

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**September 5, 2006**  
**Ballantine Hall 008**  
**3:30 – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Alter, Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Maria Bucur-Deckard, James Capshev, John Carini, Richard Carr, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Robert Eno, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Barbara Hawkins, Betsy Henke, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Laura M. Jezewski, Elizabeth Johnson, Owen V. Johnson, Christina Kuzmych, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Grant McFann, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Elyce Rotella, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Katy Borner, Shawn Conner, Aurelian Craiutu, Andrew Lauck, Theresa Ochoa, Maxine Watson

**GUESTS:** Kelly Kish (Faculty Council), Robin Murphey (Faculty Council), Sue Talbot, David Nordloh, Eric Rasmusen, Roger Thompson, Roland Cote, Grace Calhoun, Ann Gellis, Rex Stockton, Lloyd Kolbe, Ed Rhodes, Karen Hanson, Steve Hinnefeld, Cathy Larson, Richard Shockley (Kelley School)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

April 4, 2006 <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/04.04.06.htm>

April 18, 2006 <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/04.18.06.htm>

2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)

(Professor Theodore Miller)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B1-2007.xls>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B2-2007.xls>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B3-2007.htm>

3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)

(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)

4. Question/Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. General Education at Indiana University Bloomington (40 minutes) [DISCUSSION]  
(Professor Theodore Miller and Associate Dean of Faculties David Nordloh)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B5-2007.pdf>  
[Please forward any comments or suggested changes to the Agenda Committee at  
[bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)]

6. Meetings of the Standing Committees (4:30 pm – 5:30 pm)

Budgetary Affairs Committee—BH 148  
Distributed Education Committee—BH 010  
Faculty Affairs Committee—BH 008  
Foundation Relations Committee—BH 149  
Fringe Benefits Committee—BH 149  
Library Committee—BH 008  
Long Range Planning Committee—BH 008  
Research Affairs Committee—BH 246  
Technology Policies Committee—BH 008  
(Committees not meeting today: Diversity and Affirmative Action, Educational Policies,  
External Relations, Student Academic Appointee Affairs, and Student Affairs)

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Interim Provost McRobbie or Professor Miller should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)

### **AGENDA ITEM #1: Approval of Minutes**

**MCROBBIE:** Ladies and gentleman can you take your seats please so we can commence. We'd like to try to get through our agenda. Let me start first by welcoming you all back, welcoming back the members who have been reelected in some cases or are still serving and welcome the new members of the BFC including some old faces around the table as well. Welcome to all of you to what I am sure is going to be a very interesting academic year. Let me move rapidly because there are a couple key things on the agenda. Let me move rapidly first to item one -- the approval of the minutes. Can I have a motion for their approval please?

**CARR:** Moved

**MCROBBIE:** Second? All in favor, against. No one against. Assumed that they are carried.

### **AGENDA ITEM #2: Agenda Committee Business**

**MCROBBIE:** Move to agenda item 2, Ted

**MILLER:** Thank you very much, Michael. The agenda committee report will be just a very brief one today. Again one of the things we are trying to do is to get to the Gen Ed discussion. We would like to have as much time as possible to discuss that here today. In light of that with regard to item #4 on the agenda, question/comment period, to the extent that you have questions that you want to ask, to the extent that they are not really burning urgent questions, I would encourage you to perhaps defer those to the next meeting, so that we can again move forward. I will just call your attention to the three circulars that are at your places. The first one is the list of the BFC membership this year. The second one is a list of the committees, the members of the various standing committees of the council. The third document is the document summary of actions taken during the final year, during last year, I am sorry, last year 2005-06. You will see the first item there was the Resolution on Upgrading the Flagship. Last year was the year of admissions at least from my point of view in terms of the campus faculty council. This is the year of General Education. We are going to start immediately with this topic and were going to hear a good deal about it as we go along through the year in any event that is my agenda committee report.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: Presiding Officer's Business**

