

**Minutes of the  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
December 6, 2005  
Ballantine Hall 008  
3:30 – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**Members Present:** LTC Lori Bass, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Erika Dowell, Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Eugene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, David MacKay, Gerald Marker, Joss Marsh, Terrence Mason, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Theodore K. Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Alex Shortle, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams, Eric Zeemering

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Herb Terry for Craig Bradley

**Members Absent:** Katy Borner, Romualdo De Souza, Paul Elliott, Emily Fairchild, Barbara Hawkins, Susan Jones, William Leckey, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, John Odland, Lisa Pratt, Aarti Ramaswami, Jodi Shepherd, Larry Thibos

**Visitors Present:** Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), John Graves (Faculty Council), David Nordloh (Office of the Dean of Faculties), Roland Cote (Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

November 1, 2005

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/11.01.05.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions

Associate Professor Emeritus George Whitbeck

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B19-2006.htm>

Professor Esther Thelen

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B20-2006.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\* (30 minutes)  
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor Theodore Miller)

6. General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees at IU Bloomington (60 minutes)  
(Professors William Wheeler and John Carini, Co-Chairs, Educational Policies Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B21-2006.htm>

7. Standing Committee Reports  
8. Old Business  
9. New Business

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

**GROS LOUIS:** Ok the first item of the agenda is the minutes of the November 1, 2005 meeting. Are there any comments on that? As you see we have no microphone today. The microphone, Ted tells me was stolen. So if any of you out there has an extra microphone, we'd like to have it back. [Laughter] Any changes or corrections, if not we'll take it as circulated.

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

**GROS LOUIS:** And then there are two memorial resolutions; one for Associate Professor Emeritus George Whitbeck and the other Professor Esther Thelen. And I'll turn to Jeanne for those.

**SEPT:** Thank you, Ken. As before I've abbreviated these for reading purposes, but I invite you to read the full resolutions in your notes. The full resolutions will go in the minutes.

George Whitbeck was a "down easter" from Maine. He ventured to Columbia University for three degrees: a B.A. in history and Oriental studies in 1957 and master's degrees in both library science (1959) and history (1962). After working in both academic and public libraries, he headed down the coast to complete his Ph.D. in library science from Rutgers in 1970. George joined the University of Michigan School of Library Science faculty upon graduation and subsequently ventured as far south as the University of Southern Mississippi, where he was both professor and chairman of the Department of Library Science. In 1975 he came to IU, where he served as Associate Dean of the Graduate Library School (later School of Library and Information Science, or SLIS) until 1987. He then devoted his time to teaching and research, retiring from the school in 1995. SLIS Dean Blaise Cronin remarked, "I remember the first time I met George and I remember the last time we spoke. Over the nearly twenty years between these two events I never changed my impression of the man; decent, caring, and professionally committed. We'll all miss him."

Faculty, staff, and students who were at the School of Library and Information Science during George's tenure will recall him as the quintessential associate dean. He accomplished the myriad tasks that make an organization function – from scheduling courses, to maintaining contacts

within the university, to connecting with the “real world” of Bloomington beyond IU. His 12 years in this post saw a major growth in enrollment and the evolution of the school as a nationally and internationally recognized institution. This was when the state-wide education program developed, and George Whitbeck participated actively and generously. He taught on many of the IU campuses, articulating his belief that the educational program should be brought to the students, even at the cost of inconvenience to faculty members.

George’s teaching focused on government publications, bibliography of the social sciences, research methods, and education for library and information science. His research reflects the areas of his teaching interest: the Federal Depository Library System for government documents; the processing of these documents in academic library collections; curricula for master’s and doctoral level education in library and information science, including continuing education and concerns about grade inflation. His most significant work compared American library education practices with those in other countries, particularly Great Britain and the Republic of China.

He was particularly active in the education of doctoral students, serving on numerous research committees. Ellen Crosby, one of these students, remembers being advised by her fellows, “George will get you through.” “And he did,” she says. “Initially reluctant, he nevertheless took on the task of guiding me through the intricacies of the dissertation itself. Other professors helped with the research questions and data analysis – George ‘got me through’ the process. It’s thanks to Dr. Whitbeck that I can write Ph.D. behind my name and I’m grateful for his help.”

Joyce G. Taylor, another graduate of the doctoral program, remembers how George “quietly pushed and challenged” her work, leading her to new horizons, allowing her to explore and discover. “My first impression of him was that of a gentle giant—one who commands but one who was compassionate and understanding. George was genuinely interested in my research subject and goals; he proceeded to discuss seeing the ‘big picture’ in pursuing an advanced degree. I knew then that my future was firmly in place. Later George became my advisor for independent studies and finally, chair of my dissertation committee. For four years we consulted and planned. He was my instructor, my cheer leader and role model; later, I was a SLIS faculty member, he was a supportive colleague. His quiet encouragement was a welcome beacon in, at times, a sea of self-doubt and confusion.

Connie Van Fleet remembered George Whitbeck as “one of the kindest, gentlest, and most effective people with whom I have ever worked. I went to Indiana because of George. When I applied to doctoral programs, I was astonished that a professor would call every week to see if I had made a decision on a program and to offer his support and extend a welcome. That’s exactly what George did. How could I have gone anywhere else?” A particular memory always brings a smile: “Upon finding out that my daughter had a rare medical condition that required evaluation and ongoing treatment, George sought me out to let me know about a children’s hospital in Indianapolis. This was a kindness, but what so typified George was that he also had a map in hand with the route marked for me. It is this generosity with his time, his interest in each individual, and his willingness to attend to the small, but meaningful details that will always be at the center of my memories of George Whitbeck.”

Colleagues recalled George's commitment to community service. He was active in the Kiwanis Club, to the point that some have a strong association between George Whitbeck and popcorn. After retiring, George continued his community service, including work with the Court Appointed Special Advocates of the Monroe County Family Services Association. He and his wife Ruth had recently moved to Texas to be closer to their daughter, Margaret, and her family. George welcomed the opportunity to help raise his first grandchild. George and Ruth's son, Paul, remains in Indiana.

When George retired in 1995, his colleagues Herbert S. White and Joyce Taylor wrote that his "professional colleagues have always relied on his insights in the areas of government publications and international library education. His colleagues at Indiana University, for whom he has always been willing to carry more than his share of the committee assignments, also came to rely on him as a supportive and caring friend who never offered an unkind word about anyone."

In recognition of George Whitbeck's contributions to the university and the profession, be it resolved that this resolution be part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council and that copies be sent to his wife Ruth, his daughter Margaret Shelton of Denton, Texas, and his son Paul, of Indianapolis.

The second memorial resolution is for Professor Esther Thelen. Last December, the Department of Psychology and the Indiana University community lost a dear colleague and friend with the passing of Esther Thelen. She was a giant in the field of developmental psychology and has left a legacy here at Indiana University and around the world that will not be matched.

Esther was born in Brooklyn, New York to Alden and Sarah Stillman. A deep interest in science led her to a B.S. degree in zoology from the University of Wisconsin and then a M.S. degree in zoology from the University of Missouri, where she studied animal behavior. While at Missouri, Esther developed what turned out to be a life-long passion for developmental psychology. Specifically, she became intrigued by the rhythmical patterned movements of developing infants, which became the topic of her doctoral dissertation. In 1977, Esther joined the faculty of the Department of Psychology at the University of Missouri and with funding from the National Science Foundation launched a series of experiments designed to study the processes involved in learning motor skills.

In 1985, Esther joined the Department of Psychology here at Indiana University and established the Infant Motor Developmental Laboratory. Esther is perhaps best known for applying the principles of dynamic systems theory to the study of child development. Over the years her laboratory attracted millions of dollars of federal grant support and, more importantly, a number of brilliant scholars who were interested in her ideas about the development of movement in infants. The importance of her work cannot be overstated. She is responsible for changing the dominant prevailing view of how babies learn to master the rudiments of movements—how they reach for toys of interest, how they learn to walk, and how they develop early cognitive function. Esther led the field away from the idea that biological processes driven by genes were the most important determinant of motor development. Rather, her work demonstrated that the development of movement reflected interactions of the infant with her or his environment during a dynamic period of brain development.

Esther Thelen's work has influenced scholars the world over in many areas in addition to developmental psychology. Her theories are incorporated into the work of scholars in neuroscience, cognitive science, computer science, robotics, and kinesiology. Her ideas and research were also embraced by clinicians interested in movement. For example, her work had a major impact on the field of pediatric physical therapy, which now designs therapies to match the individual bodies of children, rather than applying a set of standard exercises to children of a given age. It should also be noted that Esther's research reached the masses as she was often featured by the national media. For example, her laboratory was featured in the very popular PBS show "Scientific American Frontiers," hosted by Alan Alda.

