

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 15, 2008
Kelley School of Business CG 1034
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Julie Bobay, James Capshew, John Carini, Andrea Ciccarelli, Angela Courtney, Diane Dallis, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Matt Jarson, Owen V. Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Ursula McTaggart, Amanda Meglemre, Brian O'Donnell, John Paolillo, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Jennifer Riley, Jeanne Sept, Sarita Soni, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Neil Theobald, Michael Tracy, David Waterman, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Todd Tinius (Eric Arnold)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Moya Andrews, Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Lisa Bingham, Stephen Burns, Nicholas Clark, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Luke Gillespie, Brian Horne, DeWitt Kilgore, Christina Kuzmych, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, James Patterson, Diane Reilly, Mike Robinson, Paul Rohwer, Robert Shakespeare, Richard Shockley, Herbert Terry

GUESTS: John Applegate (Office of the President), James Boyd (Herald-Times), Amanda Ciccarelli (Office of the Provost), Pamela Freeman (Student Ethics & Anti-Harassment Programs) Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Lebo Molefi (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Pierson (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 15, 2008
Kelley School of Business CG 1034
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Members of the Bloomington Faculty Council are cordially invited to the Provost's Reception of the BFC at the Wells House at 1321 E. 10th St. immediately following this meeting.

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/02.19.08.htm>

2. Memorial Resolution for Don C. Bennett

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B25-2008.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. Affirmative Action Report (15 minutes)

(Julie Knost, Director, University Office of Affirmative Action)

7. Affirmative Action Complaint Procedure Review [ACTION ITEM] (15 minutes)

(Professor Alex Tanford, Chair of the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee)

http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B23-2008_Revised.pdf

8. Revision of the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct Procedures for
Bloomington Campus: Student Disciplinary Procedures [ACTION ITEM] (15 minutes)

(Diane Dallis, Head, Information Commons/Undergraduate Library Services, Wells Library, co-
Chair of the Student Affairs Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B24-2008%20Revised.pdf>

9. SAA Affairs Committee Report on Revisions to the SAA Handbook [DISCUSSION] (15 minutes)

(Professor Robert Terrill, Chair of the Student Academic Assistant Affairs Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B26-2008.pdf>

10. General Education Progress Report [DISCUSSION] (15 minutes)

(Professor Russ Hanson and Professor Barbara Bichelmeyer)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B30-2007%20Revised%20and%20Tracked%2004102008.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/Impact%20of%20GenEd%20on%20Academic%20Units.pdf>

http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/GenEd_APC.pdf

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/BFC%20GenEd%20Progress%20Report%2004102008.pdf>

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HANSON: So we might as well begin in this strange and disorienting configuration. Just asking that spitballs not be thrown at us from behind, but if you need to speak up just, you know, no, not the popcorn either. They'll never let us back in this side of the house. But, first order of business, approval of the minutes of February 19, 2008. I need a motion. Thank you, Dennis. Second? Is there a second?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Second.

HANSON: That's good, second. All in favor? Minutes are approved. Secondly, there is a memorial resolution for Don C. Bennett. Jeanne?

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DON C. BENNETT

SEPT: The memorial resolution today is for Don Bennett in the Department of Geography and I'll read to you selected excerpts and encourage you to please read the entire resolution in the minutes.

Born in Salt Lake City, Don Bennett pursued an undergraduate degree at the University of Utah following military services in the Pacific during World War II. He completed his undergraduate degree in 1949 and went on to study under two outstanding geographers, Preston James and George B. Cressey, in the graduate program at Syracuse University. Because of his military experience, Don developed an interest in Southeast Asia. As early as 1953, he was the recipient of a Ford Foundation grant for a study of population problems and pressures in Java, Indonesia. Using that research as the basis for his dissertation, Don received his doctorate from Syracuse in 1957. His interests in Southeast Asia and population geography formed the foundation for much of his research and teaching in the years that followed.

Prior to joining IU in 1959 and shortly thereafter, Don undertook research on tropical terrain and climate conditions in Southeast Asia (Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines) for the U.S. Army. With the assistance of the National Science Foundation, he attended sessions at Northwestern University on the quantitative methodology being introduced into the field of geography at the time. A Fulbright-Hays award resulted in Don's returning to Asia in 1963-64 to study urban problems in Central Luzon in the Philippines.

When he returned to IU in 1964, Don became an assistant dean of the Graduate School. He was also active in departmental administrative matters at this time; in the fall of 1965 he was named chair of the Department of Geography. During the following three years Don oversaw the introduction of quantitative approaches to geography at IU.

After returning to his academic role, Don's research interests expanded to include problems related to population such as literacy, education, housing, and racial and ethnic geography. In response to his changing interests and the needs of the department, he altered his teaching role over the years. He taught a wide range of courses in general human geography, urban geography, and the geography of Europe. Don cared a great deal for his students and he was always available for them. He served as an undergraduate adviser for nearly half of his thirty years at IU; during that time he was adviser to nearly half of the undergraduate majors in geography.

Many in Geography have viewed Don as perhaps the department's most outstanding teacher. Don cared very much about his teaching and he perfected his craft over the years. If there were associate instructors with teaching problems, they were sent to work with Don for a semester. Because of the quality and dedication that Don brought to teaching, he led the course for associate instructors on how to teach. He brought a passion to this course that can only result from years of teaching experience.

Don and his wife Joan raised four children in Bloomington – Janis, Eric, Robyn, and Chad. Like their parents, they have all been active in serving the community. Don always encouraged achievement and independence in his family, so it is not surprising that his wife, children, and their spouses collectively hold four doctoral degrees, three master's degrees, and many bachelor's degrees – all of them from IU!

Don's academic interests also spilled over into his community service on behalf of human relations and affirmative action. He served as a member of the Bloomington Fair Housing Commission when it secured nonrestrictive clauses in real estate advertising for the city.

As a colleague, Don had many memorable attributes: an ability to see the humor in life, a breadth of interests, independence in making judgments, intellectual curiosity, and a capacity to form close personal friendships. These qualities are not easily found – but they are deeply valued, as we valued Don, and we miss him very much.

HANSON: Thank you. Can we have a moment of silence for Don? Thank you. Now to Agenda Committee Business. Lisa?

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

PRATT: I want to call your attention to a flyer that all of you should have lying on the desk in front of you entitled "On a Fateful Anniversary" and it's an announcement concerning two events tomorrow in remembrance of the Virginia Tech University victims. You also should have an electronic version of that that came out under the BFC distribution list. I hope some of you saw a commentary by Herb Terry and me that was published yesterday in the Indianapolis Star. We wrote in response to a series of news stories in the Star and an editorial entitled, "Wake Up Call for Students Makes Money-Saving Sense," not to mention an almost endless series of responses on bloggers and editorial websites. These articles discussed the efforts at IU

Bloomington to schedule more undergraduate classes during early mornings and on Fridays. Herb and I as well as the members of the Agenda Committee were concerned that there were serious misunderstandings about how these changes have come about and how long a faculty member's workweek is. We tried to address the misconception that the increased use of Bloomington classrooms was a final solution rather than a stop-gap measure until more classroom space can be constructed. In addition, we spoke out against the notion of faculty as overpaid. And I'm going to simply quote...

GINGER: ...and underworked.

