

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**February 5, 2008**  
**Indiana Memorial Union Oak Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jack Bielasiak, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Stephen Burns, James Capshew, John Carini, Andrea Ciccarelli, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Diane Dallis, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Pat Foster, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Owen V. Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Ursula McTaggart, Amanda Meglemre, Brian O'Donnell, John Paolillo, James Patterson, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Diane Reilly, Paul Rohwer, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Michael Tracy, David Waterman

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** David Daleke (James Wimbush), Todd Tinius (Eric Arnold)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Moya Andrews, James Biles, Nicholas Clark, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, Luke Gillespie, Robert Hatten, Kevin Hunt, Matt Jarson, DeWitt Kilgore, Christina Kuzmych, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Jennifer Riley, Mike Robinson, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni

**GUESTS:** Barb Bichelmeyer, Grace Calhoun (Athletics), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Russ Hanson, Ann McCranie, Daniel Oates, Craig Dethloff, Lebo Molefi (Faculty Council Office).

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**February 5, 2008**  
**IMU State Room East**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

1. Approval of Minutes.

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/11.20.07.htm>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/12.04.07.htm>

2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus David H. Gliessman

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B17-2008.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Lisa Pratt)

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
( Provost Karen Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt)

6. SAA Grievance Procedure Revision (15 minutes) [FIRST READING]  
(Professor Robert Terrill)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B18-2008.pdf>

Brief Recess (5 minutes)

7. Resolution on Priority Registration for Student Athletes (15 minutes) [FIRST READING]  
(Professor John Carini)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B19-2008.pdf>

8. Report on Classroom Use (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]  
(Professor John Carini)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/reportOnClassroomUse.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/classroomUtilizationRoomType.pdf>

9. UFC Resolution on Transfer Credit (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]  
(Professor John Carini)  
[http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/U6-2008\\_Revised.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/U6-2008_Revised.pdf)

10. Gen Ed Progress Report (15 minutes)  
(Professor Russ Hanson and Professor Barbara Bichelmeyer)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/GenEdProgressReport2008.pdf>

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or Professor Pratt 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: [bffcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bffcoff@indiana.edu)

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

**HANSON:** Approval of the minutes, have people looked at the minutes for November 20<sup>th</sup> and December 4<sup>th</sup> meetings? Anyone want to make a motion to approve the minutes? Yes. Second? All in favor? (Aye.) Next we have a memorial resolution.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS DAVID H. GLIESSMAN**

**SEPT:** This is a memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus David Gliessman, and these are some excerpts; I encourage you all to read the complete resolution. David Gliessman, Professor Emeritus of Education, studied psychology at Elmhurst College, completed his M.S. in psychology from Purdue University, and earned his PhD in educational psychology at University of Illinois in 1961. In 1965, Professor Gliessman was appointed to the faculty at the School of Education at Indiana University in the Department of Educational Psychology as an associate professor. During his 27 years of service to IU, he served as the chair of the Department of Educational Psychology for two terms, among many other contributions to the school.

During his career he developed several innovative film series with problem-based scenarios that were meant to facilitate teacher growth and development. Developed at IU, his film series, Critical Incidents in Teaching, received widespread use in programs of teacher education nationally. Subsequently, he was principal investigator and director of the National Center for the Development of Training Materials in Teacher Education. Dr Gliessman's scholarly interests intersected with his teaching. His classes served as a laboratory implementing and testing the efficacy of his models. In 1994, his article coauthored with Dr. Richard Pugh in the Journal of Education Research, was given a Harold D. Mitzell Award for meritorious contribution to educational practice through research. The Mitzell award is described as recognizing the outstanding research article for that volume.

During his tenure as a faculty member, Professor Gliessman served as a mentor and model, not only for his doctoral candidates, but for young faculty as well. His mentoring was marked by kind encouragement combined with high standards. A major part of his legacy as a scholar was reflected in the degree to which his vision of teacher training continues to influence his students, both nationally and internationally. An additional form of his role as mentor was reflected in his supervision of AIs for the department's undergraduate offerings. As an outgrowth of that service, he headed a major taskforce charged with designing a teacher training laboratory in the new Wright Education Building.

As a colleague, Professor Gliessman was valued for his keen wit and his common sense. He was a strong presence within the department, and was relied upon because of his integrity and his intelligence. As an academic, however, he never lost sight of the enormous value that he placed on his family. He was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather, all roles that he relished. Later in his career, Professor Gliessman began to develop his skills as a watercolorist as well, and following retirement, he became recognized by the local artistic community as an accomplished artist. He drew upon his travels, and sometimes an eye for the ironic, to inspire the objects of his art. He served the Emeriti House in planning its annual art exhibitions of emeriti faculty art. Throughout the Bloomington community, Professor Gliessman was a recognized figure on his bicycle that he rode throughout his career and into retirement, and we'll all miss him very much.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Jeanne. Let's observe a moment of silence for Professor Gliessman. Thank you. Lisa, Agenda Committee business?

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

**PRATT:** We are still waiting for information from the President's office on the Family Leave Policy, but the President continues to assure us in regular meetings that it is a policy that he strongly supports, but we have no further information at this time.

We have completed our review and revision of the concise Intellectual Property Policy, and that document is now, we believe, in the hands of the President, or at least in his inbox. He has indicated that he will give it a very careful and thorough review prior to making his recommendations and passing it on to the Trustees.

As I mentioned at the last meeting of the BFC, the President has named the administrative members of a committee to review core schools operations. That committee will be co-chaired by Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson. We are waiting for a full announcement of faculty participation on that committee, although we understand it's very close. I'll remind you that the Deans for the core schools are located on both the Indianapolis and the Bloomington campus. The President, when he called for formation of that committee, did specifically ask the Deans of the school to identify faculty from the other campus from which they resided to be the designated faculty member on the committee. Notably, however, the President did not ask for nominations from the IFC or the BFC for participation in this committee, so we are watching this with some interest to see who the faculty members are that are participating directly in that committee. The President did, when asked about this specifically at the UFC faculty meeting two weeks ago, the President did say that he would encourage the Deans to work through the policy committees of those individual schools as a recognition of a faculty governance unit in drawing information into that core operations review. Again, once we see the specific charge to that committee, we'll certainly inform the members of the BFC about that.

I think many of you knew that there was a series of interviews in Indianapolis to look at possible individuals and the firms with which they're associated to serve in the capacity of a master planning group for Indiana University. Those interviews are completed, and in fact, the group has been selected. David King, of JJR Smith Group will be the master planner for Indiana University. He will do both the Indianapolis campus and the Bloomington campus. In fact, he has already, as of this week, personally met with the taskforce on the Indianapolis campus. I don't believe he has met with...

**HANSON:** He's coming here Friday.

**PRATT:** ...He's coming here Friday, thank you, to meet with the taskforce here in Bloomington. David King has previously worked on buildings on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. He knows us quite well. He has also served in a comprehensive or master planning capacity for work at the University of Michigan, University of Connecticut, Penn State University, and University of Arizona, among many other schools where he's been active.

I want to just briefly quote from Vice-President Clapacs, and the decision to name David King, and he says, "David King's personality and ability to deliver strong presentations are in the model of past IU master architects, like Edward Larabee Barnes, who was so effective in creating well-designed campuses that are considered to be among the most beautiful in America.

David seems to be at just the right experience level professionally and certainly will be able to provide a long-term commitment to the University.”

I was part of that committee. Bart Ng, Andrea Ciccarelli and Richard Ward were the faculty members who participated with various administrators in the selection process. Karen was certainly a part of that. I’m not sure who else...? Is there anybody else in this room who participated? If you have questions about it... Andrea, you’re back there. Anyone who wants to know a bit more about that, or if you’re interested in knowing who else made the short list, certainly you could ask any of us.

You will hear later this afternoon about the findings of the Educational Policy Committee asked to look into the matter of classroom usage, something that was really a strong personal priority for me, coming into the presidency of the BFC this year. I just want to take a minute to thank John Carini and the members of the EPC for their very diligent investigation of this complex matter, at the same time that we were asking the EPC committee to look at a number of other fairly complicated issues, and you’ll see this afternoon that they are beginning to roll forward a number of action items for our consideration, although, on the matter of the classroom issue, they are simply today presenting findings.