**MCROBBIE:** In that spirit, let me just move to 3 and I just want to make two sets of announcements. Firstly let me welcome Trustee Sue Talbot who is setting over by the wall sure known to many of you. Trustee Talbot's actually here, I think because of her interest in the -- Gen Ed debate. I should mention that she is the chair of the Presidential Search Committee and as you know that has been formed and will be commencing its meetings next week I believe. I just want to bring to your attention that there will be two open sessions on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> of September from 9-10, 3-4 in the Rosebud Room, sorry the Redbud Room, in the IMU where Trustee Talbot will be meeting with anybody who wishes to attend those meetings to discuss any aspect of that search procedure. And speaking of searches, let me just give you a status report on a number of the searches. Pleased to inform you that I appointed about a month ago, Professor James Wimbush, James would you like to raise your hand, who is the new dean of the Graduate School, professor in the Kelley School of Business and James has joined us and is already assiduously pursuing his duties and just on Friday we announced the conclusion of the somewhat long and involved search for the new dean of the College of the Arts and Sciences. And I am pleased to again inform you though it was in the paper on Friday, that we appointed Professor Bennett Bertenthal, a neuroscientist from the University of Chicago to that position and I will not go into Bennett's background -- its covered in the paper -- and there is plenty of material on the web, except to say that we are all delighted that a scientist of Bennett's research or Bennett's quality has accepted this extremely important position for this campus. I hope to very soon to make an announcement about the Dean of the School of Continuing Studies. Again it is probably known to you that Judy Wertheim has been interim in that role, but she will be leaving the university to take up a new position in Chicago. And then we have two searches under way, one being the Dean of HPER being led by Dan Smith and the other for the Dean of the School of Informatics being led by Brad Wheeler and both of those well underway. I am hoping to get recommendations certainly in the case of the first and possibly in the case of the second by the end of the year and then hope to be starting the search for the new Dean of the University

Libraries by roughly the end of this month. So that is the status on those searches and I think the only other one worth mentioning is that, probably after we had our last meeting, I appointed the Vice-Provost for Enrollment Management, Roger Thompson. I saw Roger here before, well there he is Roger Thompson in the back there and I think that was after our last meeting so Roger has been appointed since then as well and he has taken on his new role with a lot of energy and vigor as well to address a number of the issues that needed attention there.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4: Question/Comment Period**

**MCROBBIE:** Again in the spirit of what Ted said, I had a couple of questions that I was going to respond to. I think they can wait until the next meeting so I am prepared to just take any questions though people, unless they are really desperate, if people can defer them until next time we meet that would help us move to the main item of business.

**MILLER:** If I could just make a comment, Michael, with regard to Roger Thompson. I would like to welcome Roger. I mentioned the BFC resolution of last year Upgrading the Flagship. Roger in fact is the person in fact who the faculty is counting on to undertake this particular task and I have given him my assurance that anything that he thinks he needs from the faculty to do this work, to please ask us that we would be very willing to assist him in any possible way.

**MCROBBIE:** With the number expectations on Roger, I think he is the most nervous man around actually.

**THOMPSON:** Ready and prepared.

**MCROBBIE:** There seeming to be no questions.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: General Education at Indiana University Bloomington**

**MCROBBIE:** Let us move on to agenda item five, the General Education discussion. Ted

**MILLER:** Yes, I will introduce this item today. I would like to talk initially about how we got to this particular point. Many of you have followed perhaps a period of 10 years or so various efforts on the Bloomington campus to create a General Education program. There have been a number of efforts, notably failures, to accomplish this. The latest round of interest in this really began in earnest early in the spring after the Educational Policies Committee worked on the new campus admissions policy; it turned its interest to the matter of General Education. We of course heard the exhortations of the President and the Trustees in January encouraging us to consider seriously action in this area. And over the spring semester there was a great deal of consultation between the EPC and the school Associate Deans of Undergraduate Studies, the Directors of Undergraduate Studies in various places, and a proposal was developed and discussed at several points during the spring semester last academic year. Many of you will recall the final meeting of the BFC last year where we had a discussion of this. Dean Subbaswamy was here with us at that point and made some helpful comments, I think. One of which was to consider sponsoring, having a retreat during the summer, involving members of the Campus Curriculum Committee, again Associate Deans for Undergraduate Studies, and the BFC EPC members having a meeting

where this topic could be discussed and some of the ideas in that latest draft of the proposal could be clarified and so forth. And Provost McRobbie did in fact sponsor such a retreat. It was held in early August, I don't know maybe about a month ago now, something like that. We spent about six hours with very useful discussion of where we were and what we thought we could accomplish. The result of that meeting was a draft that was somewhat similar to what you see in front of you although not as fleshed out as this one now is. Over this past month, we've had maybe three or four other meetings, smaller meetings but again involving that group of people, and we have now come to a document that is front of you here today. David Nordloh, Associate Dean of the Faculties, who is the chair of the campus Curriculum Committee, was quite involved in all of this and he may have some things to say later on if it seems appropriate.