PRATT: ...underworked and overpaid, I'm going to just quote the last few lines of our commentary, "For us, faculty life is not shutting down the factory early as the editorial puts it. We have more flexible work schedules than many Hoosiers, but we use that flexibility to put in a good deal of overtime without any additional compensation because we love our jobs, passionately believe in both teaching and research, and do what has to be done to do both well." We received very nice notes from a number of faculty members and perhaps most interestingly, we received a lovely note of thanks from the Trustees for strength of argument and clarity of writing on behalf of the university [laughter] which was a pleasure I have got to say.

GINGER: Did you get that in writing?

PRATT: We did! We do have that in writing. Bart Ng and I continue to urge the president at every opportunity to make an official announcement about Family Leave. We do expect the president to make some sort of quiet announcement at the meeting of the Trustees in late May of this year. In an important new development as a result of our face to face meeting with the president last week, Bart and I have spoken with President McRobbie about forming a joint faculty-administration committee to review the procedures and policies for Affirmative Action complaints on all campuses of Indiana University. The president was very supportive and enthusiastic about updating and clarifying procedures as a means to establish a uniform platform for Indiana University Affirmative Action that can be adapted to the needs and missions of individual campuses. It is bittersweet for me to speak today for the last time as president of the BFC. I am so proud of what we have done this year and I believe that the underlying principles of faculty governance are again strong in Bloomington. I thank each and every member of this prestigious, elected group for participating in a demanding form of service to university community. I thank in particular Provost Hanson for her courage in taking an unidentified and undefined position in a new administration and for her persistence in advocating for the mission and needs of the Bloomington campus. And I want to personally thank Craig, there he is, he's down there and his staff in the BFC office for helping us see new ways of doing business that sometimes seem strange in comparison with the way we had done things in the past, but many of them have turned out to be wonderful ways of sort of refreshing ourselves and changing things just a little bit without changing the underlying importance of what we're doing. I like bookends and I like maps, so I'm going to close with the same words and the same roadmap that I used to open the first plenary session of the BFC last fall. We the

elected members of the BFC are the conscience of the university in helping the president and Board of Trustees to make wide decisions on a broad range of complex issues that impact the academic mission of Indiana University at Bloomington. In the coming year, in the past year, we will assess the condition and capacity of our classrooms, we will evaluate the impact of changing admission standards, we will monitor the development of the General Education requirements and we will work with President McRobbie and Provost Hanson to clarify their emerging roles as the leaders of the Bloomington campus. I ask you to stay focused on the centrality of education and scholarship in our institution as state support declines in proportion to other avenues of funding. We are members of the BFC during a time of administrative transformation in Bloomington and our energies and talents are needed now more than ever to guide long term planning for this great university. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: Thank you Lisa. [applause] That was an impressive way to begin and Lisa has obviously done a terrific job this year. We're going to save some time at the end of the meeting... to roast her! No, to say a few nice things. You know, we all are incredibly sad that Lisa is stepping down though we understand why and we want to make plain our appreciation for her as best we can. But Lisa is one for moving along with business so, she has got today packed, and we'll do the business before turning to that pleasure of thanking Lisa. I have a few announcements to make. One is an update on where we are with a couple of search and screens and views. As you know there's a search and screen going on for the Dean of the Hutton Honors College, and also for the Office of Women's Affairs. Those are moving forward nicely and should draw to a conclusion soon. There has been a review of the Dean of the School of Music ongoing and I expect that to conclude soon as well. I will, at the end of this semester as soon as I can put the names together, be announcing a couple of additional search and screens for vice provostial offices. One completely new position really, though it will involve the reconfiguration of some offices that we, or some units that we already have, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. And I've been in touch with the Educational Policies Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee about how this might be structured, and talked just before this meeting with Jeanne Sept's staff because they have very ably handled a whole variety of things connected with undergraduate education in the Dean of Faculties and Academic Affairs office. And I will be continuing some consultation before drawing up a more detailed job description, but nonetheless, some kind of search and screen committee will be formed before the end of May. And also, we have other sad news about stepping down. Some of you may have noticed already, but Jeanne Sept is going to be stepping down at the end of this year. She has done a superb job as Dean of Faculties and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, but she had in fact been promised a sabbatical to do a research project that had some time-sensitive elements in it. She postponed that out of a sense of duty to this institution because she was handling the re-accreditation, which is of course incredibly important to us all, but it meant that she sacrificed something and she feels that she's not in a position to sacrifice that any longer. So we will also be having a search and screen committee formed for the position of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. We also are actually on this campus a little behind on Faculty Council mandated administrative reviews and I intend to try to get us caught up on those next

year. So I wanted to let you know where I'm going with that. As I say, the review of the Dean, the School of Music Dean, should be completed soon. Looking at the list of other ones that are mandated by the governance documents, there would have been a mandated review for the Vice Chancellor/Vice Provost for Academic Support and Diversity, but that office has been transformed and there is now no clear Vice Provost there so it's not really clear that there's going to be a review there. It's not obvious at any rate that an IUB review is mandated. This may be something you need to look at again more closely to understand how that articulates with the Bloomington governance. Budgetary affairs and planning is in sort of the same boat as ASD. A review was actually due in 2006/07, but that office has been substantially restructured so it's not clear that that's covered by these the governance documents either. The Dean of Students and the Vice Provost for Student Affairs was last reviewed in 04/05, and hence would be up for review in this next year. The terrific incumbent of that position, Dean McKaig has suggested that he's very likely to be retiring in a couple of years. I'm not so sure that a review makes sense in those circumstances especially when we have a lot of reviews we will be doing. It may be that some kind of campus review of the office might be a useful thing as we're making transitions and as other elements of structure are changing so that may be something I'd want to get back to talk with you about but I'd also like to talk with Dean McKaig and his associate Dean to see what might be sensible about that. The Dean of the School of Education was last reviewed in 04/05 and so is due for review and we'll proceed with that. The Dean of the School of Journalism is actually fairly recent to the campus but this would be the year in which a survey would be mandated. So we'll proceed with that. The review of the Dean of the School of Law is also overdue and we will proceed with that next year. The School of Library and Information Science would be due for review next year in some ways of figuring this, but the incumbent was actually not in office for one of the years of the four years since the last review so I actually think, again given the fact that we'll have three or four reviews and a lot of major searches going on, it might make sense to actually wait until four years actually in office since the last review had taken place to review the Dean of the School of Library and Information Science. So, that's where I think we're going with those reviews unless there are demurrers. Okay, any questions or comments about that?

AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

EISENBERG: I have a comment and question. The comment is addressed to you, Karen. I was chair, maybe it was co-chair, of the last review of Dean McKaig and I wanted to second according to your suggestion that it would probably be a waste of time to have him reviewed shortly before his retirement. There wasn't a discouraging word spoken about Dean McKaig. He's really a superlative dean in all respects and I'm sure that nothing has changed since that last review. Now, a question for you Lisa. I know that the problem involved a widespread perception of the faculty here as lazy bums, etc. etc... It represents a long-standing problem, but I wanted to ask more specifically whether anybody writing on a blog or a letter to the editor of the Star who wasn't already connected to the University community had anything positive to say in response to Herb's and your so nicely crafted message.

PRATT: We're sort of waiting to see what all develops...

GINGER: I saw some.

PRATT: Oh, did you? Well that's good. I primarily looked at the responses to their articles to sort of see, is everybody just going to jump on this and say, you know, 'what a bunch of wimps they are down in Bloomington because they don't have classes early,' and that sort of thing. And there was pretty overwhelming support for the notion that students here are being coddled, but there were at least a couple where people said they were glad that their son or daughter went to Bloomington where they had the freedom to make their own decisions and not be handed a schedule like a first-grader. So, but there wasn't much. And to tell you the truth, I have not looked at it, too many other things were happening today. Did you say you looked at it?