I want to assure you that the Agenda Committee will work with the Provost’s Office to look for collaborative solutions to what is obviously a very difficult matter to sort of bring forward and to make movement in a timely fashion. I hope that the BFC, at the very least, will be willing to formally resolve that the present situation is deplorable, and it’s counterproductive for the recruitment of top applicants for students and the retention of an outstanding faculty. It does appear, from the findings that the EPC is going to present this afternoon, that the change could be made quickly. However, it appears that either incentives for good scheduling or penalties for poor scheduling are going to be required if we really want to make change quickly, and not just have sort of this lingering legacy of more and more Monday and Wednesday classes, and fewer and fewer Friday classes, and more compression of the day into a smaller and smaller number of hours. President McRobbie has repeatedly told me personally that he expects the BFC to take action on this issue prior to taking his action on requests for new classroom construction or new funding. So, I can assure you that we will bring action items to the floor of the BFC this semester, and I look forward to receiving input from each and every one of you individually, either through discussion here in the plenary session or through individual communications after we hear these initial findings. And that completes the report from the Agenda Committee.

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

**HANSON:** Thanks, Lisa. Let me just add a couple things to some of the items that Lisa mentioned. On the core schools committee, the first meeting is February 19, I think. The charge has been given already to the committee, and the constraints of the committee have already been stipulated. It’s not to investigate the idea of core schools. It’s to check to see how they may operate more smoothly. So information is being gathered from the relevant deans about how their operations work right now, and the first meeting is going to be one where that information is shared among those school deans. I do believe that the list of faculty members should be available now. Johnny Applegate is staffing that committee, and I’m going to say I don’t

remember who all has been appointed to it, but each of the deans has come back with somebody now, and they've sent that information to John so that list actually should be available now.

**PRATT:** Yeah, I couldn't get a hold of John today to find out if there was an announcement in a public place.

**HANSON:** Well, I don't know about that, but I know the committee has been formed. On the master planner, as Lisa said, the firm that will be doing the master planning has been chosen, and the lead master planner is a relatively youngish person who's supposed to see us through the next ten years. He will be coming to meet with the taskforce. We have a very large taskforce, much larger than the one at IUPUI, and we're broken into a number of subgroups, thematically grouped; each has a chair, and they have asked to meet with the master planner early on, so they can get back to their groups and have, you know, a better sense for conversation with him or with some of the associates who will be working on it, about how they might most usefully contribute to the conversation. I want to put a little footnote in that our groups are also considering [inaudible] with that right away, and our hope is that we can have David King prepared by the beginning of this week, and his associates are also working on meeting here toward the end of the month. We would like to involve as many people as possible, not just the people on the taskforce; those people would like to involve others as well. So if you have a chance to come out to any of these conversations during this period, again, it's a very short timeline, and you need to think about contributing to this conversation this semester because the master planners aren't here in the summer, and if the taskforce would meet, that would be very helpful.

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

**HANSON:** Questions or comments on this or anything else? We didn't receive anything in advance. No, okay, then we're going to go on ahead of schedule. First reading, Professor Terrill, on the SAA Grievance Procedure Revision?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6: SAA GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE REVISION [FIRST READING]**

**TERRILL:** The item before you is a revision to the Grievance Procedures that are currently published in the Graduate Student Handbook. This is an agenda item that our committee inherited from last year. I joined the BFC last year, and we inherited this agenda item to revise the Grievance Procedures, bringing them into alignment with some BFC policy documents that had been approved since the Graduate Handbook had been revised. And so we worked on it some last year and some this year, and we thought it was ready to bring to you for a reading and comment and questions.

The purpose of the document is, as we understand it, as we are conceiving it, is to provide kind of a guide for SAAs, Student Academic Appointees, sort of through the underlying BFC policy documents, and also a guide to those policy documents so that graduate students could locate those documents and make use of them if they wished to. I would like to thank the members of the committee, both last year and this year, who worked on it, particularly the graduate student members, Ann McCranie who's here, and Kate Johnston, for their input. I'll open it up for your questions and comments and suggestions.

**ENO:** I just have a query on what the purpose is and how the contents relate to the BFC policies. I didn't have time to go and check the document against the policies, but they look very familiar. They look a lot like the policies that are referenced in the document. Is there a difference in the content of each of these three sections from the BFC policies? Are they a summary of each?

**TERRILL:** They are a summary. Yeah, they are a summary. In some cases some of the materials out there actually in the BFC documents, are not included here. Those would be materials that we judge not to be of immediate usefulness for the graduate students who are looking for it, some sort of a flow chart or a guide through the process. Otherwise the content is the same.

**ENO:** So the policies line up in their content and their policy points?

**TERRILL:** That's exactly right, yeah, and that was the purpose of the revision, to bring the handbook into alignment with the policy points.

**ENO:** Is the handbook under BFC control, or under Dean of Faculties control?

**TERRILL:** The handbook is published by the Dean of Faculties. Now what kinds of controls there are, I don't know.

**SEPT:** We don't control it we just try to implement BFC policies.

**ENO:** Okay, so essentially this is a BFC assist to the Dean of Faculties?

**TERRILL:** Sure.

**ENO:** One further point. On the first of the policies, which is advisory to departments, I suppose it's good for students to know that departments have been advised to do this. I wonder whether or not, as an agenda item in the future at some point, either the BFC or the Dean of Faculties might want to collect information about what departments do have policies, and what those policies are, and make those available to students direct. That was the intent of the policy when it was first implemented.

**TERRILL:** Indeed, I think that would be a very good idea. Among the things we've talked about at the meetings are the difficulties faced by graduate students who are wanting to access this information and make use of it; I think that would be really useful.

**EISENBERG:** Alright, yeah, I have a couple small points concerning the material that begins at the bottom of page 1. The correct name for the Anti-Harassment Team is not Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual, but Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered, GLBT. And I realize that, "such as" is meant to provide all the examples, you list three of four Anti-Harassment Teams. I don't see any reason for the omission of the fourth one, which is the most recently formed, Religious Biases Incidents.

**TERRILL:** Thank you. I think we should add it.

**HANSON:** Anything else? Any suggestions for the committee? Herb, did you have something?

**TERRY:** No that's okay. Actually, Jeanne, do you regard this as helpful?

**SEPT:** In all honesty, I haven't had a chance to even look at it.

**TERRY:** So if you have a problem with it you could send it...

**SEPT:** I'll have to read it through. I was curious with the phrase, just in the first opening line, the "first increases possibilities for subsequent appeal." I'm not sure what that actually means, but that's just a (inaudible). Successful resolution?

**TERRILL:** I agree that the phrasing is a little, could be cleaned up. But the intent was to communicate the idea that if you follow the steps in this order, it's more likely that you'll be satisfied with the outcome. So, in other words, if you go in the steps out of order, then you're going to mess up your chances for trying to make subsequent appeals procedurally. In other words, Brian...

**MCCORMICK:** Part of the idea was that if you begin at the campus level and you get turned down, you can't go back to the school level and get that overturned. In other words, if you start at the local level and you are not happy, you can appeal to a higher level. But if you start at the very top, you can't go back to the unit and get a campus decision overturned.

**SEPT:** A lot of the SAA, well I don't want to say a lot, but a number of the SAA cases actually come through my office and we try to mediate them. And the first thing we always do is send them back to the local units and we do have reports from all the departments on what their procedures and things are. So if somebody comes to our office, we can refer them back to the appropriate level.

**MCCORMICK:** So, I think, you know, while the wording may not be exactly clear, the intent was to encourage people along the same lines: Start locally first.

**EISENBERG:** In other cases involving grievances with which I'm familiar, I know that people have tried several avenues of appeal simultaneously. Nothing struck me as addressing that matter. Could we at least discourage people from doing that? Or indeed forbid it to the extent that we can do so? It is less than helpful if, let us say, that the Dean of Faculties is considering the matter and unbeknownst to people in the Dean of Faculties' office, the Dean of the College is considering it, etc. etc. etc.

**TERRILL:** That certainly would seem, I think that falls in line with the intention of, you know, trying to encourage people to sort of follow a procedure.