So let me walk you through this document to give you the structure of it. On the first page, we are trying to make sort of a conceptual statement about undergraduate education in Bloomington, about the role of general education in this particular enterprise. This is a part of the document that has evolved significantly over this past month and its something that we will continue to work on I believe. The second page presents the curriculum that is being proposed. You will see that it consists basically of two basic parts. One of which is called the Common Ground. It has three parts to it; a Foundations part, a Breadth of Inquiry part, a World Language and Culture part. This Common Ground would be required. The idea here is this curriculum would be found in every undergraduate degree program offered on the Bloomington campus, so that this Common Ground requirement would be required of all students who are in a degree program in Bloomington. Obviously this is going to require the faculty in the various units to think about how this is going to fit into their current degree structure and generally speaking, in most cases there clearly are some exceptions, but in most cases this required common ground will fit very naturally into the degree programs that are being offered. In many cases or in some cases, the current general education requirements include this material plus some additional general education. I would imagine that, at the end of the day, we would have this campus general education requirement as a component in a degree. There would be a school level general education which would add on to this. Then there would be a major component to the degree. There would be some elective components in the degree. I think that would be the typical structure that we would see. Given what we have learned about the curricula that currently exists in Bloomington, this material would fit quite naturally into a lot of the degree programs that are now being offered. It's not that it fits perfectly into all of them, however. This will require some change, some adaptation and that's something that we would pursue at a later stage in this process. So the Common Ground is the first part of this.

The second part is called Shared Goals and please note the title there these are components that are recommended within the context of each degree. What were doing here is saying that there will be a list of curriculum elements that the faculty is going to endorse and recommend to the faculty in each degree program. Encourage them to insure that the students in those degree programs will in fact engage in this kind of activity. One of the things that we may see as we go along here is a somewhat longer list of things in this particular element of the degree program. That is the general curriculum structure.

On page three, there is a section called General Guidelines on the top of page three. Last year, one of the most significant developments which I think really presaged the kind of harmony that

we have had in most of the meetings that have surrounded this topic this year. Last year, there were a couple of basic agreements that were reached by people who were involved in these discussions. One of them is found in number 3, this is a very important one, under General Guidelines. What number three says is that if you go back to this Breadth of Inquiry category that it is expected that most of the courses that will satisfy this Breadth of Inquiry requirement will be courses taught by the College of Arts and Sciences but that other units will also be able to propose courses that would fit into that part of the curriculum structure and at the end of the day, we are expecting that there will be some number of courses that fit into this Arts and Humanities category, Social/Historical Studies category, Natural/Mathematical Science category that come from Business, HPER, SPEA, Education, Music. There will be some courses from those units that will be in the list, but everybody I think believes that the overwhelming majority of those courses in those list will be from the College, which is where this kind of liberal education is really sort of the main game. So that is a particular important understanding that we have come to and I think its one of the reasons why we have been able to kind of get here today with some hope that we are going to continue to move forward.

The next section is a fairly long session, guidelines for courses in specific areas. There is some description of each of the curriculum components here in attempt to describe what these would be like. You will note that some of the stuff on the bottom of page three, on the top of page four, well on page four over to page five is in kind of a grayed out area, note in the middle of page three the note about that. It says that shaded sections are current practice included for illustration. So English Composition, we currently have certain understandings about what English Composition is on this campus that is what this gray shaded is. We've got some understandings about the Math. That's in another gray shaded section. This is not necessarily set in concrete but these are understandings that have been developed over a long time in Bloomington and may well be the way that we continue to view them. So that section goes on through onto the top of page 8 is the end of that section.