GINGER: I saw it. I couldn't read very far, made me mad, but I actually did see a couple. Now these maybe are somewhat biased because the persons writing the positive comments said, you know, 'I have a friend who is a professor.' And they didn't say there were a professor, but they said, 'I know that they're always working day and night, and just because they're not in class five days a week...' So, but I can't say I read through all of them because after a while I just couldn't stand it.

HANSON: I got a lot of letters from the public. Nothing good. Nothing at all. But they were primarily directed at the students. In fact, one said, you know something about 'who's in charge down there?' But they had obviously been irritated by the student remarks and one elderly gentleman wrote actually quite a moving letter about the sacrifices of his generation sort of in detail and took the time to actually look up to write to those students too, and wrote not so much a scolding letter as a kind of educative letter about what good things they'd find out if they got up at eight o'clock. But about shouldering the burdens of the world. But there were many people annoyed by that, and some people didn't quite get the message that we were actually addressing some of these issues so it was sort of impossible to write back. And I must tell you that the Trustees were initially fairly happy with the story because it, in their view, showed that the campus was taking seriously the idea of using all of its facilities fully. And again, I want to stress that when the reporter talked with me, I talked a lot about other activities that go on other than events in the classroom on Friday but that wasn't the focus of the story. And the student remarks were very annoying just to many members of the public, I think. Any other questions or comments? Okay, before you tap me on the head. Let's move to Item number 6 then. The Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee report on revisions to the SAA handbook?

PRATT: Um, no.

HANSON: Oh, sorry!

PRATT: In breaking with tradition by trying to allow Julie to not be the final speaker of the final moment, we have moved her to the premiere position! [laughter]

HANSON: I'm sorry I was just steaming along and going to put you to the end! No, the next item then, the Affirmative Action Report. Julie?

AGENDA ITEM #6: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT

KNOST: I firstly apologize for not standing up. You can see me hobble in. And so for those of you who are behind me, I'll try to speak as loudly as I can, and thank you for inviting me. What you have before you is the Affirmative Action Report for this year. This primarily gives a statistical analysis of the faculty and it's not the only way that we monitor the faculty but it's one of the more useful ways, I think, for us to look at it each year and see how things have changed or not changed as the case may be. So let me start by talking a little bit about what is in the report. First of all, each year on October 1st a frozen file is run by the university that catches a snapshot of the university, and that university snapshot is then used for multiple reporting purposes including this report. But in particular it's also used for the IPEDS report that's sent to the Department of Labor and that - or, excuse me, the Department of Education - that's used so that we can do comparisons across institutions, and it's sent to the Department of Labor so we can do comparisons across all types of employment institutions. It looks at data by a certain set of categories. And one is by sex, so that we look at male and female. Also, it reports data by race and ethnicity and those are defined by statute and by regulation as being: Black and African American, Asian, Hispanic, Latino, American Indian, and Native Hawaiian. I've also included in the report this year more CIC data. And I'm assuming that most of you know what the CIC is, it's the Big 10 plus Chicago, University of Chicago, and Penn State. I have that right? And so it again gives us a comparative analysis of how we're doing relative to other institutions that we see as our comparables. So I'm going to primarily focus on tenure and tenure track faculty and librarians today. There is a report on the research ranks and on the instructional faculty separately, but I'm not going to address it simply because of time. So let me start. Last year there were 17 more faculty. There was an increase of 17 faculty in the total faculty count, and librarians there was a minus 2 drop. The increase in the number of women faculty, there was an increase of ten and of minority faculty also an increase of ten. There was an increase of one female librarian and zero minority librarians. So there was small overall growth at the faculty, about one percent. And that's combined with a small but overall growth of the female faculty at 2% and the minority faculty at about 5%. Addressing minority faculty, currently minority faculty account for 16% of all the faculty at the IUB campus. The average of the CIC is 17%, only Minnesota and Iowa have lower percentages than IUB. I hope it doesn't offend you for me to say "IUB," it makes it easy. Unlike most of the CIC, the largest number of minority faculty are at the assistant professor rank. Among the CIC institutions, the average is 24% and at IU-Bloomington it is 28%. I talk about that a fair amount in this report. There was no change in the minority representation at the associate professor rank last year and there's been little change at that rank since 2002. Minority representation among full professors is low, it decreased by 2 last year. And IU Bloomington has the lowest percentage of minority professors at the full rank in the CIC. The IU Bloomington full professor portion is 9% and the CIC average is 13%. I'm going to talk about minority faculty then by race and ethnicity. Currently, black faculty represent 4.3% of all tenure track faculty and the CIC average is 3.5%, so

overall higher, but that's where I want to get to this distribution issue in part. Hispanic faculty represents 3.7%, CIC average is 2.8%. Asian faculty is 7.5%, CIC average is 10.2%. American Indian is .4%, and that's averaged across the CIC. It's a very small population, very hard to, it fluctuates greatly by one hire. Progress on the percentage of black or African American faculty at IUB has been flat and has been for a pretty long time at this point. Most of the hiring occurs at the assistant professor level. Retention seems to be a problem, and it's a problem at the associate and full level for two reasons; retirement, we're losing at the senior level on retirements, as well as resignations. We had resignations at the full professor level this year. Strategic hiring seems most effective at the assistant professor rank and retention does not seem to be a climate or Bloomington location issue. Why do I say that? Because our recruitment at the assistant professor level in encouraging people to come and live here is comparable or better than most CIC institutions. Also, most people stay past tenure, most stay eight up to fifteen plus years. So, what have I looked at? I have looked at why people have resigned, where they've gone, how long they've been here. So that's how I've done that analysis. The recruitment to other institutions at the associate level and above is affecting our retention. There are some minority faculty that leave pre-tenure, but they're also often going to other institutions. Retirement is affecting the profile at the professor level and the other thing that may be happening is that we have a promotion issue. And that is that we're tenuring, promoting, we're getting into associate level but we're not --this is speculation on my part-- but it looks to me based on promotions that we're not promoting into full very fast so people are seeking out other institutions where there are more opportunities and more opportunities for promotion. The other possibility is that it's a career issue so that people are producing the book, have been tenured, are more marketable, and so it's a natural change, but it doesn't explain why that's happening disproportionately for our retention on minority faculty. For women faculty, there was an increase of ten last year. Women currently make up 32% of the faculty. There has been a steady increase of 1 or 2% a year. They're distributed among the ranks at about a third in each rank. Percent of the total in all ranks is very favorable relative to the CIC. We're second in all ranks within the CIC as a percentage of faculty for female faculty. However, what you need to think about there is that some faculties have very large male dominated departments, Engineering being one of them, so that the percent of males is going to be driven up by that number at places like Penn State and therefore the percentage of females is going to be driven down. So that pushes us overall, simply because of the nature of our institution, slightly higher. The problem at IUB, one of the problems at IUB, is distribution, especially in the STEM areas, that's science, technology, engineering, and math. To give you some examples, in Math we have 44 total faculty, we have 4 women. In Physics we have 36 total faculty, we have 3 women. Chemistry, we have 31 faculty, we have 2 women. Biology we have 59 faculty, we have 16 women. Informatics we have 61 faculty we have 11 women. Med Sciences we have 11 faculty we have 2 women. In Optometry we have 18 faculty and we have 4 women. There is good news within this area. Chemistry this year made offers to three women and two have accepted. So there's been some real effort there. There have been efforts in Informatics in the last, it's kind of interesting to watch because you can see our progression and that is, at the senior level there are, I believe, 2 maybe 3 -- there's a full professor I think that's retiring, but there's basically three women. But at the assistant level there's 7 out of 12 faculty are female. And of those 7, most of them have made it past their

