmet need for all first-year, for the year 2003-2004, if we had had a goal of meeting all unmet need for all first-year Hoosiers, it would have required about \$7 million in financial aid. To meet all of the unmet need for all students, all undergraduate students enrolled in the Bloomington campus that year, it would have required more than \$20 million in financial aid. This would be a 70 percent increase in our financial aid budget for undergraduates. I want to be clear here: most schools do not meet all unmet need. Some may have gone to Ivy League institutions. Even amongst the Ivy League, it's a relative—it's only the Harvards, Princetons, Yales that have sufficient endowment that they could make an assurance from the outset that they will meet all unmet need. Most of the private sector and virtually all of the public

sector, up until now anyways, has had to live in a world where they simply cannot meet all of the unmet need.

None of this is to suggest that we should be satisfied with standing still on any of these dimensions. We shouldn't. So, until we are authorized to print money, we're going to move forward with this plan with input from the faculty, deans, I mentioned the Trustees, the way it's looking, to move forward on this plan in a realistic way and to constantly be recalibrating. And we're going to hope also that either the state does more to help us financially than in the recent years or perhaps the Trustees allow us to be more aggressively on our tuition rates. The biggest problem actually that we face and many public institutions face, is that state appropriations—I'm not sure exactly what it is for Indiana but I'm quite clear across the nation, state appropriations have been stagnant or declining in constant dollar terms for some time. So public institutions have been required to make up for that loss in state appropriations through tuition and if we have to continue to hold our tuition rates low and at the same time the state is holding, every year that our costs increase and the state either just holds our state appropriations stable, we are losing; we can't keep up.

So let me tell you a little bit about the plan. I've already indicated who's on the committee and that we have a five-year goal and it's a benchmark driven kind of document. We've identified peer groups in quality. We have identified peer groups, I mean peer group institutions for diversity and for instance, the peer groups for quality and the peer groups for diversity are different. They have to be. I was actually involved in some research about 10 years ago in which we discovered that the extent to which a public university is diverse is very much determined by the diversity of the state in which it is situated. Most public flagships tend to be about plus or minus 2 percent in terms of the overall minority enrollment of whatever the state population is. So I don't want to really have a goal that compares us with the state of Michigan or Illinois, for example, that are much more diverse. So on quality we have one set of peers, and diversity, we look for peers for states that have similar percentages of minority populations and we select public flagships in those states.

We're trying to do the same thing with access but it's awfully hard to get good data on what institutions are doing in the area of need based financial aid. But, for example, on the quality side, some of our peers, and we are aiming for the bottom half of the Big Ten in terms of our peer group in quality. For the very first.... [Tape 1, side A ends, some conversation lost] a significant difference in terms of what's possible. So they are institutions like Michigan State, Ohio State is an outlier in that, I'm sorry, Purdue, University of Iowa. We also included Miami of Ohio simply because we know we have a lot of cross applications with them, both out-of-state students, and they are also one of our biggest competitors in-state, in terms of cross applications. The goal is to get to the point where the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of our SAT scores fall between 1020 and 1050 and at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile between 1220 and 1260, and where 60 to 70 percent of the entering class rank in the top 25 percent of the class. I would not put class rank; it's getting harder and harder to make sense of class rank because fewer and fewer high schools are ranking students. They're doing that because they know that we're giving more and more attention to that; all institutions are, and they feel that some of their, especially really competitive affluent suburban high schools, many of those high schools, both in-state and out-of-state said, "We're not going to rank our students anymore because we have students who are really good and you're

not admitting them or you're not awarding them financial aid on the basis of class rank when we know or we think or we want to believe or our parents are putting sufficient pressure on us at that, we want to make the assertion that if they were at a less prestigious high school, they would be in the top 20 percent or 25 percent of their class."

I've already talked about diversity goals. We also have transfer goals: to increase transfers by 7 percent. I have not seen-- I'm going to digress from my notes here to say that I have not seen the proposal being put forward for the BFC to vote on. I too think we can increase transfer students. I'm not sure, I mean, for me this is one of those moving target questions. I would just say I would be hesitant to develop a hard and, fast plan that presumes we could reduce the number of freshmen... Let's just pick a number. Let's say we're going to reduce the number of entering students, just cut off the bottom 250 students for the next four years. That's about a thousand students. To just assume that within 10 years we're going to be able to offset that with transfer students... maybe we will and maybe we won't. At the risk of sounding like I really know what I'm talking about, four or five years ago President Brand asked me to lead up a task force to look at the effect of making Ivy Tech Community College and one of the observations that I insisted on going in that report is institutional missions and images do not change rapidly. They do not change overnight. I think it will be quite some time before a large number of students who see themselves as not just four-year college material, but four-year college material who are going to go to a residential flagship institution. I think it will be a while before Ivy Tech has that kind of image or reputation in the minds of Indiana high school students. In fact, my colleague Ed St. John, who recently left for Michigan, did some analysis on the enrollment growth in Ivy Tech to date. They've had quite large enrollment growth. He helped build a state database that included information on all the high school students. So it's not just looking at who enrolled. He has concluded up to this point in time, most of the growth at Ivy Tech has been from students who here to for weren't likely to attend any form of post-secondary education. That's not the profile of a student who's-- a student who wasn't even sure they were going to go to college is pretty unlikely to decide probably late in their high school career to go and then transfer to Bloomington and it's probably not the profile of someone that we want to come to Bloomington. My point here is simply, I believe that once Ivy Tech really establishes itself as a community college, we will see growth in the number of high school students going to Ivy Tech who want to transfer and we will be able to take advantage of that. But I would just urge caution in terms of assuming because Ivy Tech is now a community college, up to now most of our transfer students come actually... now, we have two kinds of transfers, we call them ICTs and external transfers. ICTs are intercampus transfers and external transfers are transfers from some place outside of Indiana University. Most of those are students who are attending other four-year institutions, either within the state or outside of the state. That's a group you can't really recruit. So, I just caution, it's not to say it can't and won't and in fact, actually for about two years the admissions office has been trying to be more intentional about recruiting transfers. But I believe it will be a slow haul.