Above all, Esther was a warm and thoughtful person who cared deeply about important social issues, including the welfare and well-being of children. She was an outstanding departmental citizen and was particularly interested in issues such as gender equity and fair treatment of junior faculty members. She served on many important departmental and university committees and was well known for her fairness, hard work, and insightful views. The deep respect and high esteem in which she was held was very evident during the memorial service that was held for her at the Neal-Marshall Center on January 16, 2005. The room was overflowing with Esther's friends and colleagues, all who were impacted by her thinking, personal kindness, and generosity.

Esther Thelen is truly missed by all who knew her.

Esther is survived by her husband of forty-two years, Professor David P. Thelen of Bloomington, IN; one daughter, Jennifer Thelen of Richmond, CA; one son, Jeremy Thelen of Providence R.I.; and one sister, Harriet Saeck of Sacramento, CA.

This resolution will become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you, Jeanne. May I ask members of the Council and guests to stand for a moment of silence, please? Thank you.

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

**GROS LOUIS:** Next I turn to Ted Miller for the Agenda Committee business.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much, Ken. I would like you to notice please that Herb Terry has joined us today as Parliamentarian of Council. Craig Bradley has had some minor surgery and he's just indisposed for a day or so and I'd like to thank Herb for coming to our rescue here.

**TERRY:** It's been a while.

**MILLER:** The election cycle for next year's Bloomington Faculty Council is underway. Many of you have received, I hope, your election ballots. They are due to be returned I think at latest at

the very end of this calendar year, I think December 31<sup>st</sup> is the date and I would certainly encourage you to encourage your colleagues to participate in this election. This is the nomination phase and of course this is the phase that is used to develop the final ballot which will be acted on in the spring semester. Please note that if you or your colleagues are going to nominate someone to serve on the Council, please try to ensure that those people actually will agree to serve on the Council if elected. One of the major problems that we have in our election process is that we have lots, all kinds of people are nominated and many of them have no interest whatsoever in serving on the faculty council. So it really is very very helpful if the people who get nominated, actually are willing to sever. So please try to ensure that the people you nominate are willing to serve and please try to encourage your colleagues to do the same thing.

I will say that the AAUP chapter on campus is in process of sending out some information pertaining to people who they have identified as being willing to serve in various capacities and that information should be reaching you by email shortly.

**HUNT:** Tomorrow.

**MILLER:** Tomorrow, Thank you. Kevin is the President of the AAUP chapter this year. An item coming from the faculty, the general meeting of the faculty, one of the resolutions that was acted on at the general meeting was resolution number 5. It only got a couple of minutes or so at that meeting and it was a resolution that referred an item to the Bloomington Faculty Council for consideration and I just wanted you to know that the Agenda Committee is in process of deciding how to deal with that particular resolution. I'm not sure exactly how that's going to turn out but we should be able to tell you something about that in January. I would say however, the general subject of that resolution, you may recall is the subject of the one university and its impact on the Bloomington campus over a fairly long period of time, an assessment of that impact. If anyone here on the Council is interested in that topic, as a first step, you might just send me or send Kelly a little email expressing that interest. We may end with an ad hoc group of some kind that pursues that subject. It would be useful to know which of members of the Council would be interested in such a discussion.

News on Joe Near; you'll recall that he has been hospitalized. He has now been released from the critical care unit in the hospital and he is now in a rehab unit and so he appears to have kind of weathered the immediate storm and will hopefully be back with us soon. Les Coyne has agreed to take Joe Near's seat for the spring semester. Joe I don't think will be back with us during the spring semester so Les will be filling in for him during that time. My recollection is that the election, in the election unit this last time was a nip and tuck race between Joe and Les and Joe actually won the election but Les was closing in right behind him and so he is now reaping the reward of his....

**COYNE:** All three votes, Ted.

[Laughter]

**MILLER:** I would like to recognize a couple of people who have been with us this semester who will not be here in the spring. Joss Marsh, first of all has been filling in for Alyce Miller.

Alyce will be back with us in the spring as I understand it and I'd like to thank you very much Joss for doing this in the fall semester. Eric Zeemering is the GPSO Moderator and his term ends at the end of this calendar year and so Eric will be leaving the Council and his replacement will be with us in the spring. And so Eric I'd like to thank you for your service during the time that you have been a member of the Council.

**ZEEMERING:** Thank you.

**MILLER:** And if I at any time during this period offended you over my parking comments I apologize deeply although I may take these matters up with your successor.

**ZEEMERING:** I'm sure they'll keep your feet to the fire on that.

**MILLER:** The Trustees are meeting, as many of you know, the Trustees are meeting at the end of this week on Thursday and Friday. They have reorganized their meeting quite substantially from the original version of the agenda. A number of sessions will be executive sessions and it seems clear that they are discussing with various people, issues surrounding the Special Meeting of the Bloomington Faculty and I'm not sure exactly what's going to happen with that but I thought it would be useful to at least recognize that they are going into action quickly given... in face of the requests that have been made of them by the Bloomington faculty. That is my report.

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

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you Ted. There are two things that I'd to bring to the attention of the Council. First is that the 10-year Reaccreditation of the campus will take place in 2006-2007 with the official visit of what's now called the Higher Learning Commission formerly North Central Association, will be coming here in March 2007. For places like Indiana, places where the Commission is confident that we have books in the library and that we have labs and we have curricular appropriate degrees being given etc., in addition to providing some basic material about the institution, we're given the option of having a focused visit and after conversations with the deans and the vice chancellors, we have decided that the focus visit is going to be on the theme of globalization. It gives us an opportunity to inform our peers, who will be on the visiting team, about the rich strengths the campus brings to research, teaching and service in the global arena and also to get their advice about other things we may need to do to meet the global challenges we'll be facing in the next several decades.

So the self-study will have two parts; one part is just basic documentation that the Higher Learning Commission requires. But the more interesting part is the self-study of globalization. This will be a faculty driven project, organized and chaired by Associate Dean of the Faculties and Professor of Education, Terry Mason, who is also on the Faculty Council, sitting here next to Jeanne. And his interests by the way are very much in education for democratic citizenship and global and international education. He's currently involved in several international partnership projects in Eastern Europe and directs the Center for Social Studies and International Education. He's in the process of putting together a cross-campus membership of a senior advisory board

and will likely have a number of sub-committees as the planning goes forward for the visit in March of 2007.

Examples of some of the questions we'll be exploring, and there's a longer list, I'll just read to you a couple of them: Is the excitement and energy of faculty research linked to questions of globalization reflected in opportunities available to our students; while we have significant new investments in service learning, and residential learning programs such as our Global Village, which Herb Terry directs, how do we judge the short and long term academic successes of such programs compared to more traditional academic studies. Some likely areas of subcommittee focus will be: internationalization of the arts, issues related to language learning, both foreign language for U.S. students and English as a second language for foreign students coming to IU; service learning and student exchanges in international context; teaching/curriculum and global learning goals; scholarships and research activity on globalization, area studies programs; IT support for research in a global context. There's a timeline for the various activities with next summer being the time for integrating the committees' research and writing the first draft of the self-study that, I don't know Terry if you plan to share with the Council at some point?

**MASON:** Yes.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes, do want to comment?

**MASON:** On the plan?

**GROS LOUIS:** On the self-study.

**MASON:** Just to say that as I help Jeanne in coordinating this activity, I think one of my primary purposes is to rise above the kind of traditional notion of accreditation that we often have which has to do with compliance and accountability, which is fine of course. But this is an opportunity for the university to actually conduct a research study about itself and to inform, to not only share with the university community and others about the great accomplishments that we have achieved here at IU in terms of international education but also look at the linkage between our international education efforts and the concept of globalization, which is different I think in many respects but related; and then most importantly that this be an exercise which informs a policy for the university and for the future. I think we have great resources here, there are probably things here that we can, as always, do better so I look at this as an opportunity to head in that direction, so to say.

**GROS LOUIS:** Much of the work in planning this by the way has been done by Terry and Jeanne Sept and others in her office and there's a longer list of questions that I think should be shared will all of you sometime in the second semester to see if you want to add to the questions. This concept of a focused visit is something that came about when Charlie Nelms and I were both Trustees of the Higher Learning Commission, as it's now called. North Central is the largest of the accrediting bodies in the country. It accredits over 900 institutions, which you can imagine the vast majority of those are community colleges, other kinds of institutions, very few Research I institutions. And our point at the time was that the research institutions really didn't benefit significantly from the traditional accreditation visit where the emphasis is on are the sufficient

financial resources, is the library sufficient, do you have clear goals and a curriculum, things of that sort. And the Research I institutions would benefit more from some kind of focus visit and so, for example, I've been on focused group to Michigan where its focus was on diversity and it was during the time but prior to the Supreme Court decision on the Michigan case and I've been on a focus visit to Iowa where its focus visit was its efforts in information technology. That will be very useful, as I think this will be for the campus as well. So I wanted to inform you of that.