Then on page 9, there is a page that talks about the General Education Committee. One of the things that will have to be done, if there is some general agreement surrounding this proposal, is that the detailed work of evaluating courses to be put into the various lists that will satisfy these requirements. The detailed work will have to be done and this proposal gives that charge to a new committee called the General Education Committee. The structure of the committee is indicated here. The way in which the committee will operate is indicated here. That was also the subject of a good bit of negotiation last year and I think we have an understanding that is agreeable to most of the schools -- all of the schools I believe right now -- that this committee will be operating in a way that's suitable to everybody, satisfactory to everybody. We have a charge for the General Education Committee, what it's supposed to do. That's item 4. Then over on the final page one of the things that we want to do is to build into this proposal some kind of assessment angle and as you can see we have got a couple of topics there that none of these have received a lot of thought or discussion at this point and this is one of the areas that is still needs to be flushed out I would say. That is the basic structure of the proposal.

Now what we have in mind is that today we will have a discussion of this proposal and I would like to encourage you, please, to the extent that you have comments that you would like to make to make them succinctly. I do not believe that we want here to have a real debate over any

particular aspect of this proposal. We do not want to fight over the details of the thing right now. What we want to do today is to get out on the table basic concerns that you may have about this proposal. After today, this proposal is going to go back to the group that was at the retreat, the campus Curriculum Committee group, the Educational Policies Committee group and there is going to be an effort over the next month to take into account what is said here today and whatever other comments we receive and try to work those into the proposal to the extent that we think it is possible. This item is going to be back on the agenda of the BFC in the first October meeting, I believe that is October 3. It will be again the main focus of our attention during that meeting and at that point, what I am hoping we will be able to do is to approve sort of in principle a General Education Program of the type that is described here. If we do that in early October, what then will happen is that the General Education Committee will be established and it will set to work to try flesh out the details of this proposal and once the details are set out it will come back to the BFC for some final debate and a final vote of approval. Now, to the extent that the BFC members are more or less unanimous, I don't know that that is quite the word, let's say to the extent that there is not significant opposition at the end of this road, from my point of view, I believe that the BFC vote to approve this is really all that we need to proceed. On the other hand if there is some really some significant difference of view at the end, I am prepared to call a meeting of the campus faculty, go back to the auditorium, and we will debate the matter of General Education and have a vote of the campus faculty on this matter. I frankly am hoping that it does not come to that to this point we have had really no significant issues raised over this proposal. Now you may have significant issues okay and if you do well we will try to accommodate those, but right now I am fairly optimistic that we can move forward. So in October, I am hoping that we can approve this in principle. The Gen Ed committee can do its work and hopefully early in the new year 2007, we can come back and take some action on this. That is my introduction to this. Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Ted. Well we have just less than 35 minutes for those comments and discussions. Can I open it up for comment please?

**MCCORMICK:** Has there been any discussion on the potential impacts of this on degree requirements, example being representative of the school of HPER, professional education requirements over the years have grown. As I look at this, the greatest impact on this is going to be on free electives, if there are additional credit hours required to implement this. I just do not see the professional schools cutting into the professional education requirements. It is likely to be cutting into free electives. Has there been any discussion of the potential impacts of actually implementing this?

**MILLER:** Well, I think we all understand that there will be impacts. I don't think we understand what they would be in general. I think what you are saying is probably correct, but as we get past October 3 and as the General Education Committee takes its work, the second thing that I think should happen beginning at that point is for each degree program, faculty in each degree program, to really set down and think seriously about what would happen if this was approved. How could it be accommodated in the degree program? I come from a professional school and the faculty of my school have spent a long time developing professional education degree requirements, right. Now this undergraduate degree is not an accredited degree. This is something that the SPEA faculty has just done by itself. I think one could argue that we have

overdone it so cutting back a little bit maybe would be reasonable. I mean I think you can argue that in many cases that the undergraduate professional degrees in Bloomington are over professionalized, primarily because we have never had a campus level curriculum component so the schools have been in a position to sort of tailor what they do just the way they wanted to. And there hasn't been anyone saying well you know you have gone a little too far with that or so forth.

**MCCORMICK:** Though I think, if you look across the board, one of things, again looking at my own school, we actually probably have some general ed requirements that are in excess of this and if we are being asked to add additional hours, then I would say the World Languages and Cultures is really sort of probably not included in any of ours so do we cut free electives or do we cut other Gen Ed requirements and reduce writing composition from 2 courses down to 1 to meet the letter of the law, but still stick in six additional hours that's where I am looking at what are the impacts of this.