Hold the number of international students constant is another one of the goals that 2004-2005 levels. This is only at the undergraduate; I'm not speaking at the graduate level. Hold constant or slightly increase the percentage of non-resident students. Manage our discount rate. The discount rate has been a meaningful measure in private institutions for a long time; it's becoming a meaningful measure in public flagships, too. The discount rate again is what percentage of your

tuition revenue do you give back to students in the form of financial aid. Private institutions, most privates are in the range of somewhere between 20 and 40 percent of every dollar they take in, even Johns Hopkins, an institution we regard as high status. I was talking to someone who works for Hopkins and they were delighted they've been able to bring their discount rate down to 25 percent. As we raise our tuition more and more, that discount rate will become an increasingly meaningful metric for us. We're nowhere near that right now and we don't want to be. On the other hand, to achieve some of these goals, I think we'll have to look carefully at it.

Some seemingly simple solutions: cut out 200 to 300 of our weakest students at the bottom. Unless we offset them with students with higher abilities, that will result in somewhere between that 2.4 and 3.6 million dollar loss of revenue and Neil I think that was just for one year? So if we were to do that for four years we'd be looking at probably between an 8 and 11 million dollar, I'm fudging a little bit for dropout and so forth, that means between 8 and 11 million dollars, what would be probably between 80 and 110 faculty lines that would have—not that we couldn't cut elsewhere but inevitably that would eventually come back to affect the faculty and at the risk of, oh I don't know, I would just say, when I was co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, there was a proposal to develop a profile much like that of Chapel Hill's. And at that time, I don't want to suggest that there was a lot of science in this analysis, the only science was or the only real math in this was the math done by Maynard Thompson, then Vice Chancellor for Budgetary Affairs. Bob Magee, the Director of Admissions at that time, I'm not sure what he looked at but somewhere he came up with a number that if we could have a target of five 5,000 entering freshmen rather than 6,000, we could have a profile like Chapel Hill's. This was probably 1991/92, maybe 93, some place in that time, and I confess, I said you know I hate to be, I'm the big leader in faculty governance, but I hate to be part of a faculty committee that recommends something that no one would ever agree to live with the consequences. So I asked Maynard to go back and do some math on this and what it would mean financially? He came back and said somewhere we would have to cut \$20 million out of the instructional budget at the end of four years. Our final recommendation was that we should do everything, we encourage the campus to do everything it can to increase quality. My point is, whatever we do, I'd like to see it be realistic, something we can live with.

In addition, if we simply draw a line and cut out two to three hundred of our weakest student with no analysis, it will have a chilling effect on the diversity profile of this campus. I'm an admitted liberal and proud of it. I don't think I could live personally with my own values around diversity and simply say we're going to cut out, we're just going to linearly cut off the bottom 300 from the entering class in order to achieve these goals.

Other simple solutions, we just offer more scholarship funds. We're currently proposing to invest \$1.5 million this coming year for merit-aid for Hoosiers and we project that we'll increase the average SAT by about 10 to 12 points, that gets us some of the way towards that goal for the top 75<sup>th</sup> percentile but not all of the way. Even this program, at the end of four years we would project that we'd be spending somewhere around \$5.5 million, about 50, 52 faculty lines, that would be going to recruit high ability Hoosiers. I don't really think we have a choice. Even just pure pragmatic reasons, even if the faculty didn't care at all about quality, the fact that Purdue is spending significant amounts of money on this, I think means we cannot afford not to do this.

We can't afford not to be seen just as interested in quality as Purdue is and I know the faculty do care about quality.

So, summing up, what does it mean to me? We should and we have to try to increase quality. But we need a plan that is long term, realistic and flexible. To try to bring about change quickly is certain to be very costly and produce less certain results. I've spent eight years looking at this financial aid and I'm telling you, you can spend...most people think the big risks are spending too much money to get students to come. The real risk is not offering quite enough money and having no impact on the enrollment decision because it's very counter intuitive. At IUPUI, a couple of years ago, I was making a presentation on this and one dean said, "I don't want to spend a dollar that I can't be assured will be a dollar that's going to bring a student here who wouldn't have come otherwise." There isn't a person in the country who could assure any dean of that. You would have to think about it this way, let's just say for a moment that for students with an average SAT score of 1350 or higher, that our yield rate in-state for students with those attributes is 40 percent. In other words, 40 percent of the students we admit are coming. When you make a decision to spend financial aid on students of those characteristics, at the time you make the offer, you don't know who is coming. So for every dollar you spend, the probabilities are that 40 cents of that dollar is going to someone who was already coming. So you have to be really careful about this because the bigger risk is actually to under award, have no effect, but to have just spent a lot of money on students who were already coming. So you have to be very careful about this and if you try to proceed too quickly and not be analytical about it, I'll just repeat, it can get costly very quickly and the results are uncertain.

I don't want to argue that the plan is perfect, obviously it's not. You could have had a slightly different group of people and come up with a slightly different plan. But I think the foundation is there. It's a mid-range plan that's flexible, we have a high level planning group of people who know the institution, know the resource base and are involved in this and so I think we're probably in place to make the kind of changes we all want to see but I just urge caution and maybe I'm a little too conservative about this but these are after all only the dollars that also go to do what the real mission of Indiana University is and that is to teach students.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thanks Don. One fact that I think Don you may know the answer for and I think Neil does as well, what's the national graduate rate from community colleges?

**HOSSLER:** I think, I haven't looked at this in a little while but I think the number of students getting a two-year degree from a community colleges, if you looked at it in a cohort kind of model is under 30 percent. It might even be as low as 22 percent.