Secondly today I had wanted to say, the plan was for me to give a report emerging from the Enrollment Committee that I appointed in the summer of 2004 at Sue Talbot's Academic Affairs Committee meeting Friday morning, but as Ted has indicated, that's one of the committees that won't be meeting. But I did want to inform the Council of what some of the high points I would have made and will at some point, or somebody else will make, from that report.

The committee membership, Don Hessler chaired the committee, Roland Cote who's now the interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services is on the committee, two deans, David Gallahue from HPER and Swamy from the college. Two representatives of this body Herb Terry and Bill Wheeler, Ed Rhodes from Academic Support and Diversity and people from my office, Neil Theobald and Doug Priest. So that was the committee membership.

Some of the things I was going to point out that I think would be of interest to you as well. The percent of the entering freshman class that are non-residents undergraduates has ranged between 34.3% to 35.6% over the last five years and it might surprise some of you that we are second by one percentage point to Michigan in the percentage of non-resident undergraduates in the Big Ten. The diversity of the incoming class has improved from a low of 3.7% African American in the fall of 2002 to this past fall we had 5.9%. Latino stayed fairly constant at about 2.1. International has gone up over the last four years from 2.5, 2.6, 2.8 and this year 3.3. This is at a time when many other Big Ten schools have been losing minority students and international student enrollment.

The SAT at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile is 990, fairly constant over the last five years. The SAT in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile is 1230, up by 10 points for the last two years and you'll see in a moment what the committee recommends as a goal, and I'll remind you of these figures when that time comes. Some of you may know that Indiana, because so many students take the SAT, has a very low average SAT. So the average SAT score in 2005 in the state of Indiana was 1012, which is 16 points below the national average. To put that in context, the average in Ohio of 2005 SAT takers was 1082. The average in Michigan was 1147. The average in Wisconsin was 1191 and the average in Illinois was 1200. So the 1012 Indiana average is below the national average and that creates quite a challenge.

Over the last five years there's been a steady increase, not huge, in the percent of the class ranking in the top 25%. There's a percent of the entering freshman class and interestingly quite a precipitous decline in the number of high schools reporting class rank. The schools simply don't consider that useful or valid and the expectation is this number will go down. It's gone from 87% five years ago to something like 64% this year, but a very steady decline and some of the best schools no longer report class rank.

The undergraduate tuition as a percent of our general fund revenue has gone from 35.1% in 2000 to 45.4% in 2006. The undergraduate tuition discount, that is the leveraging project at once called, has varied to a low of 9.1% in 2003 to a high of 11.5% for the coming year. From fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2006 campus general fund budget for financial aid has increased by more than 80% from 17 million to 30.8 million. This is now the general fund budget so it doesn't count any scholarships or any endowments that are held by schools or by the Foundation. Much of the financial aid has come as funds have gone to help high need Hoosier students. The goals of the committee are to have quality indicators comparable to those of Miami of Ohio, Purdue, Iowa, Ohio State and Michigan State. The following: increase the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of SAT scores to between 1020 and 1050 for entering first year students—I'll remind you again that fall 2005 the average score, sorry the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile was 990 so it's quite a jump to go to between 1020 and 1050, especially since the state average is 1012 or was 1012. Then to increase the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of SAT scores to between 1220 and 1260 and this year it was 1230 so to go between 1220 and 1260 is an increase. Then to increase to 60 to 70% of the entering class that rank in the top 25%, increase that number to 60 to 70%. The 2005 class was 56.8%, so the goal is as close to 70% as possible.

Also a goal, by the way this is a five-year plan, so the goals could change each year depending on factors, either external or internal, that might indicate that we need to alter the goals. Another goal is to increase the number of underrepresented minority students, to enroll a higher percentage of them than peer institutions in states with a comparable demographic profile, meaning Kentucky, Missouri, Wisconsin and Ohio. To try to reach a goal of 14 to 15% of the undergraduate enrollment being members of underrepresented minority groups. In the fall 2005 this figure was 10.2%, an increase of a half percent over fall 2004. So the goal over the next five years is to go from 10.2% to 14 to 15%.

Other goals are to increase the number of transfer students by 7% over the next five years, hold the number of international students constant—and this sounds like a simple goal but both because of visa difficulties that foreign students have and because Australia, New Zealand and European universities are being very aggressive, and Asia, in recruiting, so the deans have agreed to put up about a quarter of a million dollars from among budgeted income this fall to our first ever aggressive international recruiting meaning we will be hiring somebody whose goal, sole responsibility will be to recruit international students. That person will travel to various recruiting sites around the world. We've not done that ever before but it seemed to the committee and deans the only way to ensure that we would maintain the international enrollment at the figure that it is.

Some of you read about the Hoosier Link program. A program we think is unique in the nation that enables students to take courses at Ivy Tech in Bloomington and on the Bloomington campus at the same time and if they complete a certain number of hours at Ivy Tech with a GPA of 2.5 then they can enroll on the Bloomington campus as regular Bloomington students. We don't know of any place in the country where students can take courses simultaneously at a community college and at a four-year college. This will start next fall with approximately 150 students.

There's also a much more aggressive communications plan. By that I mean more visits to high schools. A new person been hired in the admissions office whose sole responsibility is to interact with Indiana high school counselors and over time hopefully to build a relationship with those counselors. And finally the committee recommended and Mike Sample has agreed that we will mount a state-wide Bloomington-only marketing initiative. I've already appointed the committee. It will have its first meeting; they had their first meeting this morning now that I think about it. The focus will be on the quality, the strengths and the unique benefits of enrolling on the Bloomington campus and also a stronger differentiation of Bloomington from other IU campuses, from Purdue-West Lafayette and from Ball State. So this will be the first time, and it speaks to the one university concern I think in that fifth resolution. First time that there will be a Bloomington only marketing initiative. The campus of course will pay for it but will get staff support from the office of Communications and Marketing. We want to indicate that, as I said, you'll hear more about this. This was part of what I would have given to Sue's committee on Friday morning but I wanted members of the Council to know that the Enrollment Committee's recommendations will do something that was discussed I think in a meeting earlier this fall and that is the goal to enhance the quality of the entering freshman class along with other things and also maintain access and increase diversity in the freshman class. That's all for my businesses so the next item is the Question and Comment period.

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

**GROS LOUIS:** Yeah, Ted.

**MILLER:** Can I start?

**GROS LOUIS:** Sure.

**MILLER:** I would like to begin the Question and Comment period. You'll note that it is scheduled for a somewhat longer period of time this time than normal. We thought that there may be comments that people would like to make about events of the past several weeks. We haven't really talked about any of that here in the Council. And we don't really have anything on the agenda suggesting that we are going to talk about it here in the Council.

I wanted to say something along the lines that I said at the UFC meeting last week, trying to explain my perspective on the resolutions that have been approved by the faculty. In particular I wanted to talk about the process by which this was done. The Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty basically recognizes two distinct ways in which the faculty can act, whether to approve a policy or to approve a resolution of one kind or another. Two distinct ways. In that sense the Constitution of the Faculty is quite similar to the constitution of the State of California. Many of us are familiar with what happens in California during the election period. They have recognized in their constitution a referendum mechanism where the citizens of the state can sign petitions and if a sufficient number of signatures are gathered the measure goes on the ballot and it's voted on by the citizens of the state. Of course California also has a state legislature which is in the business of debating and approving policies for the state.

The situation on the Bloomington campus is very similar to that. The Constitution recognizes what amounts to a referendum mechanism for the faculty. It also of course recognizes an elected representative body called the Bloomington Faculty Council and these are of course separate mechanisms. One of the things that I discovered as this situation developed was that I have a title that I didn't know that I had. I thought that my title was President of the Bloomington Faculty Council, but I discovered that I have another title which is President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington Faculty. Some of you may have received emails from me with that title used, President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington Faculty. That has nothing to do with the Faculty Council. It has to do with the faculty at-large.

So this particular situation developed under this referendum mechanism recognized in the Faculty Constitution. A petition was presented to me with a sufficient number of signatures. There were actually 131 signatures on the petition that I received, requesting that I call a general meeting of the Bloomington faculty. Such a petition only requires 50 signatures so there were more than enough signatures and so I as President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington faculty called a general meeting of the faculty which I presume many of you attended and the results of this have been as we all know. I would like to recognize Kelly Kish's, well without Kelly there probably never would have been any general meeting of the Bloomington faculty. I doubt that I could have organized this without her. She set it all up and it worked, from a procedural point of view it worked very well. We did what we had to do. The ultimate result is, as you know, and they have been communicated to the Trustees. The Trustees certainly understand what the results of this have been. So some of you may have been wondering why the Faculty Council hasn't been involved in this in some overt way. And really that is because this particular development came along the other path of faculty action and that really has nothing at all to do with the Faculty Council and its activities. I thought it would be useful for me to make that statement just to clarify. I know that many of you understand this but I just wanted to make a public statement my sense of what we've been doing and why it's been done in the way it's been done. As I say we've set aside some time here this afternoon for people who would like to make comments about this and I would invite you to do so.