**MILLER:** Well that's something that each faculty is going to have to consider for itself and I mean we certainly have at heard from at least one degree program, which has asserted that it will be impossible for it to incorporate this into its degree. And well, maybe other people might come to that conclusion as well. My own sense is that there may be an additional 6 credit hours that could be used for this purpose, but it's going to have to be something that each faculty group will have to evaluate for themselves. And part of the report that will be expecting back and we will hear about as we consider this finally is what those impacts really are going to be across the campus.

**MCROBBIE:** Larry?

**THIBOS:** Yes in a way I don't see any mention here of the anticipated budgetary implications of this kind of change. Has the committee discussed this at all or something that you are going to set aside until the implications become clearer?

**MILLER:** Page 9 at the bottom, we are exhorting Michael to solve those problems, I think.

**MCROBBIE:** It's obviously going to depend on what the nature of what those actually turn out to be and its early days for that at the moment.

**MILLER:** One of the things that is true about this is that it is not seen as a change in what is happening in the undergraduate degree programs on this campus. I mean most of the degree programs have components more or less like this, right, so I am not sure really that there are profound budgetary consequences coming down.

**MCROBBIE:** I think that is correct.

**MILLER:** Maybe in the language area, maybe that would be a place; because this might lead us to need more language instruction than we have now that could be an issue though there are alternate ways to satisfy that requirement than studying the language itself.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Yeah, Bob.

**ENO:** Just a couple of comments. One response to Bryan's problem about degree programs that may already be hedged in, having been a veteran of a number of failures on this front before as I recall there were three programs not only HPER, but also in Education that obviously became convinced at some point or another those specific degree programs because of licensing requirements that had run out of the flexibility and I think that it might be good to build into the General Education Committees brief of bullet points, considering exemptions in individual cases where no other solution is possible is something that vary adjustment on the requirements because if you run up into a deal breaker on this sort of scale with 348 programs fine and 2 programs have a small problem, you want to be able to finesse the small problem. In terms of the point that Larry raised, I think there should also be a role specified in terms of the assessment list on the back, which you mentioned isn't particular developed the resource implications or resource impacts need to be considered not just in terms of the money but whether or not general education cores in anyway requiring over time us to do things that we might otherwise not have done and as a result have to do some things that we would have wanted to keep doing that is probably a good thing to keep track of. Just two other small comments, I do have on number 2 under the General Education Committee proportional representations specified but I cannot see that it specifies proportional to what: faculty numbers or student enrollment numbers?

**MILLER:** I think it was meant to be faculty numbers.

**ENO:** Probably want to build that in and probably want to specify in 2b whether or not you want department chairs to be considered as administrators or not as that is always up in the air.

**MILLER:** There is your response, Bob. [Laughter]

**MCROBBIE:** Other Comments? Sarah.

**PRYOR:** Ted, I am almost embarrassed to ask such a facile question but, of all peer institutions, how many actually do have general education requirements?

**MILLER:** Quite a few of them. I do not know the exact number Kelly may.

**KISH:** David.

**NORDLOH:** I am trying to remember the numbers. They are available to you in an inventory I believe Bill Wheeler did as part of the document for the BFC last spring. I think something of 7 of the 9 of the Big Ten schools have general education distribution requirements, two did not of the schools that Bill surveyed. And doing background towards this particular development we looked in particular at our immediately neighboring states, Ohio State and Illinois both of which have fairly substantial general education requirements as part of undergraduate degrees.

**MILLER:** We would certainly not be alone in our peer group if we did this. We would be joining the majority.

**PRYOR:** I'm just thinking that presumably other people have experienced some of this same stresses and may be able to advise how they have overcome them.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments? Ted and I were expecting to be inedited with people putting their hands up to speak. This is very disappointing. Yes.

**HENKE:** I have a question from the general guidelines from number 3. I know how you mentioned how most of the courses would come from College of Arts and Sciences and then you mentioned that some could be added and what not. What is to the process that you are using in comparisons to other schools? How many, is there a maximum number of classes that can be added that students can still select from, or do departments just choose basically what they have to eliminate.