third year review. So you're seeing a progression move in there that's based on some hiring that's been going on. I think of some of these, this is just again sort of a side comment and that is in the sciences I see them somewhat as what I would call immature -- isn't that a flattering word? -- departments. Some is about hiring, some is about progress of women in the profession, and some is about our departments being immature. And that is that we are not keeping up with comparable departments across the country. And so I think Chemistry is a good example where we can certainly improve. Librarians, although there was only a small decrease of only one librarian over the last year, this continues a downward trend in total librarians and I don't think that's going to come as a surprise to librarians. The numbers have dropped over the years. There's been a steady, but slow increase in the number of minority librarians although the number 12 remains small. There have been no minority librarians at the full librarian rank since 1997. Two minority librarians were promoted to associate librarian last year and women continue to represent the majority of librarians. On hiring, there were slightly fewer hires last year. Total hires, there were 92 and 96 or, excuse me, in 2006 there were 99. Fewer women were hired last year. They were 35% of new hires compared to 45% in 2006. And most women were hired at the assistant professor rank. Senior women account for only 22% of women hired and by comparison 38% of all newly hired men were at the senior rank. More minority faculty were hired last year than the previous year, however, 92% of those hires were at the assistant professor rank. There continues to be little improvement at the senior rank and although there were more minority hires last year, black faculty accounted for 3% of the new hires as compared to 6% of previous year. On promotions, I'm not going to say a lot about promotions, I did put a new chart in that's pretty interesting, that's in the book, and I don't have a page number, but it gives you the cases that were reviewed for tenure and for promotion by race and by sex for about the last five years. There was...

PRATT: Page 21.

KNOST: Page 21? This year there were 68 promotions and 26% were women and 13% were minority. Terminations, that's a not very nice word again, either you quit, you die, or you retire. Faculty retirements account for a significant portion of the IUB terminations. There were 44 in 2007 and 36 in 2006. But resignations also account for a large number: 35 in 2007 and 47 in 2006, that's the highest number that we have had for about 6 years. Most of the people that resign go to other institutions, virtually all. There's a few that drop out, but very few. Women and minority faculty last year went to Michigan, UCLA, University of Georgia, Auburn, George Mason, Oxford University, University of Toronto, Morehead State, University of Louisiana, University of London, to name a few. That gives you a profile of what happened last year, and I'm open to questions.

HUNT: Julie, do you do exit interviews when minorities leave for other institutions or leave their position?

KNOST: No. I have the data that shows where they went, so I know that, but I don't actually I mean I might talk to some of them but I don't do any formal exit interviews. For a while we were doing exit interviews through the Dean of Faculties office.

SEPT: We do as many as we can...

KNOST: I think the other thing I mentioned last year continues to be an issue that I didn't mention here is that spousal issues remain a problem for all faculty and that is, people are moving in part because of opportunities for spouses to continue being a driving force.

FOSTER: Do you have any figures about proceeding to tenure? I mean some of the resignations may be because tenure is going to I mean do we have any problems with minorities and women receiving tenure?

KNOST: I actually, although they're listed as resignations they are recorded differently as expiration of appointment when it would be a, say, a third year review where someone's not appointed or where they are going to be going up. Now some people will choose to resign because they're thinking they're in trouble and so they'll get another job and resign so they would show up as a resignation, but we do track the ones where there's a termination of contract prior to tenure decision and there's not a lot of impact.

HANSON: Questions or comments? Thanks very much Julie. Alright, on a related topic, the Affirmative Action Complaint Procedure Review. Alex?

AGENDA ITEM #7: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT PROCEDURE REVIEW

TANFORD: You have the slightly revised version of the, what used to be called the Affirmative Action Complaint Procedure and this proposal will be called the Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedure since that's what people are in fact complaining about. Two issues were raised at the last session. The first one was the question of whether the term 'gender identity' which we proposed to add to the list of arbitrary characteristics upon which we do not discriminate was the correct term or sufficiently inclusive and descriptive. At what I took to be the sense of this body I went back and I discussed with our Affirmative Action officer, I discussed with one of our grads and a lawyer named Steve Sanders, who some of you know is a national expert in law in this area and I discussed the matter with Doug Bauder who is our GLBT center director. All of them agreed that 'gender identity' was the appropriate, an appropriate, term and was probably a good one to use because it was at the same level of generality and specificity as for example, 'sex.' We do not differentiate people being harassed because they are female from people who are being harassed because they are male. We group them together under the term 'sex discrimination' and the various things that people were talking about last week or two weeks ago, the general agreement was that those are all covered adequately and descriptively under the term 'gender identity.' So 'gender identity' remains the term in the proposal. I also would note that the SAA handbook which came up at the same time last week has also now adopted in their proposal the identical language here which essentially places, uses the term 'gender identity.' So that was our resolution of that. It was also pointed out that in the fast moving field of administrative reorganization, some of our, even the most recent information I had was already out of date, so there have been several

technical changes, mostly having to do with the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Multicultural Affairs which is undergoing a reorganization. All references in here that used to be to some particular branch of that office have been changed to simply refer to the Office of Diversity, Equity and Multicultural Affairs so that, to the extent that it comes in as the reorganization takes place, the Vice President can pass it on to the appropriate new administrative official. Those were the only two issues that arose last week. So you have a proposal in front of you for action which comes recommended that it be adopted by the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee.

HANSON: Any questions or comments for Alex or general assent? Everybody have a chance really to look at this again? Okay, well it's come from the committee, it's been moved and seconded. Are we ready to take a vote on the adoption of this? Okay, all in favor? [Aye] Opposed? And it carries. Thank you. Another second reading, the revision of the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct Procedures for the Bloomington Campus: Student Disciplinary Procedures. Diane?

AGENDA ITEM #8: REVISION OF THE CODE OF STUDENT RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND CONDUCT PROCEDURES FOR BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS: STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

DALLIS: We have a total of seven changes we'd like to have action on today and I'll go through the lines. The changes start on line 576. This change changes the number of days for appeal the deadline for the days, from seven to ten. There are actually three changes like this that I'll mention later. This was at the request of the advocates who help students understand disciplinary procedures. The second change is, starts on line 708. And this change adds a time limit resolution for the appeals. The current code did not include a time limit for the stuff that's in process. Adding the ten day deadline after which a hearing board must be composed if matters are not resolved. This section will be consistent with the lines on 576 that we just referenced. The third change is another change from seven to ten days and that change is on 7, starts on line 736, continues onto 737, and then there's the same change on 791. We can move on to the fourth change with starts on page, on line 998. This change, it changes the length of time for the retention of disciplinary records when expulsion from housing has been given as a sanction from graduation to five years after graduation. Currently the length of time in the procedures, it's actually longer for lesser, more serious sanctions. So this was really just an oversight when the procedures were last updated, or last changed and revised. And by changing the length of time to five years it actually just corrects that oversight. The fifth change, the one if you look on line 1006 and actually it spreads down to 1055, this clarifies the wording for deferred suspensions or deferred sanctions. This didn't exist until the code was revised in 2006 and the new wording clarifies when it is a deferred suspension to be implemented so as to not negate completed coursework or grades assigned in a class. The new wording also specifies that a deferred suspension can become a suspension if certain, if further violations occur, or if certain criteria have been met. Okay, now to the sixth change it is on line 1142 and it is also a change in the number of days from seven to ten. And then the final change starts on line 1169. For summary action, this new wording provides specific procedures for both the student and the hearing body providing due process for students while recognizing the

serious nature of any behavior that would lead to summary suspension. That all references to chief administrative officer have been replaced with the provost. That's it for the changes that we'd like to have considered.