**EISENBERG:** It does.

**TERRILL:** But you're right, it doesn't explicitly say, "only one at a time."

**EISENBERG:** Right.

**MCCRANIE:** As one of the graduate student committee members here, I just wanted to say that one of the pieces of information, well one of the things that we were hoping to do, was to make it more clear to graduate students what their roles were, and what their options were. But if there is a repository of departmental or school policies in dealing with grievances, making that available earlier rather than after the grievance has already made its way to some kind of campus level authority would be better. So for instance, encouraging departments to make that policy, you know, readily available to the graduate students on their website, in their own handbook that they might hand out. Or even have it in a place where they're collected, for instance, by BFC where they can be accessed by graduate students before they end up, sort of, taking it to the next level which seems to have -- adds animosity to the entire process?

**PRATT:** Others? Yes.

**PAOLILLO:** Just a clarification question. The wording, "student academic appointee." Could you just briefly define that. It's not something which is familiar to me.

**TERRILL:** Yes, that is implicated in a part of the ongoing revision of the handbook itself. The handbook as it goes through defines the grad student appointees in a number of ways. Some places it refers to AIs, some places to RAs or Research Assistants or Teaching Assistants and various things. And SAA, Student Academic Appointee, is intended to be the umbrella term that encompasses all of those other various levels and types of appointments.

**PAOLILLO:** So would that include people working in an hourly capacity?

**TERRILL:** It is intended to, yeah.

**BOBAY:** (mostly inaudible section )

**PRATT:** Right, because for example, I believe that hourlies are not held to the grade point requirement of SAAs. So there are a specific set of rules in place. And maybe that, some clarification. If it shows up someplace else in the handbook, I think that's fine.

**TERRILL:** It is clarified in the handbook, and I'll be sure that it is. So within the context of with which these procedures appear it should be clarified.

**PRATT:** I think since this is the first reading, and many of you because of how late this was posted, haven't really had a chance to dig through it carefully, can I recommend that you send individual comments directly to the committee for them to consider and then incorporate into the document when it comes back to us. I would like to see that happen efficiently because we'd like to bring this back at the second meeting in February and hopefully if there's no substantive disagreement that we can't resolve on the spot, get this voted and taken care of.

**HANSON:** Could I just ask, did you consult with the faculty when you were doing this? Because I'm interested in the fact that you said so many SAAs come to you first and there isn't either an informal or a formal rule here for the \_\_\_\_.

**SEPT:** (inaudible) We certainly, we're sort of one of the many doors of both faculty and all academic appointments seek mediation or consultation. A lot of people come through our doors. And we've been formally involved in a handful of cases over the years. I don't know, in all honesty, what proportion of all cases come through my office. But certainly it's consumed a lot of Michael Hamburger's time for example. He's been carefully working through a lot of these. And often they can be very vexed cases, but we've always tried to, you know, make sure that they seek appropriate avenues whenever possible.

**TERRILL:** We did need with as you say John and Michael Hamburger during the process of revising this.

**HANSON:** Sometimes one of the issues, too, is that an SAA can be appointed in a school that is not his school or the student is earning, or trying to earn a degree and that's one of the reasons he may want a campus office to get involved. Cross School issues. We lost the mic! Anything else for now? Thanks a lot. I move to suggest that we don't take the recess since we haven't been working very hard.

**PRATT:** We're ahead of schedule!

**HANSON:** John, you're up for lots of things today, so you get the mic. But, the resolution on priority registration for student athletes. This is another report which you may or may not have read, but it's available here on this yellow sheet. John?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7: RESOLUTION ON PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT ATHLETES**

**CARINI:** Thanks. This was actually something the committee was working on hard last, a year ago last spring, and so much of this report was the work of that committee, so thanks to Bill Wheeler. We also thank the Registrar's Office and the Athletics Department for providing the information we needed with our review of the policy. So going back, I think, three years now, the BFC passed a policy to give student athletes a chance to register ahead of other undergraduates and so the key provisions were that they should be given registration appointments in a time block immediately after that for graduate/professional students. So that's the system we've been operating under through this registration for the current semester. The resolution also asked for the registrar to collect data on the registration patterns of student athletes and also any patterns with significant adverse consequences for non-student-athletes. So that was then the subject of our, here are the results of those reports of what we were doing last year and also this past fall. There were two other provisions that have not been carried out including essentially an improved waitlist system for all students to get the courses that they need to graduate and furthermore the hope that the priority registration policy could be narrowed to focus in on more the requirements that student athletes might need to continue to make progress toward their degrees rather than a blanket priority registration period where they have

the way it's actually worked out the past few years. So that has not happened either. The final provision of the resolution was that the priority registration policy would expire unless it were explicitly extended by the BFC. So that's why we're here now. So, turning to the current report, what we've found by looking at the actual impact of the priority registration on non student-athletes and the positive impact it's had for the student athletes that the Educational Policies Committee recommends that we continue the policy the way it has been operating the last few years. So, the resolution we're proposing here states that the policy has achieved its goals. We have not found a significant adverse impact on non student-athletes and given that we're now in the process of switching to a new student information system it seems prudent to carry on the policy at least until that system can either be improved or superseded by something else. So that's the final clause in our proposed resolution. And we hope that there'll be periodic reviews of the impact of the priority registration policy if it's continued into the future, every two or three years. So that's what we were thinking. Now, in terms of the impact, I think I reported here back in November that we found that to be surprisingly small. In the study that the registrar did for registration a year ago, they found that they can only show that student athletes who were given priority registration only kept students out of a total of eleven classes. That is, students that would have been able to register before the student athletes who were able to register ahead of them because of their more senior standing. And that included also four juniors and twelve sophomores. And so it was also significant to us that the affected group did not include seniors. And so it seems reasonable then that priority registration is not keeping people from graduating or even from taking a course in their last year here. So when the committee heard that report last spring, we decided that we would also like to hear about what would happen during the registration period for the fall semester last fall and we asked the registrar's office to conduct another study for the fall registration with the idea being that if the impact was similar in magnitude that we would propose extending the policy. And that's in fact what we found. That there were ten courses that were affected by the priority registration and prevented twenty non-athletes and again, none of them were seniors. And so, again, that is then why we're now proposing this new resolution to continue the priority registration system.

**HANSON:** Questions or discussion?

**TERRY:** I have one question. When we adopted this, we adopted it strategically. The goal was to encourage the administration to recreate not a waitlist system but if I remember correctly the raincheck functionality that we lost when we switched over to PeopleSoft. I think that was the reason for the sunset provision. It seems to me as if the policy has succeeded very well in terms of assisting student athletes and not disadvantaging non-athletes, but it doesn't appear that we've made any progress on getting that functionality which was important to the Faculty Council at that time back. So my question is, if we approve this indefinitely, it would just decouple those two issues, giving up on trying to bring pressure to return that functionality?

**CARINI:** I think the committee will try other avenues for getting an improved waitlist system.

**TERRY:** Okay, good. This pressure seemed to fail, so another avenue may be fine. (laughter).

**ENO:** I'm glad to hear that the immediate impact seems to have been so small, and I take Herb's point about trying to, about putting in a repeated sunset provision in order to perhaps

maintain the pressure on the issue of the waitlist system. The waitlist system is actually a completely different issue. We all would like the raincheck system back, but I think it's understood that that would be a desirable thing. It's a matter of cost and priority in terms of the programming possibility. What, it seems to me, is not a completely separate issue is the second one that you've discussed which is that there is a byproduct effect that is unmeasured which is in terms of giving athletes priority access to the courses that are not necessarily critical courses, but that are preferred courses. And we have no measurement of how many students would like to take what courses and no longer can take them because the athletes have priority registration. That seems to me, in fact, in terms of education particularly in a university that's an exploratory university the way we present our curriculum to be a very important issue and one that was well addressed by the committee's original sunset provision stipulating that we really required to see this issue solved by programming the waitlist or programming the enrollment registration list so that athletes will be registering for those courses that are critical to their needs and then they'll have to wait their turn to fill out the rest of their choices. I can understand why it's been hard to do that. It's costly, and things take time. But I would really recommend that that issue, which is an issue germane to the issue of athlete priority be retained as the reason to keep a sunset provision in here. I think we're the last school to have instituted priority registration for athletes in the Big Ten. There was a lot of pressure on us to do it. We had more time to think about it than other schools, so I think we really should try to do it right. There are some places where it's \_\_\_ and it does have a bigger impact. It looks like we're not creating disasters, we're minimizing the degree of unfairness. But in this respect we have another step to go, so I'd encourage including those thoughts and sunseting it.