**GROS LOUIS:** Floor is open for your comments and questions. Bill.

**WHEELER:** So I understand the procedures you described. I had a sense that even if the tornado warning had not intervened that the discussion would not have been as full as the faculty might have wanted. Nor were the issues as well framed for that meeting as they might have been. I think this was unrest by the subsequent circulation of email messages by the Chancellor. Thinking back to the previous occasion back in the 80s when there was a general faculty meeting, it was the case at that time that this Council did discuss the issues at several meetings preceding the campus faculty meeting and I think that as a result the campus faculty had a much clearer understanding of the issues that were being placed before it and even had there been a tornado interruption at that meeting I think the discussion still would have gone a long way and as well as it should. And so I'm wondering whether or not the Agenda Committee and the Constitution and Rules Committee might consider looking at the Constitution with the eye to making some type of revision that should an occasion like this arise in the future where there is a petition received from the faculty whether there might be an arrangement to call the general meeting shortly following the next Faculty Council meeting so that the Faculty Council meeting

in between might be devoted to a discussion of the issues and a clarification of the resolutions that might go before them.

We had the situation that there were in the notices that we received that there were five resolutions put forward but only two discussed as I recall or that I'm aware of at the ad hoc meeting. There were then five on the call that went out to the faculty and then two of those withdrawn at the beginning of the general faculty meeting and then we ran out of time for the last one because of the tornado alert. So I was just thinking about it that perhaps if the faculty wants to petition for a meeting they certainly deserve the meeting. At the same time there might be a role for this Council in between the reception of the petitions and the meeting itself to have a discussion to perhaps clarify and define the issues before they go to the campus. We have, as you know at the UFC, the Bloomington campus received criticism of the Bloomington faculty at the UFC meeting last week. We received criticism from the Indianapolis campus for the matter in which the Bloomington faculty has conducted itself. There have been criticisms in some newspapers that are saying the fact and I think that since it's possible, since the situation regarding the Chancellor and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs is yet to be resolved and it is unclear exactly how that will happen, there might be similar concerns in the near future. So I'm wondering perhaps the agenda committee and the constitution and rules committee might consider looking at that part of the constitution.

**MILLER:** Well this situation certainly has revealed some aspects of the Faculty Constitution that probably could be reconsidered. I mean there is the issue of who is eligible to vote in such a meeting for example which created a good bit of confusion around the campus. Lots of questions about the way the Constitution describes the faculty using terms that are not in common use at present and so I think there are a variety of aspects sort of illuminated by this particular series of events that could reasonably lead to a reconsideration of some of these points. I'm certainly not opposed to doing that.

**GROS LOUIS:** Luis?

**DAVILA:** I much agree with Bill in terms of trying to work toward modernizing and searching that more clarity as to how we proceed on this. So this has been the best of times and the worst of times, in so far as we have had a referendum of sorts that has allowed the full faculty at least an opportunity to participate. But it's also been the worst of times in that because of this confusion and this, if you like, incongruent way of proceeding we have had all kinds of tectonic aquarellist shifting of terrain where—and I attended both of the meetings, the earlier one and the one we had in the Auditorium and there were all kinds of outlandish statements made. On the one hand there were certain elements and if you like an imperative for one of the causes for this, if you like, upsetting of the faculty but the dean, part of all this very professionally and elegantly withdrew for whatever reasons. But there were plenty of opportunities for mischief throughout on the part of all of us faculty members, on the part of if you like, maybe unwittingly administrators and in part I think there are various reasons for that. The fact that we, if you like, don't question the bill of goods that's been proposed, things such as in the past 20 years we've been drifting, we've been going nowhere. Let those people, and it usually was a few that haven't been coming to hear the memorial resolutions every other week. They haven't been noticing where the library has been going, how the School of Music has been holding its own, how the sciences have been

prospering under very tight budgetary conditions. That and many other things were said just, if you like, to be argumentative and to show our displeasure at things not having gone our way for at least some of us. And I'm very much an admirer of Swamy but I think things definitely did get out of hand and we need to do something. Even by starting just to make sure that we do what the rest of the CIC does in terms of some sunshine on searches so that when we bring the three candidates or the two on campus we don't all of a sudden discover it as everybody else does it but for whatever reasons we don't do it, depending on what we pick and choose. Because right now the Academic Handbook allows administrators or the rest of us to decide whether we want to be private, confidential or even secretive about what we do. I don't think this is what Faculty Council has been all about and some of us have been here for many years and we just don't understand how we have evolved passively into situations such as this. So I blame in part the framework and procedures that are not perfect and they can't be but that we haven't, if you like, been more ready for situations such as this, that in a way has exploded in our face. So you have people running to the newspapers and, if you like, doing all kinds of electronic mailings and what not but it seems to be a small number. So then I can understand why, and there aren't any Black faces here on this Council at this time, why the Black faculty and staff and Latinos in general might agree that there's no racism involved in all but that there's something peculiar and that strange things seem to happen... [End of Side A on Tape 1]

...dilly dallying because any type of river that's stirred up and all is certainly good for fishing for certain people. But anyway as I say, I've been saddened by what has happened in these last two or three weeks in that we as a Research I and Teaching I university, service too, are not willing to say we want to be a Herman Wells type of university still, which is one of the points that came up. We're no longer Herman Well university. We need to get with it, keep on getting as techy as we can and follow all these consultant designs and be whatever it is that now makes us an acceptable Research I, Teaching I, Service I University. That's all I have to say.

**GROS LOUIS:** Other comments or questions?

**CARINI:** Well I guess I'm going to disagree with Bill's approach to what should have happened. Using the referendum analogy I think, when you propose a referendum in California, it doesn't go to the state legislature first. It goes to the voters. On the other hand the referendum does have a specific proposal. The wording has to be exactly what you're going to vote on when the petitions are signed and so I think if you could draw up a petition that had a specific proposal that indeed could go straight to the faculty as a whole and doesn't really need to pass through our hands. And in fact possibly it should be that way because the referendum process after all purposefully bypasses the legislature.

**MILLER:** Well, my recollection is that the Constitution describes the petition. It basically says that the subject of the general meeting of the faculty has to be related to the petition. It doesn't indicate now that the resolutions considered have to be part and parcel of the petition. That could be a...

**CARINI:** Mischief reducer.

**MILLER:** Yes, it could be.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes?

**BINGHAM:** Not to change the subject too much but I understand there was a scheduled meeting of the Chancellor's search committee that was cancelled recently and is it correct that the Board of Trustees essentially asked that there be a new Chancellor appointed by January 1, and so my question is, is it within the scope of our Constitution of faculty governance for someone to be appointed Chancellor, not in an acting capacity but in a permanent capacity who has not been through the faculty search and screen process including faculty representation?

**MILLER:** Was that a question to me?

**BINGHAM:** That was a question for someone. I have no clue as to the answer and you all seem much wiser than me.

**MILLER:** Well I imagine that the Trustees, if you take it from a strict point of view of principle, the Trustees could probably do anything they wanted to regarding an appointment of any university official. But my recollection is, actually I don't have a recollection just cause I wasn't in Bloomington at the time, but what I understand and others maybe know more about this could clarify, but I understand that around 1970 John Ryan was appointed President of the University without a search and screen and that in fact was the occasion of one of the rare general meetings of the faculty called to protest that particular act by the Trustees. So, it's something that has happened but well...

**GROS LOUIS:** The President was removed in January by the Board of Trustees and then they named John Ryan the President the next day. At the time he was Vice President for Regional Campuses and that led to, as Ted indicates it, a general meeting of the faculty in the Auditorium. Ryan indicated he understood the concern and asked that he be reviewed after 3 years in office, which did take place. That didn't satisfy many faculty at the time as I recall. So, to answer your question, yes the Trustees could do that if they wanted to do it. It would be very unusual and I think the Trustees felt that in...I was at the time Associate Dean of the College. I think the Trustees felt there was some kind of crisis at the university then. I'm not sure whether the Trustees believe there is a crisis at least in terms of the Chancellor at this time, but they may. It would be very unusual for them to do it I think. If they asked the advice of the UFC and BFC Agenda Committees and the meeting with the Alliance Steering Committee and the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus, my assumption would be the advice would be, don't do it. Is that right?

**MILLER:** I'm sure it would be. I had a conversation with Steve Ferguson maybe a week and a half ago and I told him there were rumors circulating on the campus that the Trustees were about to do what you suggest and he said that they were not.