TANFORD: I just have a question. A couple of issues were raised two weeks ago including whether it was appropriate in other sections of this handbook to have the appeal going to the Dean of the Faculties rather than the Provost. There was some discussions on this anticipated that you were going to relook at that and give the Provost's office the general appeal authority. When you say that these changes are the only ones you are proposing is that simply because you're going to consider that issue at a later time or because you have considered it and have decided to affirmatively recommend the Dean of Faculties as the appeal body.

DALLIS: We'd like to consider it at a later time.

ENO: Last time that we discussed this document if I recall we had a conversation about representation, student representation at hearings concerning whether or not they were free to have anybody represent them in those conditions. How has that been resolved?

DALLIS: It has not been resolved. We brought forward things that we need to be approved so that Kim's office can operate and use the procedures.

ENO: So the same language is still in here?

DALLIS: No, the changes aren't here. The changes that were proposed last time were removed.

ENO: Removed. Okay, thank you.

HANSON: Actually maybe it would help us, is there anything else that was on the table last time that's removed so? I don't know whether everybody really has had a chance to really read this and kind of take it in in its entirety. Can you situate any of this with respect to the last discussion?

DALLIS: Of course I don't have the documents that were discussed last time. I would like for Pam to have....

FREEMAN: Well last time it was a whole other section in part 1 of the proposed procedures which is not student discipline but rather a section for students to file complaints against faculty and administrators. And that was the section that was discussed at length last time, and student affairs committee has withdrawn that so it can be further considered because there wasn't time as I understood it to really get those questions resolved for vote today. So that'll probably have to be worked on again next fall. At least that was my understanding. And then another thing that was discussed that we did mention was the advisors situation. That was the main thing from the student disciplinary procedures that was debated a lot last time. And again

the similar thinking was that this needs more consideration before a vote can really be taken so all the questions can be answered.

HANSON: So, what you're saying is that part was just excised and there's nothing, it's not that there's something else in its place that...

FREEMAN: It'll just remain as is until it can be revised in a way that it seems more acceptable.

HANSON: Any other questions or comments? Any discussion? Are you ready to vote on this? I'm not getting nods on anything.

GINGER: Just like our students this time of year...

HANSON: No, no, no...I have the feeling, do you need a little more time to absorb it right now or are you ready to vote?

MCCORMICK: Just for clarification on exactly what we're voting on; we're voting on a portion of this policy is that correct?

HANSON: That is correct, isn't it?

DALLIS: That is correct that we're recommending changes on. There are no other changes than what you see here.

HANSON: Everybody hear that? This is just one, just these changes will go into the document that's currently governing. Anything else? Okay, alright, are you ready to vote? Okay. All in favor? [Aye] All opposed? It's carried. The revision is carried. **(ALL IN FAVOR, ONE ABSTENTION)**

HANSON: On to discussion of the, as I had prefigured before, the SAA Affairs Committee Report on Revisions to the SAA Handbook. There you are!

AGENDA ITEM #9: SAA AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT ON REVISIONS TO THE SAA HANDBOOK

TERRILL: The documents that you have before you is formatted in sort of a side by side format just because I thought that would be easier to read. A number of changes are being proposed to the document and Craig has gone through and in formatting highlighted the changes on the right hand side from the left hand side so you can see the changes that we're suggesting. But rather than going through each one throughout the handbook I wanted to just draw your attention to just, four kind of, headings of changes that we're proposing to be made here. First one and probably the most substantive one is a change and the addition of a kind of locution that's, that says "student academic appointees who teach" or "SAAs with teaching responsibilities" often replacing previous references to AIs. And the reason is because not all

Als teach and some of the SAAs who teach do not carry the specific appointment of AI. And so some of these guidelines and policies that have to do with student academic appointees who teach, we want to make sure that it's clear that that's referring to all the SAAs who have teaching responsibilities. So we just went through and altered that language throughout the document in various places where it seemed to be appropriate to people. Second major change that we made was to update the language throughout the document to reflect changes in IU Bloomington administrative structure, so changing Vice President to Provost and like that that were appropriate. The third, as was mentioned, brought some of the language into alignment with the language in the Affirmative Action documents we've been discussing. We see those changes have been made, comparatively minor but important to keep those documents consistent I think. And the last change is that at the end of the document you will see the Affirmative Action, I'm sorry the grievance procedures, that we discussed a couple of weeks ago have been folded into the document and you can see the sections of those procedures are intended to replace at the end of the document. And I'll point out real briefly, in the first paragraph of the grievance procedures, they begin on page 10, ____ in the Affirmative Action office suggested the addition of that one sentence there in that first paragraph, just to direct SAAs to the appropriate office for the appropriate issues. But other than that, the grievance procedures included here are just the same as what we talked about a couple weeks ago. And so this is not an action item, but a discussion of the report item. So I'll give you time for suggestions or questions regarding the document revision.

HANSON: Okay.

PRATT: Is it possible in this document to add a definition of the specific activities that are considered teaching, since I think that word has...

TERRILL: Ambiguity?

PRATT: ...different meaning for different people? And I'm not even sure myself, if you mean as opposed to grading or what exactly you're calling out here. So I think some definitions are going to be required.

TERRILL: Sure, yeah, I think that's a good idea. I think that wouldn't be too hard to do. Perhaps in consultation with the Dean of Faculties office we could just...

MCCORMICK: I would also point that there is within the associate instructor a sentence that begins "Teaching consists of the activities of..." So teaching is defined within the document. On page 2 under Definitions of Titles, Associate Instructor, second sentence.

TERRILL: But maybe that definition needs then to be pulled out of that particular title definition and made more global.

MCCORMICK: Or simply repeated under the section on SAAs who teach.

TANFORD: I have a question maybe with Julie here she can answer. The sentence you just pointed out in the grievance procedures where it says, "Issues regarding discrimination should be referred to the Office of Affirmative Action..." We've got to be careful with circular reasoning here because the Affirmative Action document says that these grievances should first be resolved at the departmental unit level, and so I wondered about the 'should' and wondered if Julie had any thoughts about whether you wanted to tell SAAs in essence to come to you first or if we should flip those somehow.

KNOST: I think that's why we used the word 'referred,' too. Because usually what happens is that we try to make sure everyone gets both offices so that Jeanne and I would then figure out is this an employment problem or is this an appointment problem, is this a discrimination problem and so we're able to sort it out. And that's worked pretty effectively for the last at least five years.

TERRILL: So the sentence should stay and works now.

KNOST: I think it works. It also hits the problem where they come to me first and I say that, 'look, this is about your teaching responsibilities,' and so let's go back to the department and find out what's going on that I can pull the Dean of Faculties in the reverse side as well.

TERRILL: Yeah?

EISENBERG: Yeah, Lisa's question from the definition of teaching and from the definition of Associate Instructor. Maybe, although I don't really think so, it's an adequate definition for Associate Instructors, but it doesn't actually define teaching. In fact, we have a real problem with this as a definition because it's "Teaching consists of the activities of teaching dah, dah, dah dah, dah..." Which won't get us very far. [laughter] So clearly this needs to be worked on a bit.

TERRILL: Yeah, I agree I can take that up before Susan McCammon.

HANSON: Other questions? Comments?