**GROS LOUIS:** My recollection is the last time I asked somebody this question the answer I got was 19 percent. So we need to keep in mind that whatever the figure is, that the percentage of those graduating from a community college is very very low. This is now affecting obviously the transfer issue and the same holds true for the community college as it grows in Indiana. Are there any question or should we go ahead to the next report?

**MILLER:** Does Roland want to say anything?

**GROS LOUIS:** Roland do you want to make any comment?

**COTE:** Not right now, thank you.

**GROS LOUIS:** Ok.

**DAVILA:** I have a question. In the recent Almanac put out by the Chronicle of Higher Education in terms of enrollments and admissions at the end of August issue, gives us some maps projecting the number of high school graduates for the next decade. From 2005/6 to 2015/16 and amazingly they are projecting an increase of high school graduates of 13 percent for Indiana as opposed to...

**GROS LOUIS:** But look at the number Luis.

**DAVILA:** Excuse me?

**GROS LOUIS:** Look at the number rather than the percent

**DAVILA:** Well they don't give the number.

**GROS LOUIS:** The number is not large. I think it was the number of high school graduates in Indiana relative to Michigan, Illinois, Ohio is not large.

**DAVILA:** Right.

**HOSSLER:** The other complexity with that, actually I'm stealing—I'm going to steal some data here from my colleague Jorge Chapa, most of that or perhaps all of it is projected to be Latino students. Probably, this is only probably, probably primarily first generation, where English may not be the first language and this population we have to reach out to. But if that's indeed the case it's not likely to result in a dramatic number of additional students for us. In fact, Jorge put together a presentation recently that approximately half the postsecondary participation rates of Latino high school graduates ...

**CHAPA:** Not half, maybe a little bit less.

**HOSSLER:** A little less than half. So if you think about it this way, it would take... if the current postsecondary participation rates amongst Latino high school graduates do not change, you would literally need twice as many graduates to produce the same number of college matriculates that a white population of the same size will produce. So whether this is a ... it actually is potentially even bad news because if we see a decline in the number of white students graduating, it could actually be problematic for us.

**DAVILA:** And, Jorge is it still true that the dropout rate for Latinos is quite high, from high school?

**CHAPA:** Yeah, this hasn't changed in over 40 years. So it's still very extremely high, depending on how you measure it, 40 percent, 30-40 percent. There is one factor, the high dropout rate, is one factor that mitigates the low participation rate that Don was talking about. But probably 13 percent isn't enough to produce much growth in potential IU freshmen in the future.

**CARINI:** I was just going to say that the bulk of this increase comes about because of the rise in births in Indiana, starting about 18 years ago.

**DAVILA:** Oh I see.

**CARINI:** So there will be a substantial... I don't know what ...

**DAVILA:** And another thing that ...

**CARINI:** ... the demographics were 18 years ago in terms of births but I'm saying there will be an increase in the number.

**DAVILA:** Another thing that pops out of this is, I don't know why, maybe it's an omission but the Chronicle doesn't report any merit type of scholarships for Indiana but you certainly were saying there are merit scholarships.

**HOSSLER:** Well I'd have to look at that, the Chronicle might be talking about state merit programs rather than campus-based and Indiana has not moved into, aggressively into a kind of a Hope Scholarship environment like Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, New Mexico but my hunch is that they are talking about state because you can't get that, I've tried to get that data at the institutional level but nobody reports it.

**DAVILA:** I went to this because for me Newsweek and US News and World Report and all these other beauty contests tend to be somewhat unreliable but I confess I haven't looked at these percentiles and all that are being tossed about. But another thing is that universities, Indiana rates in the top 20 percent of large universities and yet we don't do as well in terms of the money that alumni might contribute to support this type of mission to recruit and track quality and support merit and diversity and all and these tables don't explain this very well. Places like UT-Austin are way up high and it's a large state as you were saying as opposed to Indiana, so it's an odious comparison but, does the fact that we have ... I guess every public university has a similar foundation type of setup where... I don't know how much money might be available to the university at times for this type of persuasive recruitment etc., monetary and otherwise.

**HOSSLER:** That's not an area I'm dealing with.

**GROS LOUIS:** As many of you know we are in the silent phase of the Bloomington endowment campaign that's now underway, one of the top priorities is undergraduate scholarships. Its undergraduate scholarships for first generation students, for diversity, for Wells scholars and for international experiences, and the Foundation folks believe that's going to be a very successful part of the campaign, mainly because donors understand and appreciate the value of giving to undergraduates. This is the first year of the Jesse Cox scholarships. It's about \$15 million, two-

thirds of it come to Bloomington and one-third to IUPUI. It's for students working their way through school and in Mr. Cox's will, after his death there will be approximately an additional \$70 million and two-thirds of which will come to Bloomington and one-third to IUPUI for students working their way through school.

**MILLER:** I think we need to move on.

**GROS LOUIS:** Sure, Ted thinks we need to move on.

**MILLER:** If there are other questions let's try to do them later on.

### **AGENDA ITEM #7: POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

**MILLER:** We're trying to get through our business here. Bill, you might want to take note please, we want to kind of move this along. Let me just say an introduction to the report from the Educational Policies Committee, that's the document that's attached to the annual report of the committee, is a model admissions policy. This is a document that was prepared over the last year, maybe a little bit more over a year, in the Educational Policies Committee and I think in those versions of the committee, it had fairly really strong support and it's really coming here today just for a little broader presentation. We're interested in comments that you might have about this. Our idea is that this will go back to this year's Educational Policies Committee for some final tweaking and then it will come back to the floor as something that we will act on hopefully rather soon. This fits into the overall idea of the Mission Differentiation Project. One of the recommendations in that project was that each campus should develop its own special admissions policy and this is the direction that we are going into.