**MILLER:** I think what were expecting is that each unit will consider the courses that it now offers and whether they are suitable for general education purpose and if they think they are then they will nominate those courses to the Gen Ed committee and the committee will consider the question. There may also be some new courses that would be developed as we go along. That also, I think, is a possibility. We have not really looked in great detail at the composition of some of the Gen Ed programs at some of these other places, but our general impression is that for the most part the courses come from a college of arts and science environment, but that other units have some courses in the mix. What I described earlier is what we have seen elsewhere. Now, of course, you can find other universities where general education is done in a completely different way where almost every undergraduate course offered on the campus is part of the Gen Ed list from every unit. You can find places like that. Of course its going to depend on what the Gen Ed Committee wants to do, but I certainly would hate to see us end up in that kind of a place myself.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments? Larry, again.

**THIBOS:** I have another question if you can clarify for me, Ted. I am not sure the bookkeeping here in the common ground category recommend up to 31 credits but there are many more than 31 credits listed in these three categories a, b, and c. I presume that the intent is that the student is required to take something from each the Foundations, Breadth of Inquiry, and World Languages. There are more than 31 listed.

**MCROBBIE:** There are some cleverly hidden disjunctions there, under c.

**MILLER:** Under c, there are "or's". Three different ways to do part c. You do one of them. There are 6 credits from c. There are 31 maximum but there is the possibility of some double counting. So for example under c roman II the world cultural courses, a number of those might well also count for arts and humanities maybe most of them well, I don't know. Some of them might count as social/historical studies. So there is a fair amount of double counting. We also know that the kind of students that Roger is going to be recruiting for us over the next few years, a number of them are going to come with AP credits that will basically count in this context but I think at a maximum there will be 31 credit hours devoted to this particular enterprise.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, at the back.

**PRATT:** It strikes me, when I first read this, as admirable but incredibly complicated, is this going to make it yet more difficult to figure out when a student has completed degree requirements. How are we going to educate students and parents and advisors to meet these criteria? Even reading now for a second time, I am still struggling and usually I am a pretty quick read but I am still struggling to understand all the components of this and presumably it will be much more detailed when we add into the breadth of inquiry possibilities for arts and humanities, social/historical, I mean its going to start to look for the list like mathematical modeling. Is this going to be manageable?

**MILLER:** Well my sense is that the advisors would very much like for us to do this because they think that this will simplify their presentation to freshman students since this is going to be a common curriculum that students can take that can apply to any degree that is offered in Bloomington. It's going to simplify the advising job in the first semester or so because everybody will have the same set of requirements in front of them.

**PRATT:** But is there a point at which you would need to complete this curriculum before going on or could we envision seniors once again struggling to graduate because they some how overlooked.

**MILLER:** I would say that is a point that may still be debatable. I think that right now that the document does not particularly speak to that issue. And people may have different ideas about how that should be done, but I think that is a good question. And one that I think we will probably want to try to answer before we get to the end of this.

**MCROBBIE:** I must say personally. I have obviously been following this, reading the material but I have not lived and breathed this everyday like Ted has had to do and I found it relatively straightforward simple document. Personally just to make a comment as a parent of an IU student I found out processes from that point of view to be immensely complicated at the moment and if this will in fact lead to a simplification that can be only be a good thing for us in terms of making us a bit more accessible to perspective students. Any other comments?

**GROTH:** Will the Common Ground be doable at Ivy Tech.

**MILLER:** Well I think certainly. One of the things we know is that the state legislature last year passed a bill which required the establishment of a 70 course sort of total transferability across all state institutions. David Nordloh is the campuses main representative of that effort and he shared a list with us a list of now what I think has now I think 88 courses on it that are still sort of under consideration to be included in the 70. And I would think but for maybe one or two or three of those courses, the rest of them would fit into this framework pretty naturally. So I think yes, it definitely, one of the things we should expect to see is that people will be able to go to Ivy Tech and complete this coursework and transfer to the Bloomington campus, have their campus Gen Ed completed and go on. I think that is something that will, almost has to, happen.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments, other comments?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I'm looking at the general guidelines page number 3, point 3 right where there is a recognition that the majority of the courses will be coming out of the College but of course other schools can offer some courses might fit those and then going back to proportional representation that Bob brought up. If the majority of these courses in fact come from the College and by the same token a proportional representation from units that are not the College the other schools, then we are setting up is a committee that is made up of non-College faculty evaluating courses that are taught in the College. Am I wrong, just thinking about it that way?

**MILLER:** The committee would have proportional representation, if you think about it roughly now in the composition of the campus faculty that means that the College will roughly have half the members of this committee, may be even more than half.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Okay so when you said proportional I was thinking in terms of number of schools instead of number of faculty.