**CARINI:** So you're referring to the fourth clause in the earlier resolution calling for narrowing...

**ENO:** Yes.

**CARINI:** ...the priority registration.

**ENO:** Yes I am.

**CARINI:** I guess you would have to think about the cost benefit analysis. I mean, we're talking about maybe a dozen courses per semester. And if you look at them, the schools and departments have, you know, implemented different restrictions on the registration in those courses. So they are indeed somewhat popular courses in general but it's really up to the schools and departments, I think, to enforce those. For example, there is a requirement that a student have junior standing to register for the course and that could be made enforceable through the registration system or if the way to restrict it to a major in a particular course then again that worked. Or, you can have spots reserved for majors. There's a number of things that departments and schools can do, you know, at the individual course level.

**ENO:** I'm talking about a different issue.

**CARINI:** You're talking about the exploratory students.

**ENO:** I'm talking about—let's just take it from the most obvious issue. We've got a really popular course; History of Rock and Roll. There is no particular reason why athletes should have first shot at the History of Rock and Roll and that students should not be able to take it because they came up at the end of the waitlist. You could multiply the number of courses, you could have a scale of popularity. None of that should be influenced by athlete priority if we do it appropriately. Athletes should be able to make sure that they are can enroll in those courses that are germane to their progress towards the degree. The rest of their courses they would have to enroll in at the appropriate time or be placed on the list at the appropriate place depending on how you want to implement the programming, maybe register at one time or it could be coded. That seems to me to be a collateral effect to the way that we've set up this policy which violates principles of fairness. And I think that it is reason enough although it will involve cost and extra effort. We're making the extra effort for the athletes and if we can afford it, we should make the extra effort to restore the balances as best as possible.

So I would include that as a desired goal and a sunset saying that we'll reexamine this in three years and see if we've addressed the goal.

**PRATT:** Is there a low-tech solution to that? Could we simply state that in writing somewhere in this resolution and ask the athletic advisors to be responsible for ensuring that this privilege is only used for necessary classes. Can we just tell them that?

**ENO:** It seems to me to be a computer issue. When the student registers, the student registers all at once, but registers under a certain code which shuffles him into those courses labeled critical at a high priority and leaves that student at the normal registration priority for the rest of the classes.

**CARINI:** So what you are describing is a system that would be great for everybody in fact, again. Well, in terms of...

**ENO:** We're making a special \_\_\_\_\_

**CARINI:** So I think that—I don't know whether we'll ever see Roland again the rest of the semester but I think we can ask him.

**PRATT:** We certainly can. If we—he's indicated that if we ask him he will come. So if this is something that the BFC feels strongly about, then we should bring him back for a discussion of that issue.

**CARINI:** Well, we can ask him and see if the committee can meet with him.

**PRATT:** That would be wonderful. You can do that through the committee and let us know what you find out.

**HANSON:** Him and perhaps James Kennedy, who's the Head of Student Involvement Services, and is largely charged with getting the PeopleSoft transition going. He says there are a lot of

work orders after that for things that people would like, that they would like to get going on. It would be useful for you to meet with him probably. For all I know the work order is in.

**CARINI:** Part of the problem is the priority that is assigned to the work orders.

**HANSON:** Right.

**CARINI:** So that might be something set for entire levels of the university, also.

**HANSON:** Yes, and there is a campus advisory committee that sets some of those priorities., but it would be good for you to talk with them and see how that's done, and whether or not that's already in the hopper. Yes?

**PAOLILLO:** I was interested in your last clause here. It says, "we expect that periodic studies of the impact on non-students..."

**CARINI:** Non-athlete, sorry, student athletes.

**PAOLILLO:** "...will continue to be performed and reported to the EPC." I think that "expect" and "periodic" are a little bit vague. Would be possible to have some more concrete wording, that would really lay out what the expectation is, and what the periodic rate would be?

**CARINI:** So it would be, I think, less than every year, but probably – they suggested every third year, but possibly we would want it more frequently.

**PAOLILLO:** That doesn't do much to keep up any kind of pressure on, you know, to not be observing two years out of every three, basically seems like we're not expecting progress between now and three years from now.

**HANSON:** So you're suggesting an annual check?

**PAOLILLO:** I think that would be reasonable. It sounds like from what was reported that the checks might happen without that much effort.

**CARINI:** That I don't know. I mean they figured out how to do it once, and they were able to do it again within their system as it existed then, and I suppose, if things don't change too much, they could run the report again. Again we can ask them what the level of effort is.

**HANSON:** Other questions, comments? Yes.

**HOLZWORTH-MONROE:** I have a quick question. I'm wondering how this – I like Bob's point in general in terms of fairness, but I do have a question, sort of for athletes, which is that, I think a lot of them, in addition to getting the courses they need for their major, as this talks about, have to find courses that fit in their practice time, which at least for some of them is pretty limited. They've got only afternoons, or only certain hours around lunch time. It's way more limited than we'd like to acknowledge, and I'm wondering how that dovetails in terms of this

priority system, particularly when we put into place the Gen Ed requirements. So clearly something like History of Rock and Roll we can all agree they don't need priority on, but if I need a certain Gen Ed requirement and I'm only free for this two hours to take a course, that is still a priority, I think, issue. So I just don't know how that dovetails, or if we've thought about how that goes together, when we put in the Gen Ed requirements.

**CARINI:** So, in terms of the benefits of the program, we can certainly -- being able to schedule labs, discussion sections, in addition to lectures at times that work with practice and competition schedules, that was certainly one of the great benefits. That's a very individualized thing, so the Athletics Department did produce a couple case studies where they showed, alright here are blocks of time that were taken up by swim practice -- two hours in the morning, four hours every afternoon -- and you see that courses have to be scheduled, you know, in between or in the evening, and they're losing about half the day there. It's a long day, too.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or discussion? Okay, it's a first reading, so this will come back if you have additional suggestions, obviously, send them to John.

**PRATT:** Maybe if we could skip down to number 9 and then take a break and then come back for number 8, which might be a more lengthy discussion.

**HANSON:** Alright, well Lisa is suggesting we skip to nine, John. Is that alright with you? [side 1 ends, tape switches side and part of conversation lost]

#### **AGENDA ITEM #9: UFC RESOLUTION ON TRANSFER CREDIT**

**PRATT:** This is up for discussion.

**CARINI:** So this is, you might recall the Academic Leadership Council had passed a resolution asking the University Faculty Council to consider imposing a university wide limit on the number of credit hours that can be transferred from two-year institutions. So this is then, I think, you have seen the report from the ALC and some of their motivations in proposing such a limit and then this is the faculty's response, at least through the Educational Policies Committee of the University Faculty Council. In the resolution, we tried to select out, what seems, the concerns that the faculty had in agreeing to propose such a limit. Then, in addition, I should mention, that we tried to -- I think this was asked at the previous meeting in November when I first mentioned this, that we were working on this just to define what exactly we mean by the Associate Colleges, Baccalaureate Colleges, Doctorate-granting Colleges. I note the definitions from the Carnegie classification scheme actually fit fairly well in the way that our state-wide education system is structured, and so I felt that was a reasonable way to define the different institutions. Our goal, in addition, was to try to have a uniform treatment among all two-year or Associate's Colleges, and not single out any one particular institution for either positive, more preferential treatment, and second, to again try to treat the different campuses equally, the different schools equally, and again, not single out any particular one. So what we've done then is to, you know, describe, I think, as clearly as we can, that we really do want the exceptions to be fairly limited on one hand, but on the other hand we should try to protect the students who are currently enrolled in Associate's Colleges, or certainly, who have already transferred to an IU campus, that

any agreements that were made before they started, or certainly, before they transferred, will still be honored. So that is exception one. In exception two we try to say the exceptions really should be exceptional [laughter]. They really should be limited for cases where the Associate's Degree really does require more than 64 credit hours because of professional licensing or similar issues. We tried to leave that a little bit open, but at the same time, we want the exceptions to be granted at the campus level, not at the school level, so that's why we list the chief academic officer as the one who, for each campus, is supposed to ultimately have to grant these exceptions. So I should say that the resolution, in this form, is slightly modified from what we presented at the University Faculty Council, but it's essentially just a restructured version of what had been presented there at the Indianapolis Faculty Council. It's received very strong, even unanimous approval from the Indianapolis Faculty Council, the Northwest Senate, IU Southeast. I don't know whether it's reached the campus-wide faculty governance bodies on the other campuses, but it has been considered by the equivalent of the Educational Policies Committee at least at Kokomo and South Bend as well. So I think the faculty across all the campuses are rather strongly in favor of this. I think the one exception might be IU East, where there's some sentiment to try to not impose a strict limit and to have some more flexible system.