**WHEELER:** The origin of this report is actually in our last meeting last spring. At that meeting I had prepared to come to the meeting to talk about general education and what appeared on the agenda was annual report and then during the question and answer period Ted who at that point was sitting at the other of the thing said that he was very excited that the EPC was coming to give us an annual report and he was hoping that we were going to talk about admissions. So here is the annual report so that that conversation on admissions can occur. Since that is the focus, the annual report is for returning members of the Council, it's primarily a recitation of the things that all of us participated in.

The committee last year worked on priority registration in athletics in the fall, it worked on TurnItIn and academic integrity in the spring. Both of those issues came to the Council and the Council adopted resolutions from the committee. The committee continued its deliberations all through last year. The deliberations began the year before. The committee first began trying to draft this model admission committee two years ago. It worked on refining it last year. We had actually anticipated that it would come to the Council last year. After consultation with the Chancellor in November, it was decided that we should wait until after the Mission Differentiation report appeared. At that time it was expected that report would appear in February perhaps because the deadline was January. It never made the report and never did appear and so the model of admissions thing did not appear last year either. And then of course the committee worked on general education last year.

Turning then to the admissions policy, I would direct your attention to the second page of the report. We refer to this as a model admissions policy. We were not attempting to actually write an admissions policy to bring to you for consideration and passage. Rather what we were trying to say is that, as a faculty the committee, we were trying to write the ideal type of admissions policy. What is it that the committee members really wanted to put down for that, that is to say, if you were asked what do you really mean when you say quality, what do you mean when you say I really want to improve it, what exactly do you have in mind, because it's useful to have the ideal down before you actually begin to make the compromises for budgetary reasons, for diversity and for all the other things that are important to us that Don commented about. So please bear in mind that this was a model which is intended to simulate discussion about both our admissions policy and the admissions policy for IU as a whole and that in drafting it, none of us thought that this would be something that we would actually pass but we thought that it would give us a way of evaluating, you know, a point of reference from which to evaluate the compromises that always have to be made.

Turning to the policy itself, on the first page it mentions some of the things that shaped it. The five factors are listed are the incongruity between the mathematics and foreign language guidelines of the current policy which are fairly weak, requiring only 3 years of mathematics which is not adequate for many majors. And not actually requiring foreign language even though so many of our baccalaureate degrees do require foreign languages. So, one sense was that we needed to do more in terms of foreign languages and mathematics.

Next there was the general issue of improving the quality of our undergraduate student body in comparison to our peers. Another factor has been the development of the CORE 40 and the Academic Honors high school diplomas in the state and the comments that the Indiana Commissioner for Higher Education has made in those regards. In the Commission's plan for higher education in the state that appeared two years ago, the Commission called for all four-year institutions to require at least the CORE 40 and for West Lafayette and for Bloomington to require the Academic Honors diploma. So that was a development that has been further... that aspect of it has been further straightened by the passage by the state legislature last year of Senate Bill 200 which requires the university to require the CORE 40 as a general requirement for regular admission or something equivalent thereto.

And then another concern of the committee is the fact that although we have requirements for people who are coming in as new freshmen, the people who transfer, both internal transfers from other campuses and transfers from outside, are not always required to satisfy those same standards that we have for freshmen. So it moves to say that if we have a person who is transferring in, who's still in freshmen status, that they should be satisfying those same requirements. So those were some of the matters that influenced the committee's thinking.

The primary changes, compared to the current admissions policy which is a university-wide admissions policy that appears in the Academic Handbook, is a strengthening in course requirements by increasing the number of required courses from 28 semesters or credits to 34. to specify a distribution for these; the current one is very flexible in that it specifies 8 credits of English, 6 credits of mathematics, 2 credits of laboratory sciences, 4 credits of social sciences

and then 8 credits that are distributed at the students option for a total of 28. Going up to 34 permitted the committee to go ahead and responding to the CORE 40 which has a very rigid course requirement structure, to go ahead and meet both what the CORE 40 calls for but also to attend to our commitments to the humanities and particularly the foreign languages.

Item 2 there was that we were going to require all students, transfer students from other IU campuses, from other colleges and universities and those who've been outside of high school for three or more years without being in college, to require them to satisfy those same course requirements. That is, the same 34 courses as students applying as new freshmen. And to require all applicants to rank in the upper-third of their high school graduating class. This item number three was the one which we were unsettled on until the very last discussion of it. Currently the requirement on class rank is that Indiana residents must rank in the top-half of their graduating class and students who are non-residents need to rank in the top-third of their class. The committee was certainly not of one mind on this but the majority of the committee did feel that even for in-state, there should be a goal that students should be in the upper-third of their classes.

Let me digress just for a moment perhaps on the history of admissions policies at Indiana University to the extent that I understand them. The first formal admissions policy as I understand it was instituted around 1960, late fifties, early sixties, in anticipation of the baby boom of whom I was the first generation, the first class I guess. So it certainly predates my arrival at the university. At that time there was one Faculty Council. It was the Faculty Council of Indiana University for the entire system such as it existed. It was about half administration and half faculty and the dean of the freshmen division which became University Division proposed an admissions policy. That admissions policy had approximately the same goals on SAT sCOREs. You had to be at that median Indiana sCORE or above, so that's always been at around the 1000 level. They didn't say students had to be in the upper-half of their class, out-of-states at the upper-third. The original admissions policy at that time called for 26 credits. At that meeting where this was discussed, the minutes of that meeting indicate that someone asked the Dean of the Freshmen Division, "how many of our current students would not satisfy this" and he said approximately one fourth of the students at IU at that time would not satisfy the upper 50 percent of their high school graduating class or over 000 SAT sCORE. They were of course hopefully going to be satisfying the course requirements. But in terms of the quality indicators of high school rank and SAT sCOREs, approximately one fourth of the current body would not have satisfied it. And that continues to be the case even today. There are approximately one fourth—throughout the entire 45 year history of our current admissions policy, there are approximately one fourth of our students, sometimes a little bit more and sometimes a little bit less, but it's a rule of thumb, approximately one fourth of our students do not meet either the SAT guideline or the high school rank guidelines.