**MILLER:** No, no, no. It's based on the number of faculty based in each school. One of the things about this is the College is going to have a very significant representation on this committee. If you read point 3 on number 9 however you will note that if the only people that vote to put a course on a list come from the College, even though they have a majority on the committee that course will not go on the list. There have to be people from multiple schools voting to support a course going on the list. On the other hand, the way that this is now setup, assuming that it is a majority at least, the College could block any course from going on the list that's the way it's structured right now.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Thanks. That answers my question.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** Thanks you. First I apologize to the council, I was not here earlier. I was meeting with students to discuss matters of religious holidays so I regret that I wasn't here for the mathematical modeling discussion which I gather apparently came up.

**MCROBBIE:** It was very extensive, Bill. [Laughter]

**WHEELER:** Well, perhaps it was better that I was not here but I would like to direct your attention to the paragraph that is at the end of that section opposed to the part that is being highlighted. It is on page 5, second paragraph, at the top the one that is not highlighted, that says "To be approved for General Education credit, a course must be a mathematics course required for students majoring in the natural sciences or mathematics or a mathematics course for non-science majors that includes modeling of phenomena in the health sciences, social sciences, or environmental sciences." And that was the first thought in this when you ask yourself from the point of general education, what do they need to know from mathematics sometime just in the past maybe 200 years ago, people would say you take mathematics because it helps to develop the mind and things of that nature, but in today's climate of we assume that happens in all of our departments and courses, the issue is using mathematics, you need mathematics to do your

subject work in other areas, if your going to be, I actually presented to the committee my list of things that people should know from mathematics. They should know, I do not have this in front of me but from memory it's something like, they should know Arrow's Theorem in the social choice that says there is no perfect voting system something which is actually relevant to sitting here on the council. They should know the Hardy-Weinberg law on genetics which settle a great dispute on evolution at the turn of the century. They should know the connections between Mathematics and Language, the connections between the inclusion and exclusion principles, competition principles, Venn Diagrams, and the words 'and', 'or', 'not'. They should know the connections between modifiers on subjects of sentences, the connection between conditional probability and Bayesian probability. They should know about linear modeling that is very important in economics and business. They should know something about the use of differential equations, which are important in modeling situations which there is a weighted change. They need to know something about the technical topic called Riemann Sums, which come up whenever you try and figure out what a totality in which gives rise to the definite integral of mathematics.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill before you start proving the theorems.

**WHEELER:** I am finished. And so the issue there is the course list that appears on the first page that was secondary [End of Tape 1, Side A] need mathematics that you need to know for your other areas that is the thrust of why its mathematical modeling and not something like algebra.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Maybe you can prove the theorems. Any other comments?

**THIBOS:** Can I make a comment on the charge to the committee and I do not see any language about reviewing all the undergraduate programs for compliance with this program. Is that going to be a charge of the Education Committee to make sure that they are?

**MILLER:** I think. I am not sure. Depends on how you use the world compliance I suppose. What we are envisioning I think is that we do want to track what is happening with regards to this program, particularly, with regard to the so called Shared Goals, which are recommended things but not absolutely required of every student. We want to track that to the extent that we can and follow how many students are doing these various things. And I would expect that the BFC every so often would want to receive a report along those lines and think about how important it is. Kind of reevaluate these items in the recommended list and if very few students are actually ending up doing them, well we may want to reconsider how this program is structured going forward. I think this is meant more as part of the evaluation component of this, not compliance in the sense that we want the committee. Committee is not going to be in charged to enforce anything or make people do anything. This is Michael's job. Michael is the guy that makes people do things.

**THIBOS:** And his Cousin Vinny, right?

**MCROBBIE:** That's right. Bob?

**ENO:** It seems to me the Registrar would the one to keep everybody in compliance. If these are

degree requirements you can not get a degree until you fulfill them and the departments or schools have to fill out the paperwork but the Registrar has to take care of the paperwork. One thing you mentioned something on the outset about 10 years behind all of this and 10 years in struggles of General Education. As I mentioned, I have been involved in a number of those years. I think this is really a better outcome of a serious effort to solve all these problems giving all the conflicting interests than I could have ever predicted. It has been really well thought out to this degree and I expect the support on it when it comes back if it has this shape with these details and content. Those around the council can go back and look at previous proposals some of which I believe I think which I brought to this body in one stage or another and this is far better thought out, far more clerical, than anything that I have seen in the past.