MCCORMICK: I was going to point out that health insurance information on page eight in the discussion we had in the beginning is that the challenge we have with links in this is that the Chickering Group is already outdated as the name of the health insurance and it's now Aetna Student Health. Robert did point out that if one were to click on the link there, chickering.com/schools/iu does connect you to that, but our recommendation is to try to make the links internal as much as possible so that we don't deal with things being outdated by external links. There's one under the dental plans that points directly to UHR benefits students under the new dental insurance information and the discussion was to direct students to that link where they can then subsequently be directed to the most current benefits.

HANSON: This is on page eight. Any other questions comments suggestions?

PERRY: In this document you refer to the Bloomington Provost, and it is a Bloomington document. In the other document, the changes referred to the Provost. I guess since we're changing the language, I wonder if we shouldn't just make it all consistent. Or are we anticipating other provosts? [laughter] But it's a Bloomington document so...

TERRILL: Yeah, that does make good sense and it should be easy to repair, so...

HANSON: Anything else? Okay, this was, you know, a discussion item. If you have further comments or suggestions, I'm sure you're receptive.

TERRILL: Thank you.

HANSON: Thank you. We are going to have the discussion on General Education progress, but Russ is teaching and can't be here for a little while so one of the things I thought we would do is take our break right now then we may move to some other business before Russ gets here. And also, remember that there is a reception for all of you immediately following this meeting and we're in this strange configuration because it's closer to the site of the reception which is Herman Wells' old house. So that will be a lovely thing to go to, I hope you will just trek across the street afterwards, so for now, don't load up on popcorn but take a break, talk to one another for a short period and then we'll convene.

PRATT: Popcorn will be used to form a breadcrumb trail from here to the reception...

BRIEF RECESS

HONORARY REMARKS ON BEHALF OF PRESIDENT LISA PRATT

HANSON: I must say that it has been a great pleasure for me to work with Lisa in this capacity this year. I have admired Lisa for a long time. I think the first time I had any extended conversation with her was when I was squiring a job candidate up and you were Associate Dean of the College and would come in, and those were always interesting discussions in the College because they would get into the meat of the candidates' work and it was always impressive to see how somebody like Lisa could do that. I obviously was coming from a different field and yet she managed to turn the conversation into something interesting with everyone I brought to her. I also, I don't know if Lisa knows this, but I have sneaked into her classes from time to time because she is a model teacher and I've admired the way you know, I've gone in to see her teaching large classes trying to understand how to use those clickers and seeing the sort of devices she uses, which I think are replicable in a variety of other fields to keep a huge class motivated, interested, and learning something every minute. And I think she has a reputation for that as well as being, obviously, a great mentor to students. I think, I don't know whether this is the case or not, but she may think of her teaching as focusing a lot on the sort of field work that she does and bringing students out into the research that she has ongoing. But she is also a model teacher for large lecture courses. And if you have a chance, I'd advise you to

sneak in on her classes. I mean, it's hard to find a seat because she keeps the students there throughout the term, so that's, that I admired her in the construction of Simon Hall where she took charge of something and produced something that is of a lasting benefit to this campus. I saw her talking about her research at the Phi Beta Kappa lecture at one point, and learned a little about these extremes that she likes and learns from. And you know, just thought of her sweating down there in the gold mines of South Africa and in which was applicable to these things that's she is deserting us for, understanding life on Mars, if such there be. And I must say, I got a whole, you don't know this either, but I was actually on the committee that selected you for the OWA Distinguished Scholar Award so I saw many other people attesting to the full range of Lisa's many talents. Well, probably not the full range, but a huge enough range that her selection was inevitable. And then of course this year I've had the great pleasure of working with her in the BFC and I, it really has been a huge pleasure and a wonderful learning experience. One of the things that has been so important to all of us on the campus is to have somebody like Lisa who has so many other things going on and who is doing all of those other things so well, give her time and attention to faculty governance and to the issues that matter to the whole campus. And that's one of the reasons I was thrilled that I would be working with her closely and of course she fulfilled every one of the promises that one might have expected her to make to this particular institution even in the face of keeping up her terrific teaching her terrific research. She approaches everything with gusto, honesty, and an intent to make a difference and I think she's really done it this year. So I want to say thank you very much, Lisa, it has been a great pleasure.

PRATT: Karen, thank you so much for the kind words. I wish my 13 year old daughter, my seventh grader [laughter] was here for the counterbalance because she would tell you about my many flaws.

HANSON: I know, I have teenagers too! But I think that the Agenda Committee also wants to mark this day.

BOBAY: Yes, we had hoped to have a some remarks looking back on the year working with Lisa and Herb Terry was going to deliver those for us and Herb was called away for a family emergency just yesterday. So we just have a few words to say, and a few gifts to acknowledge Lisa's contributions to faculty governance. I've been a member of this body for many years and have worked with several presidents and I've got to say, this year may have been one of the more challenging and interesting years. It was a year of firsts on every level that I can think of and Lisa's contributions are really extraordinary on behalf of all of us and so the Agenda Committee wanted to acknowledge those and we have gotten a few large and small gifts to mark the occasion. So we'd like you to open those now.

(Opening of gifts, comments left out of minutes)

AGENDA ITEM #10: GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRESS REPORT

PRATT: I feel bad not saying this while Russ and Barb are in the room but I do want to at least share with you that there was a great deal of email discussion this week about the relative roles and authority for General Education at this point in time and many of us went back and read with great interest the closing remarks one year ago at the final meeting that Ted Miller presided over as president with regard to what we were voting on in terms of the recommendations and policy documents for General Education. And as we went back and looked at the transcript, it was not at all clear exactly what we did or why we did it other than to initiate the process. And so at this point in time what we are going to hear from Russ and Barb and if you've taken the time, and I really hope you have, to read the documents that were sent out, we are receiving from them an update on the activities and the discussions that have taken place in the Gen Ed committee which you will remember was very carefully structured in order to take advantage of faculty expertise in order to provide representation for all of the schools here in IU Bloomington, but also to acknowledge a very special role played by the College of Arts and Sciences. As that group has met this year and has really struggled to come to, you know, to come to grips with what is an implementable version of General Education, they have needed to revisit some of the wording in the call, in the policy guideline, that we gave them. They have debated those changes long and hard. And every one of those changes have been voted with a roll call vote so they knew whether or not the voting reflected difference among the schools or differences between individuals of, you know, just different persuasion or rank. I have asked them to come here today and to walk us through what we think are the most, sort of, important of those voted changes. They in turn initially asked us to not consider revisiting any of those issues as a body by the BFC and I simply had to say in the end that we would listen with respect but that we would continue to engage in discourse and debate because these matters are at the heart of academics, they're at the heart of curriculum and that it would be unreasonable for the BFC to ever agree that they no longer had responsibility to keep an eye on these matters, so, what they're going to bring forward is what I view as recommendations from a committee that we had a very important role in putting into place. But we will not vote on these recommendations today because I think we really need time to read the documents and think about them and it may well be then that the BFC will meet in the fall and offer some sort of blanket support for the changes or some one or two of them may be called out to revisit, but I ask you not to sort of jump ahead a series of rational steps here. We do not bring this in intending an action item at this time. This is an informational meeting and also it's a chance to have them describe to us the ways in which they have trimmed down the list of acceptable classes that they are bringing forward as a recommendation. So there will be lots of content. Content that is both with regard to the course list and content with regard to some of the more difficult issues that need to be in place in order for this for General Education to work on this campus and in order to give every school and every major time to think about how these requirements are going to impact progress to degree of the students in their individual tracks toward specific degrees. There will be much to talk about and we do not, we certainly will not be able to discuss everything by 5:30 this afternoon. So again I think this will be to get us all up to date. We've tried very hard this year, the Agenda Committee has really stayed away. We have not tried to micromanage or direct the activities of this committee. We felt that it was important that they had a year to really come to grips as a very large, very strong

committee, and this is great because now Russ and Barb will have no idea how I have set up their presentation, but I welcome you and I am delighted you're here and the floor, the floor is yours right now because I have the globe of Mars here as my witness. We're delighted to have you here.