I think this is a...in that discussion they said the reason that they were adopting this admissions standard was to try and influence high schools on their graduation requirements. That was one of the main reasons for doing this because the high schools were about to have the baby boomers coming through and that IU by adopting an admissions policy could perhaps influence the high school graduation requirements. So what this shows is that for 45 years the admissions policy has been there to try and influence the high school graduation thing while still being cognizant of the fact that in terms of our mission, to meeting the needs of the state on Indiana for higher

education, that a significant portion of our involvement would be students who did not in fact meet that. So these two things have continued for the entire time and I think that is something we do need to bear in mind.

Around the late 80s, Sara McNabb chaired a committee that reviewed the admissions policy and what it did was it increased the number of required courses from 26 to 28. So if you now come to this admissions proposal, what we're saying is that for Bloomington, the most significant change would be to increase the number of credits required from 28 to 34 as itemized on page 4, retaining the 8 credits in English, increasing the social science credits from 4 to 6, increasing the mathematics requirements from 6 to 8, increasing the physical science requirements from 2 to 6 and then specifying 6 credits of foreign language. This is of course very strong. Now, this is essentially the same as the Academic Honors version of the CORE 40. If you look at the college prep courses that are required for the Academic Honors version of the CORE 40, this is exactly what that is. And now approximately between 60 and 70 percent of our Indiana residents do actually come to the university with the Academic Honors program. So a number of our students do meet this currently and the number of students in the state who are, a percentage of the high school graduation in the state, earning the academic honors degree is increasing also. So this is not unreasonable although at the same time it is more than perhaps more than 30 percent of our students in the foreseeable future will actually do. At the same time it does actually represent what would be a solid base for pursuing studies in all of our majors on this campus.

The other major change was to require all applicants to be in the upper-third of their high school graduating class. So, that's in-state, out-of-state is already required to be that high. There were no changes on the SAT requirements. That continues to be as it has been since 1960, at the Indiana median or above, which is currently about 1007 sCORE on the SAT. Again, the committee was trying to consider for your consideration what it thought would be the ideal, if you were trying to say what it is that we would really like for all of our students to have, then this was the answer that we would like for all of our students to have these 34 courses. The state of course is calling for us to require this by moving the Bloomington campus toward requiring an Academic Honors degree. But after looking at it, the members of the committee felt that we would like for all of our students to have this in terms of college preparatory courses and then in terms of quality it would be good to have students who typically rank in the upper-third of their graduating classes. Of course we recognize that there is variation from one high school to another in terms of quality and so there are certainly some schools where being in the upper-half is equal to being in the upper-third of some other schools and of course it is always our assumption that the admissions office would take that into account.

**GROS LOUIS:** Questions for Bill?

**PRYOR:** Maybe I'm missing something desperately obvious, but if you have the SAT requirement, why is the upper-third required? Doesn't the SAT, setting a threshold for SAT insure quality. I mean, why have this discussion of one-third or one-half, what the actual?

**WHEELER:** So the two have a correlation but it's certainly not a perfect correlation. We do have charts in which we have plotted scatter plots where every student is on a scatter plot. One dimension is the SAT sCORE, the other dimension is the rank in high school class and the ideal

is to be in the quadrant where both are high. But there are many many people in all four quadrants including the one where you violate both of them. The SAT is a measure of aptitude, high school rank is a measure of achievement. So an underachieving student may have of course a very high SAT sCORE but very low performance and in math classes I encounter these students who have high SAT sCOREs but don't do their homework. [Laughter] So there is a need to measure both aptitude and achievement when you're assessing whether someone will succeed at the university. And some would argue that perhaps achievement is a more relevant measure than aptitude.

**GROS LOUIS:** One thing you might want to consider and maybe Don can answer this is how many schools are eliminating ranking students?

**WHEELER:** Well that is right and that's one thing that the committee has to look at. There is this issue of high schools no longer reporting their ranks and so the committee this year is expecting to undertake discussions of other alternatives to this. Ted has proposed that we look that we perhaps look at their high school GPAs. In fact at IUPUI they actually get down and look at particular courses. Vic Borden at IUPUI is reported to have said that the single best predictor of success for freshmen at IUPUI is having made a B or better in their last high school algebra course. And so the University-EPC is also looking at the issue of a university-wide policy and is looking this in that it might end up saying, in terms of achievement, that you need to be in the upper-third or else you would have to have a GPA of at least 3.4 or 3.2 or else you would have to have all Bs and in your algebra course, your 4<sup>th</sup> year English course, your chemistry course of something like that. So, it's entirely possible that this item number one might be replaced with a series of alternatives for measuring achievement in high school.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thanks Bill. Don?

**HOSSLER:** I was just going to say one time, when we run models to try to look at the predictors of first year GPAs, as well as persistence from freshmen to sophomore year and this is in the best predictors are, and this is actually not in rank order, class rank, number of credit hours in Math, number of credit hours in science and the number of credits hours in foreign language. SAT in some of these progression models is either the least best predictor or sometimes it's not even a significant predictor of freshmen GPA or persistence.

**DAVILA:** How about recommendations? We use for graduate school and all and the Groups Program also depends on recommendations for students that don't appear in this desirable recruitable group? I don't think it's a policy at all for high schools much, right, to look at recommendations for students, at the freshmen level as opposed to grad school?