**GROS LOUIS:** Kevin?

**HUNT:** Does anyone know what the schedule is for the Search and Screen Committee then? We've not got much time between now and January 1<sup>st</sup> if they just cancelled a meeting recently

and we have to identify candidates and have candidates visit the campus especially with break coming up. It seems like it's a very very tight schedule. What are their plans?

**GROS LOUIS:** Is anybody here on the Search Committee? [Laughter] I knew there would be somebody here.

**KRAVCHUK:** I can't speak for the committee and I have not discussed this with the chair. I have no idea why the meeting last week was cancelled. I was surprised.

**GROS LOUIS:** My understanding is that Trevor has indicated to the President that the time table is not realistic.

**KRAVCHUK:** And the President has indicated to the committee that he believes the time table is not realistic.

**GROS LOUIS:** Right.

**HUNT:** Have the Trustees responded that they think the time table is realistic?

**KNOST:** They haven't met since that statement was made. I mean the Trustees aren't meeting this week and so we'll certainly know more after this week.

**MILLER:** It is true, I believe, that when the Trustees made their January 1<sup>st</sup> statement, that was prior to all of this that we have seen. That was on the day after, I believe, the first meeting on the campus, that Thursday night meeting. They made their statement on that Friday morning I think. A lot of things have happened since then and I would expect they're certainly aware of all these things and they must be aware that this has some implications for what we're trying to do in terms of hiring a Chancellor.

**KRAVCHUK:** And Trustee Shoulders is a member of the search committee so he's intimately aware of the situation.

**GROS LOUIS:** Kevin?

**HUNT:** When President Herbert was here, he was asked if the same level of confidentiality would be attempted with the new search and he said yes. The Agenda Committee sent a resolution to the Search and Screen Committee saying that we thought that if it was a necessity that there be secrecy with the selection of the candidates up to the time that the finalists were named then certainly at the time of the three finalists were named and campus visits were planned that then there should no longer be a level of secrecy and perhaps the difficulties that we've had with the last search would have been avoided if we had known the names of the three candidates before they visited with some of the difficulties that we had. We may have had different candidates but we certainly had a chance—the three candidates instead of only one by the time campus visits were finished. I wonder if the Search and Screen Committee has any sense of whether this resolution that they were sent, that I understand was accepted by the Search

and Screen Committee, if they will be allowed to proceed in that manner that Committee once the finalists are named that then the names will be public.

**KRAVCHUK:** Again, I can't speak for the committee. I can only speak as a member of the committee and I prefer not to sort of discuss too openly what the dynamic is on the committee itself. The committee is functioning quite well, I can assure you that. We've gotten to know each other really well. The notion that a committee of 23 people cannot function, as diverse and representing as many constituencies if you will on campus as it does is simply not true. It functions quite well. But I would say with respect to this particular letter from the Agenda Committee that the committee accepted it without dissent and it communicated it to President Herbert. But that is all that I know.

**GROS LOUIS:** Jeanne?

**SEPT:** I just wanted to return briefly to the issues of campus climate that Luis referred to as well and just to sort of say that in the swirls of sort of communications, confusion and sort of mixed pain and frustration that we all heard the last few weeks, I think there are... I'm hoping we can find real opportunities maybe to engage in more thoughtful dialogue on campus about the issues of racial tension in particular and sort of missed opportunities and expectations. I've been trying to talk to as many colleagues as I can over the last few weeks to try and get a sense of peoples feelings and ideas and I just want to say that I'd invite any suggestions any of you have. I think it would be wonderful for the Dean of Faculties office to work in conjunction with the Bloomington Faculty Council to try and develop a thoughtful process that could emerge out of this dialogue that could maybe help us become more aware of where we are and where we want to go and what we want to be proud of on this campus in terms of, not just a sense of faculty ownership of the campus but also I know our students are very confused about some of the accusations and certain missed opportunities for communication and engagement. I just wanted to say that and I've been speaking to the associate deans about it and if any of you have suggestions or ideas of what we might do as a campus to try and make sure this type of situation doesn't happen again, I would appreciate your ideas and thoughts.

**DAVILA:** May I ask a question if I could of the Search Committee members? First of all, forgive my ignorance, how many, what we used to call extra Bloomington campus members are on the Search Committee?

**KRAVCHUK:** I would have to go down the roster.

**DAVILA:** But we do have some, is that correct?

**KRAVCHUK:** Yeah there are some, but they have functioned conscientiously on the committee and have to their credit indicated quite clearly that this selection, despite the combination of the roles, that the selection of the successful candidate will impact Bloomington more than the other campuses. They have been, I think suitably deferential without surrendering their full rights and responsibilities as members of the committee, appropriately deferential to the Bloomington faculty members of the committee.

**DAVILA:** Because I think one of the reasons why some people are reeling is that there's a suspicion, maybe wrongly so, that the beyond-Bloomington campus administrations have some sort of a veto on who might be our Chancellor and our Vice President. I don't want to inquire beyond the proper limits of the Search Committee but it's something that's been in the grapevine that I have heard and possibly it's just imaginings but it has caused frustration and therefore I'm one, and I think it's on the record that I've opposed rhetoric such as calling ourselves the flagship campus and all. Because I knew that it would breed a certain type of animosity within the system that we work with. But we have been asserting that prerogative so to speak, which is a way of saying, that's just the objective correlative, its facts, truth but I've always felt we needn't rub it in. So, that's why I ask about the extra-Bloomington campuses and how much say they're having on whom we should have as our Chancellor. I don't know that you can answer that...

**KRAVCHUK:** It has not been out of line.

**GROS LOUIS:** I think Bob is correct. It's similar to, you know search committees for Bloomington deans always have a couple of members from another school. But those other members really defer to the faculty from the school that's looking for a dean. I think the saying is true of the other campus representatives they're going to defer to Bloomington, even though they're going to maintain their rights as members of the committee, but they know this is primarily a Bloomington position.

**DAVILA:** That's good to know, because it's been, I think part of this visceral reaction that we've had this ignorance.

**KRAVCHUK:** Don't get me wrong there's a lot of discussion, there's a lot of interplay among the members on the committee. But when the committee has acted, it has acted unanimously.

**GROS LOUIS:** Other questions or comments on the committee or the meeting with the Trustees this week? Okay, if not we'll move to the next item on the agenda which is the general education requirements that you have at your place...

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6: GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAUREATE DEGREE AT IU BLOOMINGTON**

**GROS LOUIS:** He's going to start this discussion too! And then it goes over to Bill or John?

**MILLER:** Yes. I would like to compliment Bill and John initially here, for preparing what I think is a very fine document for our consideration today. Very nice general stuff about general education, sort of recounting our rather checkered history as we have tried to deal with this issue over the years, and then providing us with a proposal for a general education program that if I understand it correctly would be a model program that the various academic units would consider as they develop a general education component in their baccalaureates. I think the document is a very nice document.

I would just like to make a couple of preliminary comments. The University Faculty Council had a very successful, I think, discussion of this topic a week ago. I was very uncertain going into

that, exactly what was going to happen but I thought it was a very useful discussion and I think it was clear in the aftermath of that, there really is an interest in the faculty across the various campuses of Indiana University in this topic of general education. It certainly is true that there are active efforts on some of the campuses, current efforts, to develop a campus-level general education program and there seemed to be a good bit of interest in listening to other people in terms of listening to alternate ideas and so forth. So I was quite heartened by that meeting. Prior to that meeting I was ready to cash in my general education chips actually. I just really didn't see that there was much that was going to come out of this but I now think that we may have an opportunity to do something that maybe means something to the university. I hope that will happen.

I just want to point out one of the things that Bill has in the document is on the very first page in italics. Sort of a pre-statement if you will. I would really call your attention to this particular statement because it really does focus on one of very important issues that confronts us here. That is who actually has the authority, who should have the authority to develop a general education curriculum. One of the things that has become clear to me is that if you look at universities across the country, there are very different models in place in terms of this sort of authority over general education. Indiana University, I believe represents one of the polar extremes of what is out there and basically we have put this authority into the hands of each school faculty. And so every school, with every one of their degree programs is making their own decisions about the nature of general education and this has been going on for years and years and years and years and years and so what we have in place right now is a, well some people think that there's a lot of commonality across these various general education ideas and that may be so. But still, the commonality has developed not because anybody, any Chancellor made it develop. It's because that's the way the faculty wanted to do it and it just kind of serendipitously turned out to be some commonality. We have set in place, in my view, we've set in place a process related to general education that really complicates our lives from many points of view, particularly from the point of view of dealing with transfer students. It's very clear to me that this very individualistic approach sort of atomized approach to developing general education has created lots of problems for us and in many ways is responsible for a lot of the bad press that we've gotten over 10, 15 years, people complaining about how we deal with people who try to transfer to Bloomington.