**HANSON:** So, you would like discussion and then a straw vote, about support?

**CARINI:** Well I think, is this actually listed as a first reading then?

**HANSON:** No, it's a discussion item.

**PRATT:** I do think it's important that we move this along because UFC is waiting for our action because they're ready to take action. So a straw vote might be a nice way to then bring it back next time for a vote.

**HANSON:** Well, does it even have to be next time?

**MARKLEY:** I was wondering if you would review for us how many credit hours are currently accepted and also, how many, if you know, how many credits are accepted by other state schools? ISU, Purdue, how many do they accept of these credits?

**CARINI:** That's a good question. The number of credits that are accepted varies with school right now. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences here limits it to 60 hours. Other campuses, or other programs, have specific articulation agreements, some of which go beyond the 64 credit hours, but a number of them stay under that, stay under that number, 60 or 62. So now as far as the other state campuses, I have to admit, I don't know.

**MARKLEY:** And does it vary, this says - about the associate programs - does it differ if it were from another baccalaureate, from a four-year school?

**CARINI:** Right, there's no limit there. There can be school - there's no university limit or campus limit, as far as I know. There are school limits, school residential requirements again.

**PRATT:** I think it's important that you haven't sort of picked up on this one sentence. Individual schools or campuses can choose to have a much tighter limit. And this doesn't limit the number of transfer, it limits the number you apply toward a degree. So we're not saying that the courses aren't valid, we're saying that a degree from Indiana University should reflect a predominance of courses taken at Indiana University, or an equivalent.

**GROTH:** Is there a way that a student can take more than 64 hours, transfer them or articulate them into a different university that will accept many more, that actually show up on their transcript there, and then transfer to IU Bloomington and end up circumventing the controls? The answer is probably yes. [laughter]

**CARINI:** I think that the credits usually show up on the transcript as being transferred in, at least the transcripts I've looked at, that have a history like that.

**HANSON:** Bob?

**ENO:** I think that that actually works itself out in the way that the transcript's reported. There's an issue that has to do with transferability of individual courses from campus to campus on another level, but I don't think it would apply to this for AI. I take it we don't have to pass a resolution here, right, what we're doing is expressing the sentiment of the BFC because the UFC is the organ that has to act, right?

**CARINI:** That's right.

**ENO:** And they have come to the various campuses because they don't want to act unilaterally?

**PRATT:** And they are bringing this forward simultaneously everywhere at the same time it's being discussed by the UFC.

**ENO:** I think this is a perfectly straightforward way to do this and it's got about every safeguard that I think that we could ask for, in both directions. I think that it's very well designed. I would have no trouble voting for it.

**HANSON:** Other comments or discussion or questions?

**CARINI:** So at the UFC meeting, Herb has asked for a sunset provision on Exception 1, and in our EPC meeting we decided we couldn't do that, but we would leave it up to the campus or school themselves to set the time limit.

**HANSON:** Anything else, or are you prepared to vote on a sense of the BFC? Okay, all in favor of supporting this? Again, you are not voting to adopt it, but supporting it so that can be conveyed to the UFC. Signify by saying aye. [Aye] Opposed? [silence] I guess we could take a short break now.

**BRIEF RECESS:**

## **AGENDA ITEM #8: REPORT ON CLASSROOM USE**

**HANSON:** Can we reconvene? Let's move to Item #8, Report on Classroom Use, and again, John will present the report for discussion.

**CARINI:** So again we've spent maybe half of our meetings so far this academic year talking about classroom utilization and we've met frequently with Roland Cote and Mike Carroll from the Registrar's office and we thank them for all the good information they've provided to us. You know, kind of slice the data they have different ways so you can understand first of all, you know, what the level of usage is now and some of the historical patterns over the past ten years. So at the very first BFC meeting, you know, we saw and heard that classrooms are actually being used at a pretty high rate, and what these graphs here that were provided by the Registrar's office, this is from Fall 2006, try to express is that level of use in terms of how many number of hours per week a typical classroom gets used. And it's up, we're talking about seminar rooms, it's up around 38-39, large lecture halls over 40 hours a week. So to me that sounds like a fairly high level of use. So I would say that we concluded that it wasn't that classrooms were being underutilized, it was really how the hours that they were being utilized were being distributed that was causing some scheduling problems. So in particular if you look at the graph of Daily Utilization from 9AM to 5PM where we saw at our first meeting classroom usage is quite high starting about 9 straight through to the rest of the day, at least Monday through Thursday, you can see what we mean. The usage is in the range 85 almost 88 percent of possible classroom minutes that you can schedule are being used. So really then looking at kind of a, there's a solid block of usage that really should be considered what prime time is effective 9-5 Monday through Thursday the classrooms are basically filled nearly constantly. Now the seminar rooms are used at a somewhat lower rate across the board as you can see there. Now, of course, the problem then is that you can only fit so many classroom hours during that time and there's a mistake here it says 40% of classroom usage occurs out of it, but it's really is closer to 30% in the fourth paragraph. So some kind combination of non-prime hours has to be used just to teach the courses that are being taught. So that would include the hours from 5 – 10, from 8AM-9AM and then of course on Friday where you can see that classroom use falls off even during prime time 9AM-5PM. So you might ask, 'Well what's the problem?' We're using classrooms a lot and getting our classes taught for the most part, but you know behind the scenes here the pattern of requests for classroom time has kind of reached its logical limit. There's so many requests for these prime hours every semester that they can't possibly all be fulfilled and at the same time, you know, the classrooms that do sit empty at least some time, for a significant time, during the week either on Friday early in the morning or in the not-too-late evening either, and so because of the way that classroom hours are being used and the way the scheduling requests are distributed, the Registrar's really lost any flexibility in terms of adjusting the schedule, or in some cases, even getting a classroom for a section. So, for example, this past December, we had 30 classes, about 3,000 students, without a classroom, and so, maybe one of your classes was suddenly moved to another room at the last minute, something like that. That was in the attempt to find classrooms for these sections. That's one of the things that the Registrar's Office would like to avoid in the future. So, one of our goals then, should be to use classrooms more efficiently, but also we want to be able to use them well. We're not saying that instructional needs should be secondary here. They should really be primary, but right now, instructional needs really cannot be met in all cases. So, you're teaching a class in a room that isn't optimally