**HOSSLER:** Students can submit recommendations. That is certainly true right now we don't require all of them. The other thing is that sometimes, at least some institutions of course are moving toward essays. What I'm about to say, I think, part of what I'm about to say is anecdotal and that is it is my sense that much like many areas of recommendations, with open record laws and so forth, it's harder and harder to get lots recommendations that tell you how good our people are but you don't get many recommendations that tell you that someone really isn't very good. I think they're a structural thing, for both essays and recommendations. You would need

more bodies to read all those in an admissions office. On the essay side of this, the University of California Berkley, the University of Georgia, are spending a fair amount of money now hiring and training readers every year to go through these. It's not that it can't be done but it does get expensive and it becomes one more additional cost.

**DAVILA:** What about testing English as a foreign language for people that come from diversity populations where they are bilingual?

**HOSSLER:** I have not heard of doing that for people who have diverse...

**DAVILA:** That would be a good indicator too, it might have not registered in the other areas if people are doing well with English as foreign language maybe in terms of grades.

**CARINI:** I just realized that there are actually a couple of things that Bill left out believe it or not. One was we're talking about a policy that would take effect at some point in the future, several years from now. But it has to take effect by 2011 because the Senate Bill has basically invalidated our existing admissions statements. But I don't think it's intended to take going into effect immediately.

**WHEELER:** Oh, that's certainly true... was adopted for five or six years ...

**CARINI:** ... notice and we want to remind you what we should be aiming for is to figure out what we think students need to be well prepared to succeed here and we thought, again, talking five or six years from now so they have time to prepare themselves.

**DAVILA:** And Senate you mean the ...

**CARINI:** The state legislature.

**GROS LOUIS:** The mandate of CORE 40

**CARINI:** That's right, in which our current policy does not meet.

**MILLER:** I would just like to make just a comment about something here that to me is really maybe the most striking fact in this particular situation. And I thank Bill for relaying the history of Indiana University admission requirements to us because I think it's really very interesting to just think that for 45 years, this university has had an admissions policy that includes, if you look on page four of the EPC document, it has had an admission requirement similar to 1.2(2), at the bottom of the page. "An applicant must sCORE above the median established by Indiana University on nationally standardized admissions test." That requirement has been in our admissions policy for 45 years and today as our little Upgrading the Flagship document points out, we still have 25 percent of our undergraduates that fall below that standard. Twenty-five percent of the undergraduates fall below a standard that the faculty recommended 45 years ago.

So one way to think about this particular project that Upgrading the Flagship is trying to describe, is really to try to bring the Bloomington campus into compliance with a policy that is

45 years old. And to my way of thinking, I've heard Don talk on numerous occasions over the past ten years about these issues and I'm always very depressed when he gets done because there are lots of problems and it's very clear to me that over a very long period of time, this university, this campus, has simply failed to make progress in this regard because we're sort of frozen in place because of all these potential problems. I just think we have got to do something and get out from under this. And that's what we're trying to suggest in this document.

**DAVILA:** But Ted isn't what he presented, in a way, possibly a grim picture of the diminishing returns that are plausible in this age ...[End of Tape 1, Side B, some conversation lost]...there's a business model for the university on how you sell students to come to whatever it is, or whatever university you are at. So it seems to me that you talked about triangulation and we need to enter the dialogue but I think it's a type of troika that we have that puts the university in the center and we have pulling in two or possibly three directions because everywhere you look there is a type of commercialization or marketing the university. What I think is that's the way you try to make up for lack of state support, lack of foundation support, and for the possibility of continuing to raise tuition ad infinitum. So I think there's a bit of a paradox of what we're about and what at times is a type of corporate framework for a university and it goes back for a long long time too, as you say, 45 years. So in this best of all possible worlds I think that we have to watch that we don't strut about like peacocks when we do have clay feet and we would be an elite university but we have to watch being elitist. And that's really a future type of population...

**MILLER:** Luis, I do not believe we are trying to become an elite university.

**DAVILA:** I hope we are.

**MILLER:** I do not believe that we are trying to do that. We are trying to become a better university.

**DAVILA:** Right, that's what I mean.

**MILLER:** A university that has a better undergraduate program.

**DAVILA:** I don't argue with that Ted; I say let's be an elite university but let's avoid being elitist. Elite as opposed to elitist.

**GROS LOUIS:** Let's go over here and then Harold.

**CHAPA:** If I recall correctly IU accepts 82 percent of the people that apply from the *Herald-Times* a few weeks ago. There's not a lot of room in that. One reason that IU hasn't addressed its SAT standing since 45 years ago is basically it can't. I wonder in looking at the Upgrading the Flagship document if there are other indicators that can be manipulated or improved in that because I found Don's presentation depressing too because if we have an 82 percent acceptance rate and a certain demographic, than upgrading the SAT maybe the wrong indicator to focus on or at least solely.

**OGREN:** My question is sort of related it's really a question of what was the thinking in developing this model policy that focused on increasing the cut at 1/3 rather than 1/2 and focusing on that rather than SAT, the SAT was not mentioned. And yet the measure of the quality that we keep hearing is SAT. So it seems like the focus here on improving quality has been on accepting a smaller fraction of the high school students based on their achievements in high school but not on the SAT. That must have been discussed; there must have been a point about that you are making here.

**MILLER:** Could I take a first crack at it? Well I think the issue Harold is that if you look at our current SAT profile we have got, as I said, 25 percent of our current students fail to meet the standard that is in our current admission policy and which continues in this one. Our idea was that really what we need to do is not to raise that SAT cut-off another 100 points and not admit anybody that has less than 1100 but we need to move ourselves so that the people we do admit meets the standard that we now have. And that's a huge challenge in and of itself.

**OGREN:** I understand and that's fine but moving that cut to 1/3 would automatically produce some increase in the SAT and it's not clear how those correspond and whether or not it would be more than expected.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes?