Well in any event, I think that that is a very important aspect for us to recognize that this is what we're dealing with here. It's possible that we could change the way we deal with it. That is to say, we could give the authority for general education to the campus faculty. Some of our campuses actually have done that. We have not done that in Bloomington. We could give the authority to the university faculty. Those are things that could be done. The proposal in front of you of course doesn't do that, but I think it's very important as we go into this to recognize sort of the context of what we're dealing with and also to recognize some of the problems that are inherent in the approach that we now have because those are problems that ultimately we're going to have to confront, no matter how this turns out. Anyway, I would like to thank Bill and John again, so please do whatever it is you're prepared to do.

**WHEELER:** Thank you. I want to thank the Agenda Committee for finding this...do I need to stand up or can I do it here? On behalf of John, myself and the Educational Policies Committee,

I'd like to thank the Agenda Committee for finding time for us to have this discussion. We've been looking forward to it for a long time. As Ted said, it was a fruitful discussion at the UFC last week, we hope for a similarly fruitful discussion today. You have before you the proposal. It speaks largely for itself. I had the privilege of being on this council when this council adopted the current policy in 1981. Other members of the Council, I know that Dick Barr I think was on the council at that time, Herb Terry, perhaps Gerald Marker and certainly Chancellor Gros Louis was in the chair at the time we talked about that. 24 years have passed. Things have changed during that time and I think it's appropriate for us to come back and look at general education.

We're looking at general education because we're concerned for our students. Our students are one of our top priorities, if not our top priority for all of us. We are very concerned for their future and for their education and so I think it's appropriate from time to time to come back and visit the nature of the general education we're trying to provide for the students. I would suggest that it's important for us to try to come to a coherent statement of the campuses view of these things. It's important for the students, it's important for their parents. It's important for us. I think this will help guide us both in our educational efforts over the next few years. I think it has a role to play in our efforts to improve the quality of the undergraduate student body. If we look at other campuses of Indiana University, if we look at other universities and colleges within the state they are highlighting in their recruiting efforts the quality of their undergraduate or their general education programs as one of the reasons that one should attend those universities. It's important for us. Years ago we were known in this state as the place to go if you wanted a liberal arts education. My wife came to this campus, decades ago because she wanted a liberal arts education and Indiana University Bloomington was known as the place to go in the state for that. I think that we need to...perhaps that's not so clear anymore in the minds of the citizens of this state and that we need to address that and reestablish ourselves as the leading liberal arts institution in the state.

As you know John and I are not of one mind, you know that from what he said a few minutes ago. So you can be assured that this proposal before you represents the give and take of the Educational Policies Committee and it is before you for your consideration. I would for just a moment address perhaps a few issues that \_\_\_\_ from this proposal that you've received from last spring from University Faculty Council's Educational Policies Committee. I think there are three things I would direct your attention to. One of them has to do with the issue of requiring sciences. John has done an analysis of the \_\_\_\_ capacity of our campus and will speak to that and how we've modified the language to that.

There's been concern on the part of several schools about the issue requiring a C- for courses that were counted toward general education. There are a range of views on these. Some people say a C- is too low and we should be requiring a higher grade for that if you really want students to know something. Other people take the point of view that the C- is too high that if we required anything above a D- then you will actually force some of the students to study on the campus while \_\_\_\_ being the case. [Laughter]

The point I would make there is that the C- was included in the UFC proposal as providing an assessment plan for general education which would not require the institution of additional testing procedures or other administrative arrangements that we would have to undertake at some

cost. If we look at the other campuses of Indiana University, if you were in recent years, worked on their general education policy and turned into, I too had reservations about the flagship thing and in terms of general education, we're not the flagship of the Indiana University system, we're the troller of bringing up the rear. The other campuses, especially South Bend, IUPUI, Southeast and Fort Wayne have in the last decade done wonderful work on general education programs and \_\_\_\_\_. The C- was in there for the sake of the Higher Learning Commission that requires that every campus in the university not only have a general education program but have an assessment mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of this program. The other campuses have had to, at some cost, try and find procedures. When this campus was last reviewed, the College of Arts and Sciences proposed a comprehensive collection of senior exams or tests that seniors would take to demonstrate they had learned, or had achieved \_\_\_\_\_. That has not succeeded and so the C- issue is in there for the sake of providing a means of assessment that was integral to students work in their courses. So this new proposal says that if the school has an assessment mechanism or assessment plan in place then they do not have to concern themselves with that. It was simply a proposal that was there as one type of assessment mechanism that could be used. Let me ask John to speak to the issue of the lab, science lab.

**CARINI:** So thanks, Bill. So, as much as a physicist, as much as I'd love everybody to be required to take a lab science course, I think we have to step back and ask, "what would the cost be?" I think that's the one part of this proposal that would really cost some serious money. That has been one of the concerns expressed by the college and other people as well.

So first of all what I tried to do is to figure out what the scope of the problem was. So I tried to identify how many seats are there that could be considered introductory courses that have a lab component. And so it turns out you can identify those really quickly just by finding the courses that require a lab fee, which is now collected in many departments for particular courses, and then out of that list I selected 100 level and 200 level courses that didn't have extensive registration restrictions. So I found about 9,000 places in lab sections for the entire academic year, last fall, this spring and last summer. And so of course we have about 7,000 new students each year. So it sounds like we have plenty of seats, but of course many of those seats are occupied by the same person. So somebody in biology for instance might take three or four of those introductory courses. So I figured about half of the places that are available might be open to somebody who is not a major in that particular science area, so that's about 4,800 places. So you can see we would need to add something on the order of 3,000 lab seats. And a typical lab section, at least in Physics, is 24 and so we're talking about adding a hundred some sections per year.

So then you might ask, well are science departments willing to take on this responsibility because these are new courses that we're talking about in some cases, or new sections. So each section of course is typically taught by an Associate Instructor. You need a lab to hold it and you need equipment typically for those computers and other lab equipment and so it's a substantial allocation of new resources, both in people space and equipment support. So on the other hand though I think some departments are clearly in a position to expand their offerings in this area. My own department in Physics, we have several general education courses that currently don't have labs that could easily add them. And I'm talking about courses with enrollments on the order of 100 or so. And I could think of a new course where I could add a couple hundred more

places per year. Astronomy also shares our building. They teach an extensive range of introductory science courses, about 800 students a year. None of them have labs and it's not because they don't want to offer them, it's because they don't have the space, or the graduate student AIs or the faculty to supervise those AIs even if they had them. At least in those two departments there's some willingness to teach these new courses and you can see that there could be many other departments that would be willing to take them up as well.

So whatever the fact that goes against requiring it is, first of all the need is obviously greatest for lab physicians for none science majors and so departments of course would be putting many of their available resources into new courses for students that are not in their own programs, they'll be willing to do that. All of these courses are resource intensive as I've already said. As some people know, there's been very little new teaching space built on campus lately and there's been even less, I think, teaching lab space added to campus for quite a while; years, possibly decades and during that same time student undergraduate population has grown considerably. Anyway, so just to make things more specific I talked to the Chair of the Astronomy, Katy Pilachowski. She's actually talked to her faculty and actually they're more enthusiastic than I thought about possibly taking something like this on. But she points out where there are 800 students per year; they need approximately 18 lab sections per week. They would have to increase the size of the department possibly 50 percent to take on that new responsibility. So, that's new AIs, new faculty to supervise those AIs in their doctoral research and teaching space and office space. And they are already at their capacity, up in the 30 point quote or less. In fact, in Physics of adding a few hundred labs is considerably less because we have some lab space to teach lab courses. Now we can imagine squeezing some people in but there's a hundred or so. So, you could say well it sounds like its doable except for the space issue and I guess if somebody is willing to throw in \$40 million to renovate Swain Hall West we're all set. We're in a very good position. In fact it's actually in the future inventory buildings to be renovated but... I'm just saying that you can see that main limitation at the moment is probably space, clearly.

**MILLER:** Thank you Bill and John. So I guess the floor is open for comments about this proposal.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes

**PRYOR:** I guess everything you said is very practical but it doesn't at all touch on the pedagogical benefits of requiring a science course. And on behalf of the physical scientist within Geography, we'll accommodate all students that you send us. I feel it's not very persuasive to me to say this is difficult from a practical point of view because I think that we do need to educate the next generation.

**CARINI:** Well I agree and I would disagree, say that and probably people in the room would agree but there is that practical side. We're talking about a substantial investment in an area that departments may not consider vital for their survival in the future. I mean, in some ways its vital but in other ways it doesn't address their immediate needs for what research space and...