set up, or the way you like to teach, as many of us are. Many of us would like to use more active teaching techniques, working in small groups, and the rooms can't easily be configured to do that, and it's even difficult to schedule them that way because if you set up a room like that, you lose a lot of the seating capacity, and right now we're short of seats, especially during those prime hours. We need to find a way then to break out of our existing pattern and use classes more efficiently, being able to use them, in many cases, better than we are now, in the educational sense. Now, there are certain classroom scheduling policies. They're on the web, and if you're looking through these things, you're saying, you know – they describe the priority system and you see that they give priority to, highest priority, to the following types of classes – so, 50 minute classes that meet either daily, meaning 5 days a week, 4 days a week, Monday through Friday, or 75 minute classes Tuesday and Thursday. So other types of scheduling receives a lower priority, so you're reading this, it sounds like this was written in another century. Of course it was, right? [laughter] Back when I was a student, in the last century, the traditional classes met three times a week for 50 minutes Monday, Wednesday, Friday, twice a week Tuesday Thursday 75 minutes. That works out great, right, as long as you have 60 percent of your sections meeting Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and 40 percent meeting Tuesday Thursday. But that's not the situation we're in now. Over the past 10-15 years, we've moved to the scheduling requests, well, not just requests – the classes as they're taught, there are 3-4 times as many sections that meet twice a week as meet three times a week. So you can see this mismatch between the way we're teaching and the structure of the calendar. There are actually about the same number of sections that meet at 75 minute periods as 50 minute periods. Of course, the way that our schedule is set up during the day, it's set up for maximum efficiency for scheduling 50 minute periods. The class starting times are all based on 65 minute intervals, 50 minutes of class, 15 minutes pass. You can see then, the way we're teaching does not match up with the way the calendar works, the way our clock works, and it's changed, again, within the past 10 or 15 years, and the policy itself has not changed. I note a few other things – that we're not using class time very efficiently, either, on 8-9am, which we know why that doesn't get used too much, but also there's been a shift from those Monday, Wednesday, Friday courses that used to be taught – 100 of sections – now shifted into a Monday Wednesday scheduling for 75 minutes, and 75 minutes do not comfortably coexist in our schedule with 50 minute class periods that are supposed to predominate on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. So it results in some time that is not – some gaps that are just unusable, 15 minute gaps, or in some cases longer ones overlapping in the middle of the day. This comment at the end of the section about parking, you should take that seriously. You can park here in the middle of the day, maybe not exactly where you want, but you can park, but you probably can't find a classroom space. You can take it even further, the way the scheduling requests work, kind of every semester, circling for an open spot, three or four sections possibly, and it sounds a lot like the way parking used to be around here in the middle of the day. And so when I realized that – this is bad. Alright, so, what are the consequences? One is, you know, what the registrar has to do to accommodate a class. There are hundreds of requests for these sections that meet in the middle of the day, Monday through Thursday, hundreds of more sections than there are slots available, classrooms available. So they have to resolve these every semester. Possibly, you found yourself as an instructor, with a classroom that is inadequate for your instructional needs, or you'd really like to reconfigure a classroom in line with your instructional needs. We've done that. We've had this experience in the physics department. We're more in small groups in our discussion sections, the rooms are just not set up to facilitate that. To make it work, you would lose a lot of seats from those

classrooms, or you'd haul the chairs out into the hallway, whatever. But none of those types of solutions work very well because it leaves the next class rearranging the room to fit their needs as well. It was mentioned that there were several semesters when we've had sections without classrooms, right up to the beginning of the semester. It's very hard to imagine how we could renovate our classrooms. Here we are with classrooms that are 50 or more years old, really out of the last century, if not the one before that, and you can't imagine doing any major renovations because we'd lose the use of those classrooms for too long. And by the way, when you renovate classrooms, you frequently lose space because, modern standards, chairs are wider, safety standards are different. A lot of our older classrooms are essentially grandfathered in, so if you start to change them, you're going to lose some seating capacity. Then of course, there's the big problem with the extra long weekends that some of our students enjoy. So, as you can see that there are many different sides to this issue, not all of them educational in nature, but enough of them are that I think that's why this has kind of started with us, on the Educational Policies Committee. Finally, we noticed, I can't explain this, our load has gone up 10 percent in 10 years, but our number of sections that we're teaching has gone up 5 percent. It seems to me that there might be a good reason for that. It's very hard to imagine scheduling 5 percent more sections than we're teaching now, given the way that we're scheduling. Even if we started building classrooms tomorrow, we'd still be stuck where we are right now for several more years. There are two sides – sorry about the blank policy on that page, that's my fault. So, the registrar is proposing some, a few things. So now we're on page 4 – actually enforcing the existing policies. I guess the idea is to try to use that to get more classrooms scheduled outside of what are prime hours, primarily, and second, to try to make sure that classroom requests are overall just more realistic when they're submitted, and also to try to discourage non-standard teaching time slots. There's an appalling number of combinations of starting times for classes, and days of the week they're offered. You'd never guess how many there are. In addition, there are some changes in policy the registrar's proposing that would definitely impose some pain upon some schools and departments. I think that's undeniable. The policy for scheduling, I think it's over by the Calendar Committee. We urge the Provost to reconvene the Scheduling Committee to actually consider these. It's too late to do anything about probably next academic year, but probably the earliest would be done the following year. The one thing that we would like to propose to the faculty is just to help their scheduling officers. Try to help them submit more realistic scheduling requests, and that's something every faculty member can do, on the one hand. On the other hand, if our educational needs are not being met, we need to communicate that to every level of the administration. I mean, I'm as guilty of not doing that as everybody else, you know grumbling about the state of some of our classrooms and our inability to teach classes in ways that we really think would benefit the students greatly, but we're being held back by available classroom space. That's just not right. I'll just leave it there. There are some other kinds of administrative recommendations that the Faculty Council is largely not in the position to implement any of them. However, I think, in terms of trying to plan for the future we have learned a few things. In closing, we're talking about spending billions of dollars on new research space for the university. In comparison, classroom space is relatively inexpensive, and a small amount could go a long way toward allowing us to really improve the educational experience on what's supposed to be the flagship campus of the university in the state. So I think we want to make our needs known and, in every department, to try to work with the taskforce, the planning taskforce, that's about to start meeting.

**HANSON:** Thanks, John. I don't see a problem with reconvening this committee and I assume, making some of these changes fairly rapidly that are proposed here. What would be useful would be to find out whether any of the faculty have any other reactions to this report from the EPC.

**JOHNSON:** A couple of things. It would be interesting to see how classroom usage is between full-time instructors and part-timers. Do full-time instructors want so much the Monday Wednesday that they've tied it up? Are the others putting in on the same Monday - Wednesday or Tuesday - Thursday in response to student behavior? If you have a Monday, Wednesday, Friday class, inevitably Friday attendance is lower, so the pedagogical success is less, so departments want to avoid that.

**CARINI:** We're told there are many reasons - that students are less satisfied with courses that meet on Fridays or early in the morning, less likely to register for them. So there's nothing you can do -

**JOHNSON:** It would be interesting to see if full-time instructors behave in a certain way, or if, in fact, they're more tolerant toward Monday Wednesday Friday usage, to see where the problem is.

**CARINI:** I see

**JOHNSON:** One question I have on the Roland Cote talk is saying these provisions ought to be included. Are those for classrooms that he controls?

**CARINI:** Sure.

**JOHNSON:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Yes?

**TERRY:** Owen's comments actually suggest something related to them. Journalism and my department both use a fair number of adjuncts from the community, and that sort of thing. Their schedules are often set by their employers and other sorts of things. I hope when the committee convenes, it will understand from time to time we may have to accommodate schedules of people who work for us only part-time and we don't control them. Second thing, I would encourage you to send this to Tom Gieryn. He's the head of the subcommittee of the taskforce that deals with classrooms, and see what happens there. Third question is did you get a handle ever, because I think we talked about it last time, on level of utilization of non-registrar controlled classrooms, as to whether it's similarly compressed, or is there space there?

**CARINI:** Yeah, I don't - well, our information came from the registrar, so all those classrooms that are listed classes ARR, we don't - the registrar doesn't control. He just assumes that departments or schools figure out how to schedule those.

**TERRY:** And finally, and Andrea may want to chime in on this, there's a notion of prohibiting unwarranted seating capacity increase requests. If I remember right, one of the units that wanted

to do that particularly was foreign language departments. I think they often want to teach four days a week, for some pedagogical reason. Has that come up in...?

**CICCARELLI:** Language classes, most language classes, are taught everyday.

**CARINI:** That's right, or four days, and those are favored in the current policy. So if you want to teach 3, 4, 5 days, you can find a classroom.

**TERRY:** So there's not a disadvantage to proposing this?

**CARINI:** No.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Alex?

**TANFORD:** Not that we need yet another reason to propose more classroom space, but I do want to add one, and suggest that it work its way into the report. The Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee met last fall with the registrar over a related issue, which was that the registrar and the instructors do not know whether a disabled student has enrolled in a class, essentially, until the first day of class. There are a number of classrooms that the registrar controls that are non-accessible. We've had a large number of complaints from disabled students that courses, including required departmental courses – they show up, it's in a disabled classroom, the instructor goes to the registrar, the registrar is unable to move that class because there is no equivalent available space, so it is yet another thing that really cannot be solved any way other than increased classroom space.