**MARSH:** This is a question that comes out of ignorance, not having children and having spent part of the past two years out of Indiana, and not being American, so I don't understand some things. What is the development of the CORE 40 and Academic Honors Diplomas in the state of Indiana and what's the bearing of that exactly on what we can ask particularly on the raising of the number of credits to 34? Because that seems to be a small optimistic point possibly which we might want to hear.

**WHEELER:** I'll try to be as brief as I can. The State of Indiana has been trying to increase its high school graduation requirements for some years. The governor and the legislature set up the Education Roundtable, I'm not sure exactly when that happened perhaps a decade ago, and that consists of business leaders, education leaders, legislative leaders from around the state and they were charged with trying to come up with ideas for improving P-16 education. And so the first thing that came out several years ago was called the CORE 40. And the CORE 40 was going to say that this should be the curriculum that all high schools teach and it should be the primary curriculum, the primary type of diploma. So it's really called the CORE 40 diploma. And it's not the only diploma that a high school graduate can get. There's a general diploma which has lower qualifications and there's an Academic Honors version of the CORE 40 which has higher ones. And now there's also—and that was put into place. Then, several years ago they started thinking about maybe strengthening that because there's some ambiguities and as you read the current CORE 40 there are some places where it's a little bit confusing because for instance on mathematics it says 6-8 credits in mathematics. Well, what's required for graduation—what it's really trying to say—is that to degree you need 6 credits but we recommend that you take 8. And there were several other places where these were described in terms of a range of credits and then the lower end is what's required and the higher end is what's recommended.

And so over the last several years they developed a new CORE 40 plan and it reviews some of those ambiguities; it also strengthens the Academic Honors version of it by putting into place a requirement that if you do the Academic Honors you also have to take two Advanced Placement courses and take the Advanced Placement Exams or you have to take two ACP type of courses or you have to take one ACP and one AP or you have to make a 1200 or better on the SATs or you have to have an international baccalaureate degree. So they were trying to clear it up some and strengthen it a little bit. But there were some minor changes in the CORE 40 in terms of electives; they actually increased the number of electives that were actually tied in some sense foreign language, fine arts, or business/technical. They increased the number of physical education credits that were required; they increased the number of electives recommending that you take a career/technical track.

But then the really new move was then they put it into state law. That is to say, previously it had just been something that had been enacted by the state board of higher education, or whatever the right word is there, but last spring the state legislature actually passed a bill, Senate Bill 200, which put into law that the CORE 40 should be the primary high school degree diploma for students who begin high school next year. If you're not going to go for the CORE 40, you want to opt for the general, you actually have to sign a form, the student and the parents actually had to sign a form saying we understand the implications of not taking the CORE 40 and we go forward with that. And then as part of this in order to try to put even more force behind it the legislature said that all state public institutions of higher education, all four-year institutions, have to by 2010-2011 and I forget the exact date, have to adopt an admissions policy which has the CORE 40 diploma as a general requirement for regular admission for Indiana students, or something equivalent to that. And then it goes on and it has other provisions in there about students who don't get the CORE 40. And so this is part of a long-term project by the state to improve the quality of high school education and now the legislature has written it into law in a way that actually directly impacts the university.

**GROS LOUIS:** There are several issues with CORE 40 that I think all of you need to be aware of. One is that despite what Stan Jones at the Commission for Higher Education says, in my capacity as VP for Academic Affairs, I've asked the vice chancellors from all the campuses to survey their regions and the report back is that in some rural areas of the state and some inner-city schools the courses for CORE 40 are simply not available. Or in those same areas in the rural schools and inner-city schools they are available but only to a certain number of students and the other students are put onto other tracks. Second of all is that CORE 40 has no GPA attached to it so a study that Charlie Nelms and I did found that in the fall of 2004 students who had completed the CORE 40 and applied to one of IU campuses 22 percent of them were not admitted. Why? Because they might have graduated with a C- or a D average. So it's a real flaw of the CORE 40. I mentioned this to Stan Jones and he seems to pay no attention to it. Without a GPA requirement, and the fact that there are places where either it's not available or it's available only to a limited number of students, are I think real problems. Yes?

**DE SOUZA:** Few people would be happier than I if we upgraded the academic climate with the ability of undergraduates on this campus but I think we focus on one side of the equation which is improving the raw materials that come into this campus. And it seems to me that what we are really after in improving the academic climate is in the young women and the young men that we

turn out of here, at least that should be our goal. And an important component of that, as much as the raw materials you start with, but the process that you go through and how you challenge them. And I have to wonder whether if we incrementally improve our standards of admissions, even if we're successful in doing that, can we in fact change the process, the challenge that we present these people with? Because the change is so small, will we notice 10 points on our 10-20 points on the SAT and will we be able to ramp up the challenge we present these young men and women with? Because if we don't it doesn't matter if we start with better raw material.

**MILLER:** Well I mean I would certainly hope that the faculty would respond to such a situation. One of the, we've got a phrase in our little document here that kind of asserts a positive view of faculty from this point of view. I certainly hope that the faculty would respond to this challenge. But I do believe that the current situation is such that in some parts of the university the faculty are actually disengaging from the undergraduate education enterprise because they are so frustrated with their undergraduate students. I mean I think that this that what we're talking about here is very important to the morale of the faculty of this campus as well as from some other points

**DE SOUZA:** My comment wasn't meant as a criticism at all. It just meant that there's another part to it.

**MILLER:** I agree with you completely.

**DE SOUZA:** And we can't just rely on it being up to the faculty in a general way we need to set in place, we need to investigate and set in place some measures that achieve that to move forward on those goals.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #8: RESOLUTION: UPGRADING THE FLAGSHIP**

**GROS LOUIS:** Why don't we move then to the Agenda Committee's resolution? I guess Ted summarized it earlier. It comes from the Agenda Committee and therefore it's moved and seconded and is open for discussion on the floor. You can see the actual resolution is the very last paragraph in bold print. So the floor is open for any comments or questions you may have. Bill?