**WHEELER:** If I may respond just momentarily that the result of John's analysis there was the insertion of 2 words. It's not that we're taking up the call for physical sciences but if you look on

the top of, I guess its going to be page 8, in item 3(i) which is the one that refers to the physical sciences. The difference is the insertion of 2 words; at the end of the first line, the word “whenever” and in the next line “possible”, so that it now says that they need to take at least 5 credit hours in physical life sciences including whenever possible. What is new is including “whenever possible”, at least one laboratory of field experience or observational course. And so it wasn’t dimensioning that there was a need for education in the physical life sciences although rather simply trying to be realistic that while the ideal would be that everyone should have a laboratory or field experience or an observational course, that we may not be able to do that. Speaking personally in a time when one of the pressing debates outside the university is the issue of the theory of evolution versus intelligent design and that I think it is vital personally that every graduate of Indiana University has an experimental experience so that they understand the nature of science and its empirical basis. And so for me at least that informs one of the reasons why I feel strongly that we should, if at all possible provide a laboratory, observational or field experience course for all of our students. It was \_\_\_ that we’re unable to do that. I think physical reasons I think is something that I hope that budgetary side and the physical plant side of the university can consider. If one looks back to the 50s and 60s, we did have adequate laboratory space and I believe it’s the growth of the campus, although since the 70s with the limitation of the number of \_\_\_ physical facilities that prevents us from meeting that vital need.

**GROS LOUIS:** Sarita.

**SONI:** I will support what Bill has just said. Unless we put in there it won’t happen. So those two words, “wherever possible” allows us to move forward with a notion that we keep that in mind, that we do need to provide these sometime. But let’s make sure that those 2 words don’t disappear and we continue to do lectures rather than laboratory exercises as well in the sciences. So I support it.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yeah, Maxine.

**WATSON:** I think there are also alternatives that we need to think about as alternative ways of educating our students in more so that we’re thinking that the only way to teach science is through traditional labs and lab exercises whereas there are interesting computer mechanisms and other types of learning that wouldn’t involve the future investment in physical facilities. Faculty we need to be more creative in how we deliver it. So I think that learning and critical thinking could come about in multiple ways. Some may be more realistic than others and the technology side may help so much too.

**GROS LOUIS:** David

**MACKAY:** I’m certainly in favor of expanding the student’s laboratory experiences but there’s a statement on the second page that I have a little bit of difficulty with. It’s in the paragraph in the middle beginning “undergraduate education at Indiana University”, and proceeding to the end it says that Indiana University degree ought to be responsive to the two great educational demands of the twenty-first century, namely, the need for a global perspective in all fields of learning and the need among the state, national, and global citizenry for the capacity to evaluate the technical, political, social, and ethical implications of scientific knowledge and to distinguish

between dogma and empirically tested scientific knowledge. But in the social sciences, opinion and empiricism are often intertwined and the boundaries between well confirmed scientific theories, claims and knowledge, are very fluid and I would suggest both ways of a friendly amendment that the wording at the end of the second demand be changed to “the need among state, national and global citizenry for critical thinking that is able to sift evidence and challenge received views”.

**WHEELER:** So are I would kindly suggest that we would welcome all suggestions. We’re not anticipating that today we’re going to be getting into a minimum process on this. So we welcome all suggestions for language and modifications and things like that. This is more of a discussion than an actual data. I would not anticipate that this would be an action item. I think there’s a need for a broad discussion.

**MACKAY:**

**WHEELER:**

**GROS LOUIS:** So David’s sentence is suggestion to\_\_

**WHEELER:** And I’m counting on \_\_ for the transcript. Send those suggestions and we will definitely read the transcript and anyone who has suggestions about this by all means please send them to John and me. This proposal is going to be discussed by the Campus Commitment Committee. I’m sure it will be discussed by, received for the discussion by the school policies committee and the school curriculum committee. There’s a need for an involved discussion of this before we move forward.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thanks Bill. Gary.

**WIGGINS:** I was very happy to see that the computer and information technology and such was added in section 2(b)(v) and as you know it disappeared from some of the earlier drafts that have been talked about in the last year or so. But I think \_\_\_from 2(b)(vi). This portion deals with professionalism, should be in a different school and of course \_\_\_ technology/ computer science/ informatics. I don’t know if you can tell us what the rationale is for that?

**WHEELER:** There was... I think a desire for breadth that is to say that the hope would be that if for example a student in the college were to take a course in Informatics for item number 6, that they would go ahead and take another course in one of the professional schools; business, education, music, HPER. There was a sense that... we’re a remarkable campus. We have an extraordinarily strong College of Arts and Sciences, we have an exceptionally strong professional schools and the current information, the Higher Learning Commission all point out that the general education plan should take into account the streaks of your campuses and the nature of your student body. And so one of the factors that influenced the language was the sense that we want to give people a strong rounding in the liberal arts and we also want them to experience the breadth of the outstanding offerings of the campus. So that was the reason for saying that, you know, that’s it; the desire to increase breadth.

**WIGGINS:** It seems that if there really is that kind of desire, that the restriction should be more restrictive. That we should require the students to take that professional course outside their major area, whatever that might be. In other words, why should an Informatics student who's chosen a career in Informatics not be allowed to take a professional course within the school of informatics but a math major who's chosen to be in professional mathematics would be allowed to take a professional course that might be

[tape 1 side B ended]

**WHEELER:**

**WIGGINS:** [Tape 2, Side A starts]...trying to do not to single out particular schools.

**GROS LOUIS:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I, maybe following up on this, looking at 6 again, the professional area. I'm not sure what departments within the College of Arts & Sciences you had in mind as professional departments but you may have had mine in mind. And as a friendly-type of amendment I would suggest you think about saying that they should take one course in a professional school or a professional course within the College. In the sense of my department there is a mixture of courses that you could regard as professional or not; you wouldn't want the student to take our sort-of professional courses and say ah-ha I've fulfilled this. And I suspect mathematics and other departments could offer or may offer courses that talk about the professional; being a mathematician or being a historian, whatever.

**WHEELER:** Well I certainly can't speak to other departments other than my own. Certainly in my mind there were three departments; telecommunications, speech and hearing sciences, and apparel merchandising. In the earlier draft inside the committee those departments were explicitly mentioned. At this point since it will be up to the schools to implement this it was thought that it was better to leave, to be less specific and leave it to the schools, given their knowledge of their own situations, to clarify that. So I, in particular to leave it to the College, to specify which...

**TERRY:** I can see both sides of that.

**WHEELER:** ...what things, what the situation is about.

**TERRY:** The other things I'd like to say is that I've been here for a long time and I've been through these debates before and I'd like to return to Ted's point at the beginning. I think this is what you can do if you adhere to the type of structure that we now have where the schools have the authority to do this. But as somebody who now directs a major project that involves lots of undergraduates, many of whom enter this place exploratory or undecided, I think there is merit to a more general education core that could be easily taken by an exploratory student that would transfer well eventually among the various units of this campus. To go back four presidents, we're one campus without an obvious front-door right now. And I think having dealt more with undergraduates in the last several years than I had previously, they need, they would benefit

from, this campus getting together and agreeing upon something more common across all of our schools. But the only way to do that is to amend the Constitution. So unless that happens, you know I have watched many committees struggle with this and I think \_\_ this document has flexibility for the various schools and they can make something work with that but it will not improve the ease of student progress through here and if anything I suspect it will. I mean we haven't asked if PeopleSoft can do it but it will turn advising a lot more and into a process of what can I take that can fulfill a requirement rather than what should I take to become...

**WHEELER:** If I could speak for a moment there is one aspect that John and I and my conversations with Maynard Thompson have focused on this past week and that is to say that each time we discussed this we are always reminded by the representative from the University Division that there are problems when students transfer from one school to another or from one intended major to another. That some of the courses that they were taking for their general education in their first choice were not acceptable for general education in their second choice. I want to suggest that this is perhaps an indication of what this document intends to say of what is general education. It may not be appropriate to put forward a document which specifies what is not general education. That is to say that each school has tended to interpret the word general in its own context; that the general education requirements of the various schools are that part of those schools' requirements which are not specialized requirements. And so general has been by default that which wasn't in the major within the school and all schools have their own majors; over in Education, secondary education, specializations inside business, specializations inside SPEA. And one of the things that we might want to consider is a set of guidelines about what people could not call general education because they are really general-professional, not general education in the broad sense of the word but they are general only within the context of that profession and they really are outside that school professional courses. And that this might ease the situation at least in regards to the number of complaints we receive because then a student would not be under the misimpression that something was of a general education nature if it really was more of a specialized course. Particularly to the extent that a course is not acceptable by several schools for general education it's an indication that that course is, even if in that school it might be considered general education, it's not general education from the perspective of the campus. So it might be that part of the solution to all of the complaints that we've heard over the years is to ask the schools to be perhaps a little more circumspect in their use of the word general education within their own degree programs, that they really should try to keep the word general education for those things which the campus as a whole agrees are general and find perhaps another phrase or another word to use to describe those things which are professional even though not specialized to a major.