**MILLER:** Well thank you very much for that Bob. I will tell you just an anecdote at the first meeting of the EPC this year. There are a number of new members in the EPC and we had a discussion of this proposal and we went around the table and it came to one of the new members and he picked it up and he said “This is shockingly good” which was music to a number of our ears.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes.

**ROTELLA:** I actually think what it might be is shockingly pragmatic which may be its great virtue. I have been in other universities and I have gone through all of these discussions as well. Usually in Gen Ed there are deep intellectual issues between deciding in whether to let people take anything they want or deciding that there is something that is utter foundation of an education. This is far enough away from either of this that I think it has this nice pragmatism and it also has a pragmatism I think that its not going to give rise to this sort of turf struggles that Gen Ed things usually run. Once people either are fighting on intellectual grounds or fighting to defend their turf and at sometimes it is both at the same time and I think that this is reasonably modest and therefore probably workable. I guess I want to say Congratulations.

**MILLER:** Thank you. It is probably that we are all just exhausted over 10 years of previous struggles.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments we have got about 5 minutes to go for further comments. We could of course remarkably finish early and move on to the next agenda item if there are no more comments, but other comments from anybody. No other comments. Comment?

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Probably does not really matter, but I am just curious as sure you know they are changing the Indiana Graduation requirements also and wondering how you see this sort of building on that or how it overlaps with the future high school classes will be required to take.

**MILLER:** The new admission requirement for the Bloomington campus which was approved by the BFC last year, which will go in effect in 2011, takes into account those changing requirements. This proposal is built on top of the new admission requirements so for example the way that you can see that the most clearly, well a couple ways, with regard to the languages, the language requirement here is a sophomore year language requirement. We basically are as an

admission requirement in 2011. We are requiring enough high school language that people should be able to place out of the first year of language into that second year. Okay so the typical person admitted at that point should be able to go directly into the second year language though purpose all will be able to but this proposal has been tailored to the admission requirements that have been set for the future.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok. We're pretty much timed out. Anyone else have a comment?

**TERRY:** I would just like to emphasize something that Ted said may have gotten lost in everything. Our hope on the agenda committee is indeed that the next meeting over this after the Provost's Address next BFC meeting can move us along towards an option. We can keep it on schedule if we do that. To do that, we need to know what you think of this. That means if you have concerns send them to the Agenda Committee or the Educational Policies Committee but systematical send them in soon so that all the groups involved can take a look at all the concerns that are raised and I would hope at the next meeting that a brief report can be made that says we considered this and this and this and we took them into account and hopefully that would speed up the process. I've been here 32 years and I have been through many of these discussions to and I think it is much longer than 10 years and I hope that we can get it done this year.

**MILLER:** I think we are planning to send a note to each member of the campus faculty calling their attention to this particular enterprise and soliciting comments that they might have over this and we will do that shortly. We want to have this, the comments at least in hand in at least two weeks time so that the next two weeks before our October 3 meeting can be spent sort of thinking what to do with those. I do have just as a final point. I do want to remind you that our next meeting, which would be what the 19<sup>th</sup> of September. Our next meeting will be devoted to the Provost's State of Academic Affairs speech, the State of Academic Affairs speech. Please note that that meeting will not occur in this room. It will occur in the Moot Court Room at the Law School at the same time Tuesday September 19<sup>th</sup>.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay well clearly the nature of this debate was nicely summed up by Rotella that this seems to be a feeling that this is maybe reached sort of a pragmatic equilibrium here, maybe we have some reason to be cautiously optimistic for the next meeting. Obviously we don't want to get to self-congratulatory yet but I do want to acknowledge just how tenacious Ted has been and how hard he has worked on this and also David Nordloh and Kelly, the members of the Campus Curriculum Committee, and the members of the Educational Policies Committee over the last year or so and actually going right back before that to bring this to what looks like its moving towards hopefully a positive conclusion. Thank you all very much and we move now to Agenda Item number six which means you diverse into your various standing committees. Thank you and we will see you at the next meeting.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6: Meetings of the Standing Committees**

[The BFC adjourned into standing committees.]