**WHEELER:** I just wanted to clarify that what we are voting on is the portion that's in the bold-face not the "Accordingly" there and so then in voting in favor of this one is not necessarily endorsing perhaps all the rationale or one might want to...I just want to clarify that we're not, that this vote is on the matter of principle not on the matter of means described. Is that correct?

**MILLER:** That is correct.

**CHAPA:** Just clarification, are we voting on the adoption of the Model Admissions Policy?

**WHEELER:** No, just on this sheet, just the bold print.

**CHAPA:** Thank you.

**BRADLEY:** Ted, I just wanted to make one comment that perhaps things aren't quite as grim as Don seems to suggest, well he seemed to suggest that there's really nothing we can do, that our hands are tied I thought. But in the time that I've been in Bloomington, 20+ years, this university has grown, the Bloomington campus has grown quite a bit—Ken would know better than I do but it seems to me it was about 33,000 when I came here 20+ years ago and now it's over 37,000. And I assume the undergraduate population has grown in that time. Had we kept it just where it was 15 years ago or so then the standards would have improved on their own but we've allowed the undergraduate population to grow in that time and consequently the standards haven't gotten any better. So we may not necessarily be talking about cuts; we may just be talking about let's decide to stop growing. With the concomitant needs for new buildings, etc. and try to get the legislature on board with that notion.

**GROS LOUIS:** I'd like to step aside for a moment as your presiding officer just to say that I didn't interpret Don's report as suggesting that we can't do anything. I think what he was trying to say was that it's very complicated and there are trade-offs; that in the triumvirate of quality, diversity, and access it's very difficult to achieve all three of those without giving up something else on the campus. Choices have to be made. So I don't think I interpreted it as depressing at all but simply as a realistic statement of the challenges that we're going to face.

**MILLER:** You listen to Don talk too often! [Laughter]

**HOSSLER:** Can I just? I mean I did not, those are all real issue we face, but you know what in most of the areas we do our research on they are complicated. There aren't easy solutions; that's why we enjoy our research, in some cases that's why we get grants to do our research. They are simply complicated. I'm actually, I feel quite good about the plan—not the plan in the actual specific targets, that's really secondary. In my entire eight years until now we've never had any serious discussions about these issues; we've never kind of developed peer groups, we've never really said we want to get somewhere on these things. So I actually think this is all a very positive step and I think we're also in a position, you know, if we find some things that are going even better than we expected we're certainly not going to say oh we can't do that because we'd even get better than the plan suggests. This is simply, these are the real-life tradeoffs we make; and this is just like most of the areas we all do our own research in. And we have peer groups now—I would hope this committee would ask every year from whoever my successor is for a report. I view the kind of goals in here as the floor, the minimum. And I think a group like this ought to be expecting movement along those lines. But personally I don't view these as just depressing and we can't do anything but I tried to paint in a real sense...if someone thinks in the next four years we'll become as selective as the University of Illinois, probably not. And if you were to say that's our goal I couldn't honestly encourage anybody to take this job that I've left. But I personally don't think that this was a statement that we can't do anything and that we're frozen.

**DAVILA:** Since time is running short on this I wonder if we could consider the second line of this resolution and the gerund toward the end of the second line “by improving its undergraduate profile” given the complexities involved could we not say something akin to “by examining its

undergraduate profile” or something that might come from Council that would be more fitting. Because this would give us more room to consider and not immediately imply that the undergraduate profile is in the dumps or something of that sort.

**ODLAND:** Luis that makes the last sentence meaningless.

**DAVILA:** The last sentence? “to implement that policy in a way that reflects the intent of the faculty.” The whole sentence?

**ODLAND:** There’s no goal if you modify it to “examining.”

**DAVILA:** I don’t see why not; toward the goal of examining, is that not a goal?

**ODLAND:** No.

**DAVILA:** Ok. I see that could well be a goal. At any rate I would argue that giving ourselves more resilience with this would be better as opposed to just passing a resolution that might not go anywhere.

**WHEELER:** Is that a motion?

**DAVILA:** If I may, I should like to move the substitution of that word if someone might, at least for discussion, second it. I move that we substitute—unless there’s a better word—as opposed to “improving the undergraduate profile.” I think it’s a slam at our undergraduates.

**PRYOR:** Surely it’s a statement of fact. I mean if the US News is telling us we don’t have a strong profile it’s not that we’ve magically taken this out of the air. We’re saying this is what undergraduates are looking at and we want our undergraduates to be proud of it. I concur with John; I mean already this statement is not reaching for the moon. If we weaken it further it makes it seem ineffectual and un-ambitious.

**WHEELER:** Point of order. Has there been a second?

**BRADLEY:** There hasn’t.

**GROS LOUIS:** A second to Luis’? Not that I’m aware of. Anyone want to second Luis’ substitution?

**WILLIAMS:** I’ll second.

**GROS LOUIS:** Ok. It’s moved and seconded. Discussion?

**WHEELER:** May I call the question?

**GROS LOUIS:** Sure. All those in favor of substituting the word “examining” for “improving” say aye [aye], opposed [no]. Ok. [Motion fails]

**WHEELER:** May I call the motion, please?

**GROS LOUIS:** This is a, I should point out, a directive, and maybe it's intended to be a directive to the Budgetary Affairs Committee because you're not going to improve the student profile without spending money both in the admissions office in terms of staff and in financial aid. So that that's all clear you will be putting this as a high priority for the Budgetary Affairs Committee. The question has been called. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying aye [aye], opposed, abstentions? It's been carried. And we've reached our mandatory adjournment.

[Approved resolution: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B9-2006.htm>]

Meeting adjourned 5:31 pm.