**CARINI:** They have some free for that purpose.

**HANSON:** Diane?

**REILLY:** Another observation that I think we can add to what Professor Terry was saying is that as the number of female faculty, especially young female faculty, as the university grows, they are bound often, as are their husbands, if they're faculty especially, by the daycare schedules that exist in Bloomington. And you can't teach in the evenings, and you can't teach at 8AM, if you have a child who is in daycare or who is in the Monroe County School Corporation. So this is one of the limiting factors here, and it's something that the university is eventually going to have to address if they want to, as someone suggested last fall, compel junior faculty to teach in these early periods or to teach in the evening. I wondered if anyone had explored, any more, one of the observations that was made that in some universities the students are just told when they're going to class. They get their schedule and that's when they'll go. I, personally, I think that that might be an answer. I mean, I know that we're looking at them as more of a consumer culture these days, but if IU is really that desirable, maybe they would swallow it.

**HANSON:** Yes?

**WATERMAN:** Just one question. The arguments you make about efficiency are very compelling, but how much would the potential increase in efficiency come from say, shifting classes to Fridays in general, and also into Friday afternoons. I think as you alluded to before, there seem some pretty potential downsides to doing that in terms of student attendance, and it's been mentioned about the long weekends, but other things equal. A student being able to compress their education into four days, or having the flexibility to do so, has a lot of real advantages to many students. It isn't just that they start drinking on Thursday night. They can travel, they can work more effectively,....

**CARINI:** We know that the School of Education, the students can go into the schools on Friday for instance.

**WATERMAN:** I'm just wondering if we shifted a lot to Friday afternoon, for example, if we wouldn't be back here in a couple years with the same topic that we've had about the Thanksgiving break is that the students all leave on Tuesday afternoon so we consider cancelling classes for the week. So I just wondered if it's all real apple pie in the extent to which the committee considered these various downsides of greater utilization of Fridays. I'm not implying that it's not a good idea. I'm just raising the issue about this.

**CARINI:** Mmmhmm.

**HANSON:** Bob?

**ENO:** I think there are a number of ways to start approaching this. The Registrar's Office, which is really quite spectacular, has done what can be done, for the most part. Enforcing the policies they've developed is probably a good idea. I can't see much long term promise to try to institute coercive measures, either on students or on faculty, to try to solve the problem, which are pretty normal patterns of needs, both academic needs in departments or types of needs having to do with responsibilities off campus that faculty have. We've known for a long time that we have a very serious classroom shortage and the reason that these problems have come up to this degree isn't because we're an exceptional campus in having Friday contracted. There are certain advantages to, academic advantages, to having Friday contracted because we do a lot of stuff now on Friday afternoons - conferences, meetings, and things like that - where we know we're going to have time because students don't come to class Friday afternoon. We don't try to offer courses then because they won't come. That's actually a benefit and a payoff compared to what things were like 20 years ago when you couldn't get people together at the same time because we all had class. We had a classroom building that was funded, that was sited, that was - it just disappeared. It never happened because the priority didn't seem to be important enough to begin to address this problem. It's been the lowest priority item, as far as I can see, for the campus. We've added faculty, which is a good thing. We've added students, maybe a good thing. But if you're going to do those things, you've got to add space. We didn't do that. I think, Lisa, I heard you say at the beginning that President McRobbie had said that unless we came up with a way to solve this problem, he wasn't going to start moving on the classrooms?

**PRATT:** He has told me that to my face several times now.

**ENO:** There is no way to solve this problem. We're not going to solve the problem, and the problem is not necessarily any symptom of any wrong behavior or counterproductive activity on the part of students or the faculty. The problem is counterproductive behavior on previous \_\_\_ by the state and on previous administrations in not doing everything they could to address the fact that we have too few classrooms, which is painfully true when you compare us to other universities. That's where we have to solve the problem and I don't see where we should hold up getting that problem solved to see whether or not the BFC can come up with some further coercive measures beyond what the registrar has very reasonably tried to do. Those poor people in the Registrar's Office deserve medals. I've never seen anything like it. We're constantly on their back because of things that change as they constantly do and it's amazing the capability they have for solving problems that seem insolvable. I think it's time for somebody else to bail out those who are under pressure with these issues.

**HANSON:** Lisa?

**BINGHAM:** All of these comments, it's a fascinating discussion, and obviously it's an important issue – just a couple of observations. One is that the report doesn't talk, as someone who went to law school at night, the report doesn't talk too much about the capacity we have for offering more sections in the evening. I'm just wondering, in terms of a step that we could take, whether some sort of nonbinding resolution suggesting that faculty volunteer to teach in at least one nontraditional time slot once every two years, or once a year, would work. If you think about it, we offer labs at SPEA on Fridays. I've taught seminars in 3 hours, 2 and a half hour blocks, on Friday mornings, and the Friday morning time slot addresses the child care issue if you do it all in one block. Then the early morning time slot, we may have trouble with undergraduates, but I think we have less trouble at 8AM with graduate students, and certain people who teach graduate students a lot actually sometimes prefer that 8AM slot. We have lots of adjuncts who, SPEA teaches, I won't even tell you the percentage of our undergraduate courses mounted through adjuncts and lecturers, but, yeah, let's not go there, the late afternoon or evening are actually preferable to them for work reasons. So if we could set up some - and I'm speaking from a school that doesn't ask us when we want to teach, by the way. We don't generally get asked to express a preference. We just get a chance to squawk once we get a schedule and then be told 'Tough,' so I don't have a whole lot of sympathy with people not being willing to be flexible in terms of maximizing our space. And maybe the Faculty Council could establish some expectations, uniformly of faculty, not of junior faculty, I think that's unfair, but of all faculty, because as we move through our careers different time slots actually work better or worse for us. And just expect that everybody is going to volunteer and not complain about teaching in nontraditional slots, meaning evenings, Fridays, 8am, at some regular interval, and it will be part of our ethical expectations.

**BURNS:** Not to disagree with the need for more classrooms, because I actually approve of that statement strongly, but as we're moving towards more classes on the longer time period, has anybody run scenarios on the dead period loss by going to a timing schedule that's actually synched to the long class periods? I think the dead times would be a little less if you did that, during the day. It should be a scenario that could be run, at least, given a real distribution of classes.

**CARINI:** So not based on the 50 minute class?

**BURNS:** Base it on the 70, because you said that we're already approaching more 70 minute classes.

**CARINI:** There are still reasons that people want to teach in shorter periods, languages, sciences, math...

**BURNS:** Absolutely, I'm not requiring it, I'm just saying that if you teach a 50 minute class, and there's a little longer period before the next one, because you prioritize the starting time according to the longer ones, there's a point where you tip, and you probably have less dead time in the classrooms by prioritizing to the longer classes the start times. I don't know where that comes though.

**CARINI:** Yeah, well I tried to come up with schemes like that and couldn't.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #10: GEN ED PROGRESS REPORT**

**HANSON:** Well, we'll have to continue this another time because we have two special visitors to tell us about where Gen Ed is going now, so if we could continue this discussion later and/or you could send comments to me, and John's committee, and the Agenda Committee may want to put this back on since it looks as if it's something people want to talk about. But we have Barb Bichelmeyer and Russ Hanson to talk about Gen Ed.