**MILLER:** Could I just in response to this, Herb, I will say that this material on the front page in italics represents Bill's interpretation of the Constitution of the Faculty. Other people don't see this as the only way one could interpret the Constitution. It isn't clear you'd need to change the Constitution to come to some different conclusion that Bill's come to here. But this certainly does reflect the practice over many years in Indiana University. I mean the school faculties have indeed been the faculties that have been—that's where the general education decisions have been made. Whether it's mandated by the Constitution or not is a matter of debate I would say.

The other thing I would say about this is, in a related point, if you go to page 8, the very final

sentence of Section 2, the very final sentence which refers to courses being in the College of Arts & Sciences, it seems to me actually is a statement in this document that really is taking the authority to decide which courses would count for general education out of the hands of the school faculties. You basically are at a campus level saying that well you can choose whatever you want but you've got to choose College courses. And of course, our current situation today is that most of the general education courses I think in our curricula are College courses across all the schools but really the authority as expressed by Bill here doesn't preclude the fact that the faculty in a particular school could decide to satisfy general education, a general education requirement, from courses taken across a broad range of the schools of the campus. I mean there's really nothing to prevent that from happening although this particular statement would prevent it and it seems to me it actually is a somewhat problematic statement given the sort of the constitutional interpretation that this is premised on.

**GROS LOUIS:** It does seem though that (e) speaks to that point, (e) towards the end near the footnotes where it says "Although the names used for the categories of courses are usually associated with groups of disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences this does not mean that the courses used for those requirements have to be within the College of Arts and Sciences."

**MILLER:** Well, I mean, there is a little bit of flexibility in this statement on page eight but it really does say that most of these courses should be College courses.

**GROS LOUIS:** Right. Bob and then John?

**KRAVCHUK:** Ken there's an issue here that we've touched on only tangentially but I think it bears discussion at some point and that is the issue of transferability. There have been times when I've said in this body that there are times when we operate as a campus and as individual schools within that campus. There are times when we have to operate as a university, but we also need to be cognizant of what's coming down the pike and that is the great desire on the part of the General Assembly that transferability will also include the Ivy Tech State Colleges. And it seems to me that as we go forward to discuss gen ed requirements we need to keep in mind that the legislation is a very blunt instrument and the legislature has been very very clear in their desire that we work something out in the long run. Ivy Tech is still at such an early stage of its own evolution and development that if we work to, as a university, to put up a set of gen ed requirements that they could understand and also begin to incorporate into their own planning for curriculum so that they could bring them up to standards that could meet our requirements that this would ease the transferability of Ivy Tech students with a 2-year degree to our 4-year degree programs.

**GROS LOUIS:** Very good point. John?

**CARINI:** I just want to point out that this is supposed to represent kind of a minimal framework and not restrict what schools can add to their own general education requirements and in fact it mandates fewer hours than are in our current policy, which is 40 hours, 9 hours in each of the sciences, humanities, and social sciences. So this is requiring less but I think schools can have more freedom. I think having a framework; a minimal framework will help someone in the transfer process.

**GROS LOUIS:** Dick?

**CARR:** Having run through this problem a few years ago when I was in the earlier series of elections to this Council and having been shot down completely from a proposal for general education I have to applaud the approach that the EPC has taken in this particular document with the emphasis very simply of giving to the schools an ability to elaborate upon general principles which are clearly enumerated. I think this might be the way to go. You may not recall that the last time the question of general education came up it was shot down mainly by the professional schools who felt the College of Arts and Sciences was simply trying to bolster its enrollment and felt the whole thing was sort of unfair. This moves around that objection and quite rightly places the decision within the school itself. But this leads me to a question for either Bill or John. First of all, I don't quite understand the Section (e) that Ken just read or the next sentence after the portion that he just read and the necessity that you voice earlier of having the first four sections taken in the College. I see this as a type of contradiction but you can explain it undoubtedly. And the second question I have on this is the following: perhaps one of the structure that your committee may have talked about. This is an invitation to the faculty to develop courses meeting these guidelines that could be offered appropriately in any unit. Now I can, well, let's say I cannot be allowed to teach calculus in French and therefore appeal to a certain segment and show off my knowledge of French. Now is there some sort of group or committee, or whatever it may be, that you saw accepting such a course to meet the requirement you have in mathematics. Is there an oversight committee for this? Do you envision any sort of structure for the courses which are appropriate and accepted that students can sign up for and be reasonably assured that they would count?

**GROS LOUIS:** One possibility, I'll give a quick answer, nothing personal on your example, but it's conceivable that the mathematics department might file a remonstrance if you were teaching calculus in French...

**CARR:** Especially if they knew my mathematical ability!

**GROS LOUIS:** And then it would go the Campus Curriculum Committee that David Nordloh chairs. So there have been instances where a school, even outside of gen ed, has offered a course that another school has said this really overlaps with our course and it goes to the Curriculum Committee for adjudication.

**CARR:** This is a little bit different insofar as it seems to me that there will be a need for the schools to introduce courses that will meet specific requirements. At least I see this as an invitation to the schools to open those curricular avenues and I was just wondering if you had seen any way in which this could be controlled that such and such a course. Well we're talking about transferability and transferability between schools, if an undergraduate changes his mind and decides to major in a different school you have the same question of transferability. Is there any oversight here? Have you thought of a structure where by this is reviewed?

**WHEELER:** So that's item (f) actually. And it's this body, the Faculty Council which is the oversight committee for the following reasons. The last effort on general education was not shot

down by the professional schools it was shot down by the College; that was the COUGAR proposal and the College objected to it on the grounds that decisions would in fact be made, decisions about which courses outside the College would satisfy the different categories, that decisions on non-College courses would be made by the Campus Curriculum Committee and the College objected that the Campus Curriculum Committee is a one-school one-vote environment and that this was unacceptable from the College's point of view that it would have only one vote in matters that were so vital to the College's curriculum. That is, to its distribution requirements. And yet on the other hand the other schools objected that somehow the College has a veto over their courses. The College has at times taken the position that historically the College is the school that has been given as part of its mission, the delivery of general education. The sentence that has been, to which attention was directed calling upon one or all but one, that sentence is the result of some negotiations with the College on exactly this matter. The College has taken the position that 12 out of 12 should be in the College. The professional schools have taken the position that that is unacceptable. Our President Pro Tempore of the Faculty, Ted Miller, has been a forceful spokesman of the School of SPEA in pointing out that in the opinion of the school of SPEA that their government course, introduction to government, is as genuine a social science course as any introductory course offered by the department of political science and that for the College to exercise a veto also is inappropriate.

So we have this tension as to how things should be done and what this proposal proposes is that as Ted indicated, there are various ways of interpreting the Constitution. I think the Constitution indicates that in the first instance that authority over academic matters including curriculum is vested in the faculty of the university, system-wide. And the university Constitution delegates that authority to campus faculties while retaining for itself the authority over matters that transcend a single campus. And then our campus constitution, by in the University Faculty Constitution, provides for a further delegation of campus authority over academic matters to the schools to the extent that things are within the school. But at the same time it reserves for the campus faculty authority over academic matters that transcend a single school and this is the issue to which Ted was speaking that one can interpret the faculty constitution in saying that on matters of general education which span all the schools on the campus that authority is vested in the campus faculty to make the final decision on issues of a curricular in nature.

The Constitution further provides that the Faculty Council shall exercise the authority of the campus faculty in matters where the campus faculty has authority. So the direction of this proposal is to acknowledge that argument and say in the last resort it is the campus faculty and acting on their behalf it's the Faculty Council that should make decisions if there is a difference between the schools. That should be a last resort that in the first instance authority should be exercised by the schools who have the best knowledge of their circumstances. And that's why in this situation that this document proposes that at the campus level the appropriate way to proceed is to see if we can reach some sense of our norms and our values and then ask the schools to implement that on their own. It envisions each school making its own assessment of its courses, to trust our colleagues to act in good faith, to make sound judgments on these things. I myself am comfortable with that. I believe that other schools, other than the College, will make sound decisions as to the educational merits of their courses. And I trust the SPEA faculty to make sound decisions on which of their courses would be genuinely social science courses.

And so this document proposes then that each school in the first instance shall evaluate its own courses and say which ones are in their minds are the ones that meet the goals set out for general education courses in terms of knowledge and intellectual development. That if there then should be a disagreement between the schools as to the appropriateness of some course, as to whether there really is that that presumably they would go to the Campus Curriculum Committee for mediation of this. If mediation does not succeed at that point in time then they could come to this Council, a representative body exercising the authority of the faculty on this Council. If this Council were to decide that it could not reach agreement on it then, since a decision would eventually have to be made, it invests in the final analysis the authority of the chancellor of the campus to make a decision if a decision cannot be reached in any other way.

**GROS LOUIS:** We have reached the mandatory adjournment time unless there is unanimous consent to continue. I see people folding their papers; I guess there's not unanimous consent. We're adjourned, thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 5:31pm.