R. HANSON: Well, I will begin and Barb will finish the formal report and we'll entertain questions. As you all know, the General Education curriculum goes into effect in 2011. In fact it needs to be finished well before then in order to be implementable in the sense of allowing units to plan courses to meet the demand that students present and to do the financial planning and so forth. So we're aiming to have essentially a finished curriculum a year from now and we think we can do that in part because the committees that were working with us this year really made substantial progress particularly on the Common Ground component of the General Education curriculum. The Common Ground is the courses in English Composition, in Mathematical Modeling, the Breadth of Inquiry courses, and then the language and cultural courses. And as you saw from the report that we distributed, between last year and this year, the first rounds of course proposals we received a little over 1200 courses that were considered for inclusion in the common ground curriculum in one of the other slots. The committees reviewed these courses using rubrics the committees worked hard to define substantive rubrics that would tell them which courses were appropriate and which courses were not. In the end at this stage of the game, 604 have been approved for one or another area in Common Ground. That includes more than 150 in languages which received a distribution on the first page of the list of courses that has been formally endorsed by a vote of the General Education Committee. A unanimous vote, I might add, by that committee. That list is in some respects different from the list that you saw last spring. It includes some new courses, but it also does not include some courses that were originally proposed but which have been removed at least for reconsideration as the rubrics and cells were redefined and the new policy is implemented by the General Education Committee. The courses that were not approved fall into two categories. One is deferred courses. These are courses that look like they would potentially meet the rubrics, but for which additional information was needed in order to decide that fact. There is a list of courses that were formally not approved and we did not say that these were disapproved because we're going to return them to the academic units and ultimately to the departments to see if these want to revise them and resubmit them for consideration. Some of them are unlikely to return because they've been affected by decisions that were made by the General Education Committee as we'll see in just a moment. As an example of that, we did receive several 300 and 400 level classes that it was the decision of the committee not to include those courses in General Education. We are proposing to departments that in some cases it might be appropriate to re-number a 300 level course. If it is a course that is not really aimed at majors, it's a course it could be renumbered and then be reconsidered for General Education or alternatively it might be that it could be used for distribution credit within an academic unit. For example, in the Arts and Sciences College what is being discussed right now is the plan of building distribution requirements on top of the Breadth of Inquiry. So whereas the General Education component requires, let's say two courses in arts and humanities, the College of Arts and Sciences might require four, so two additional courses and those courses within the college might be 300 or 400 level. So we're not saying that there is no place for the 300 or 400 level

courses in the distribution scheme. We're saying that the General Education curriculum is not the most appropriate place for them. And that's for a couple of reasons. In the first case, we think that renumbering and the use of these other distribution schemes will be sufficient. And there were also several discussions within the committee about what kind of experience, not just what kind of subject matter, but what kind of experience students would have in 300 level course and whether that would serve the purposes of a Common Ground curriculum which is meant to also generate a common experience for incoming students. The policy decisions that we made in the course of reviewing these are listed on the front page of the review. We have throughout this year worked very much with the idea that the circular from the BFC is our constitutional document. We need to remain within the constraints imposed by that. But it is silent or permissive in certain areas and so we have asked the General Education Committee by formal vote to make some decisions that have had the effect of shaping the curriculum and they are listed here. One area that comes close perhaps to departing from the circular is the vote by the committee to raise the minimum grade in English Composition to a C-. Under the original circular, it was proposed that successful completion of a foundations course would meet the requirement. Successful completion would mean a D- in composition. In fact most units on this campus already require as a condition for admission to a degree program or graduation a C or a C-. And so the composition committee proposed that we recognize that *de facto* standard which applies inside units and make sure that the Gen Ed requirement was close to that so that you don't have this gap between what's required to satisfy Gen Ed and what's required to actually graduate with a degree from a unit. So that is a vote that we took this spring. 38 people cast ballots and it was 30 to 8 approving and raising the threshold for English composition to a C-. The virtue of these policies is that we now have a kind of consistent framework that was lacking last year. We've applied that to this year's courses and we've also applied it retroactively to courses that were considered last year. So we've got a consistent application of the framework. That's why the composition of the list is a little different from what you've seen before but we feel quite confident that we've made fair decisions. The next step after we present here is to convey these decisions to the academic units and departments along with the reasons why the decisions were made and some guidance as to how they might refrain from proposals if that's what they wish to do. And we expect to go through another round of course proposals next year. Indeed, this is likely to be an annual event as we continually refresh the curriculum. We also expect to prune courses from the list occasionally, if they don't meet the frequency of offering requirements, for example. And as the BFC circular stipulates there will be a mandatory review of the full program after five years and that would be a chance to in fact assure ourselves that the courses that we thought were appropriate are in fact accomplishing the objective in the curriculum. So it's not the case that this course list is going to grow forever and ever. We do expect that new courses will be added but some other courses will be removed as (inaudible) dictates. That's the Common Ground component, Barb will talk about the progress that's been made in Shared Goals and will also say something about what we think we need to do in the upcoming year.

BICHELMAYER: As you may recall, the Shared Goals portion of the General Education curriculum is actually recommended for the academic units and it's not required as the Common Ground portion is. The Shared Goals portion, it contains four parts; first, an Intensive

Writing element, secondly an Information Fluency element, third a Diversity in the US requirement for recommendation, and fourth an Enriching Educational Experience for students. Now, when Russ and I took over as co-Chairs in the fall, we immediately began scheduling appointments with academic unit officers to discuss with them where they think they stand in terms of preparation to actually take on the General Education curriculum and what their plans were for the Shared Goals. You see before you, or you have in the packet of materials we sent forward, a document that is entitled the Academic Unit Status Summaries. And in this document you'll see summary reports that we asked the academic unit officers to provide for us. Generally these are either the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for the College and each of the schools. And in those reports, they spell out in some detail what they expect the impact of taking on the General Education curriculum will be for them. The good news in the Shared Goals area, and you can read through these reports at your leisure I'm sure...

PRATT: We did not print that one out, it's an electronic link.