**R. HANSON:** My name is Russ Hanson and this is Barb Bichelmeyer, and we're here to give you our progress report on the development of the new general education curriculum that is scheduled to go into effect in the fall of 2011. While that might seem like it's a long way into the future, many things have to happen before that can actually occur, so we've been busy at work this year, trying to extend the work that was done last spring, and we'll provide a report on that. For those of you who weren't part of the original discussion, and that includes us actually, since we're new to the committee this year, the purpose of the curriculum is really threefold. It's to deepen students' skills in the fundamental areas of composition, reasoning and mathematical modeling, it's to broaden their intellectual horizons by exposing them to the full-range of disciplines that we offer on this campus, and it's to extend their engagement outside the classroom in the kinds of experiences that internships and study abroad and so forth offer by way of acquainting them with the world beyond that which they are familiar. To accomplish this, the General Education Curriculum has two principle components. One is called the Common Ground, and this is a set of requirements which all students will have to satisfy, and the requirements fall into several areas. There is a composition requirement. There is a mathematical modeling requirement. There is a requirement to take courses in arts and humanities. There is a requirement to take courses in social and historical studies. There is a requirement to take courses in natural and mathematical sciences, and there is a requirement to take courses in world languages and cultures. So this is a kind of distribution scheme that all students [tape ends – some comments lost] satisfying these requirements. And last year, what happened is that all of the academic units proposed courses for inclusion on one or more of these lists. Committees went to work to vet these proposals. They took rubrics they had developed which described the

kinds of properties of courses that were suitable for this kind of curriculum, and then evaluated specific proposals and made decisions, in some cases, of which courses were clearly approved, and in some cases, which courses were not appropriate, given the rubric which had been developed, and then a block of courses that action was deferred because either further information was required about the course or, in many cases, because there were some policy questions that arose, including whether 300, 400 level courses would be included, and we needed a resolution of those issues before we completed the round of evaluation that began last spring. This fall we've resolved those issues. We had a meeting and a ballot of the General Education Committee. We resolved several policy issues including the requirement that courses that are part of the Gen Ed curriculum be offered on a regular basis, that they have specific titles, that they be at the 100 and 200 level, and so forth. And now the committees are going back to work to finish any leftover business from last round, and they will also then begin work, which should be completed by spring break, on a second round of proposals. As the list currently stands, there are about 640 courses that have been approved for inclusion in the General Ed Curriculum. That sounds like a lot, but keep in mind that approximately 100 of them are language courses, and so if we distribute the rest out across, it's not such a huge number, but it will grow. One of the conclusions that Barb and I reached, fairly early on, was that in addition to reviewing the entire curriculum every five years, as the BFC mandates, part of that review should include revisiting the question of whether courses that are on the list should remain on it. So, it is not the case that courses are permanently approved, but they will be subject to periodic review to make sure they are doing what they are supposed to be doing in terms of the curriculum objectives. The second component of the Gen Ed Curriculum is the Shared Goals which is Intensive Writing, Information Fluency, Diversity in the United States, and Extended Educational Experiences. These are not requirements in the way that the Common Ground requirements are. These are goals, and the way in which the goals will be met varies from unit to unit, so each of the academic schools and the college will develop their own plans for providing opportunities for every student who wants to take advantage of these things, and of course, if the units wish to do so, they may require students to do these things, but that's not something that is set at the campus level. This is respecting the autonomy of the schools in developing their degree programs. Not much work was completed last spring on that. Rough rubrics describing each of the goals were developed. We will be refining them this spring. What Barb and I have done, is we have met with all the chief academic officers from the schools and the college to discuss how they might go about implementing the Shared Goals. We've asked them to prepare reports that will help us understand how they might go about that. Those reports have just come in. We'll be looking through them and carrying on the conversation with each of the units to develop a working model of the core curriculum. We expect to come back to the BFC in April with a working model of the Common Ground and the Shared Goals for your inspection. There are other issues that we've been working on, including building the kind of institutional system that will be required to maintain the curriculum. It's not something that is done once or even twice. We imagine that this will be an annual event, so we'll need recordkeeping systems for which courses are on the list at which times and this has to be linked to degree auditing arrangements so that we are making sure that people who came in under one set of classes are being fairly evaluated. We also want to improve the flow of communication, so that people who make proposals learn, in a timely way, what the disposition of the committee was, and if, in fact, they wanted more information or thought the course was inappropriate that some sort of communication goes forward from that. There are a number of other issues that we've been working on, including one

that we will surely have to come back, at least to the EPC for. The BFC has mandated an assessment of the curriculum after five years and this of course, means we have to have some sense of what the appropriate criteria are for evaluating the effectiveness of the curriculum, and so we will certainly want some guidance from the BFC on that. We will need to estimate, when we have a working model of the general curriculum, its impact on enrollment, and hence budget allocations. We've had a conversation with Provost Hanson, who was, I think, sympathetic to the need to buffer schools from any sudden surges or declines, whether we will have fiscal resources to do that is another matter, but we know that that problem is there. We need to realign the registrar, the enrollment services, and particularly university division, with the new curriculum, because everyone tells us that the key to making it work is clear communication from advisors and a curriculum that can be clearly communicated to the students by advisors. We should also point out that once we have a working model of the curriculum, this will have ripple effects on the degree programs in the individual units. And indeed, I think all of the units will probably be adapting degree requirements now that a general set of requirements is in place. That, in turn, will ripple through the bulletins and production schedule that produces materials for the 2011 implementation. We're working hard to get a model of the curriculum so that all of these other steps can occur. We've got an excellent group of faculty who've been hard working and generous with their time. The chairs of the subcommittees, in particular, have been very useful to us and have given us good advice. We're trying to make the process as transparent as we can, and welcome any suggestions you might have. Barb, do you have anything you'd like to add?

**BICHELMeyer:** I think one point, just to follow up in terms of the Shared Goals and the distinctions between the Common Ground and the Shared Goals and the fact that the common ground is a requirement and is curricular. The Shared Goals may be curricular, may be experiential, and they are recommended to the academic units. One point, though, is that one of the Shared Goals is actually a requirement, and that's the Diversity in the U.S., which by a previous BFC circular is a requirement that all students have experience with Diversity in the U.S. at some point in time. Other than that, Russ, I think you've covered everything.

**HANSON:** Questions? Discussion?

**EISENBERG:** I'm coming to this late because I wasn't on the BFC last year, etc..., etc..., but I'm puzzled by the fact that all of the courses, the Common Ground part, have to be at the 100 or 200 level. What is the objection to a more advanced course, let's say on Shakespeare, as a way of introducing a student to, what is it, arts and humanities, etc..., etc...? Just choose that as an example.

**R. HANSON:** This is one of the most closely debated issues in the General Education Committee, and there are, I think, arguments on either side. The arguments against including them, which did, in the end, carry the day, were that very often these 300 level courses were pitched to majors. So you were getting material that on the surface looked appropriate but the classroom setting in which it was offered might not be appropriate for freshman and sophomores. I think that the telling argument that was made was that in the case of a course that is now at the 300 level that is really general education, the solution is to renumber it and offer it at a 200 level. No one is excluded from doing this. If they think it is appropriate for general education, they can renumber this, and we even, in fact, conveyed this message to academic officers.

**BICHELMEYER:** And I would like to follow up by saying that it also brought up conversation in the General Education, the full Committee, when we discussed these policies and took a vote on this, about philosophical issues about how do we define General Education and what General Education means. And there's a broad array of responses to that in terms of how inclusive it should be and how narrowly we should define it, but again the response to that that seemed to be appropriate to academic units was if it really, truly is a course that would be appropriate for any undergraduate student to take from any academic unit regardless of what they intend their degree or major to be then the appropriate solution would be to renumber that.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments?

**CAPSHAW:** Is there a way to know what those 640 classes are?

**R. HANSON:** We'll post a – when we bring the curriculum back, we'll post a list that includes not only the 640 but any that are decided between now and then, which would include courses on which action was deferred from the first round, and courses that had just come to us in the second round. We'll have the full list available.

**BICHELMEYER:** And again, I will follow up by saying that the current list is actually on the BFC's website under the April 3, 2007 agenda and meeting minutes, and I'm not sure actually that is the final or complete list. I think there was one that's dated April 10<sup>th</sup>, so the March 31<sup>st</sup> or whatever that date is, is not the final one. And we learned late in the game, as Russ and I said, we both came to this this fall, and were not part of deliberations last year, there was a later approved version that didn't make it to the BFC website.

**TERRY:** Let me see if my recollection of things is correct. If I remember right, we gave, in a sense, tentative approval to this General Ed plan last year with the understanding that your committee would come back and make recommendations for things. So, you might come back and recommend that we incorporate this 100 and 200 level.

**R. HANSON:** We will come back with a full curriculum based on this policy decision.

**TERRY:** And then the intent would be that we would adopt it permanently, I think. Second it would help me, to follow up, do you have, in hand, the correct BFC circular number for the Diversity in the U.S. issue? I doubt that we came up with it in 1900.

**R. HANSON:** No, it's 1990, 1990. That's a typo. Sorry. Herb, this is a far sighted faculty!  
[laughter]

**HANSON:** Thank you very much Russ and Barb. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned 5:30PM