BICHELMAYER: It's a 28 page document so I understand why you might not print that out. The one academic unit that is not actually represented in that document at this point in time is the School of Nursing and we will update you on that as we move forward with that. All the other academic units are represented there. The good news is that for the Shared Goals element of the General Education curriculum or the Shared Goals portion, most every academic unit was probably in the range of being able to meet three of the four recommendations at this point in time. And it varies from unit to unit which piece they feel like they might have to we would call stretch pull for that or that they would have to do something they need to put in place. So what we meant to do with that report was to gather information about the Shared Goals aspect as well as the overall implementation initiative and that will guide us in the future. One thing that we have left to do in regard to finalizing the information in the circular and finalizing the General Education curriculum requirements is to be able to readjust the rubrics around the shared goals as necessary and these academic unit summaries are helping us to shape what the final terminology should be that we should present in that portion. Other than that in terms of implementation, what we plan to do in the coming year because we are, as Russ mentioned in the beginning, on a what might not seem like a quick timeline but Fall 2011 is not far away when you consider the work that needs to be done and when bulletins are printed and when the Registrar's office has to be able to engage in and know that the technical pieces are in place for degree auditing and when we have to actually start giving information to the enrollment services and to promote the idea of General Education curriculum. So the last page of the overview that we gave you and progress report highlights some of the things that we think we need to address in terms of taking care of implementation issues for the next year. And in addition to finalizing that Shared Goals language, probably the next most important thing, and we've already been in contact with the EPC about this is to get some guidance about the assessment plan for the General Education curriculum which is written into the circular that there will be an assessment at five years and ongoing and so we're looking for guidance from the EPC and the BFC regarding what that assessment plan might include and what the details of that will be. Additionally we have been in contact with the Registrar's office and we will

continue to be in contact with the Registrar's office and we've also asked for the names from the academic unit officers of those who were responsible for degree audits in the various academic units as to exactly how technically we are going to be dealing with doing degree audits for the General Education curriculum and Russ and I spent a, hard to believe you can spend two hours, talking about PeopleSoft and the technical aspects of degree auditing but we just had that meeting about a week ago and I think we both came out with our minds just a little numb from the details of that. We also will be looking at and working with academic units in terms of adjusting the degree programs in the bulletins so that we can prepare those. Some degree granting units begin actually producing their bulletins for the Fall 2011 academic year in 2009, so we are fast approaching that date to have those materials ready for them. And then, again, ensuring that enrolling services, University Division, that can accommodate the General Education curriculum in terms of admissions policies and making sure that those are all squared away: enrollment management, advising, degree auditing. Then another important part of that is to begin next year analyzing enrollment patterns so that we can determine just how the General Education curriculum might impact the various degree granting units and the units that offer these courses to see just exactly what the impact will be as far as we can tell. And then finally we need to be able to begin finalizing this information so that we can help to prepare the materials that will promote and provide marketing opportunities for our new General Education component. So we have a busy year next year but unlike this year where we were busy setting policies and putting them in place so that we can ensure consistency, in terms of the General Education curriculum, next year will be more fully engaged in implementation issues and preparing the campus to actually be able to offer this curriculum. That's our report. I don't know how much time we have for questions...

PRATT: I'm hoping you can just talk briefly about why the C- minimum grade was recommended for English Composition but not for Mathematical Modeling.

R. HANSON: We discovered and we've actually discussed this with the EPC and there are different pedagogical issues in these fundamental skills. The way English proceeds is to offer lots of advice and consultation up to the point of submission. And so the work is reviewed and commented on before it's actually graded. And so as a result, most students can actually achieve a C- with relatively little difficulty. It takes a lot of coaching to get there but they're not for the most part, having to repeat courses regularly to reach that threshold. That's not the case in Mathematics, at least with our current student body. Lots of people come in poorly prepared in Math. They have to take courses which may not even carry college credit just to get into a college course that does carry credit and even there, they may not perform well. So there are real concerns about setting a C- threshold in Math that most students, or many students at any rate, might not reach. There are corresponding difficulties with that, but it's the situation is sufficiently different that we didn't think that the consistent threshold was required here if the problems are different for the two skills.

BICHELMAYER: And I might add that we've seen evidence at this point in time where the vast majority of students already do get a C-. So we've looked at grade data and in English Comp, that's not a stretch to expect that most students would get a C-. The other issue in terms of

why not with Math Modeling at this particular point in time is because we're anticipating that the new Core 40 requirements are going to better prepare students to be able to be successful in the Math Modeling courses. We don't necessarily know that yet, so we don't have some of the same data that we have to make that decision that we needed to make the decision about the English Comp.

R. HANSON: Now, Bill Wheeler is doing transcript analysis. I'm not sure if Bill's doing it alone or if other people are working with him. Are you working on that John, also?

CARINI: No.

R. HANSON: but he's looking at the class that just came in, which people think of as being stronger and maybe an indicator of what's likely to happen as our admissions standards ramp up. He's looking at their math backgrounds to see if in fact they're likely to do better, but we're not sure. Now that said, we don't want lots of students to come in and fail. That does present a different problem that we have to address in the curriculum if the math threshold stays at D-. Each academic unit sets its own math standard for admission to a degree program and for graduation. So this is a case where you could actually have a significant number of students who satisfied the Gen Ed requirement but didn't yet satisfy the degree requirement for the unit they're in. So that raises some serious advising issues. But we have this problem wherever the threshold is set. It's either in the mathematics department or it's in the larger university that you have to manage a sizeable number of students who are poorly prepared in math, and who can't get that C- threshold at least the first time up and maybe not even the second time.

CARINI: With the foundation's half ____ has also raised the level, that is to be considered the college level math. You have to pass a college level math course. If you pass, you know different schools have had different requirements but say in the College, the requirement is not actually that high. So we didn't want to simultaneously raise the expectation level and yet at the same time implement a grade...

R. HANSON: This is a requirement that is going to address units differentially too. The College currently has a C-, the Kelley School of Business currently has B. The School of Music doesn't, it's a D-. So I mean, the impact of this requirement will be quite uneven and I think there are real concerns, particularly in the School of Music given the kinds of students who are recruited who very often come from conservatory backgrounds and don't have the same kind of academic prep that the rest of our students have, of how this might affect their ability to recruit students. So we want to proceed very carefully on this and we're not advancing that discussion. In some ways it may depend on what happens in the College of Arts and Sciences which is beginning to consider what its curriculum will be in relation to the Gen Ed curriculum. There is no reason for us to even approach that until they decide which...

MCCORMICK: Russ, in terms of looking at the courses that are approved and not approved, is the makeup the same? Or are a lot of the courses that are not being approved coming from outside the College? As I look at the numbers here, approximately 10% in the three areas that

are not 100% from the College are from outside of the College. Is that the same in terms of the ones that were not approved or are a lot of the ones that are not approved coming from the outside?

BICHELMeyer: It's not that a lot of the ones that are approved are not coming from outside, or are coming from outside the college. It is that the data we presented to you about the courses and the course lists is both last year and this year's review. And what happened was, many courses were approved last year that were 300, 400 level courses that were not offered at the appropriate frequency. And so there were, I think probably, I can't say proportionately, but the courses that are not approved don't really represent any particular academic unit as much as they really represent that we have policies that we put in place this year that we retroactively applied. And every subcommittee had to go revisit those courses.

MCCORMICK: I would, I mean, I would very strongly encourage to look at the impacts of this on units that a course that is currently meeting a humanities requirement that drops off that humanities list could have a very dramatic impact on certain units.

BICHELMeyer: And that's exactly why our plan for next year is to really look at that kind of stuff.

R. HANSON: And the impacts are mendable. That is, it could be an important course and if it's not on the list you squeeze somebody's schedule in a way that's uncomfortable. It has revenue implications as well. So one of the goals here is to have a kind of a working model of the curriculum which can do enrollment analyses and project enrollments again to prepare for what will be some revenue swings that units have to be buffered against. I will say, I don't know the exact number, but the vast majority of courses that were reviewed came from the College.

MCCORMICK: And that's what I was asking...

R. HANSON: We're not getting many from outside the college. That's, they're not, they're welcome, we would love to have a greater buy in, for what is after all a campus wide curriculum, from other campus units. But it's difficult for some units to dedicate resources to the Gen Ed when they're strained in terms of meeting their abilities to satisfy the internal demand.

HANSON: Any more questions, or...?

PRATT: One other thing that simply jumps out at me off the summary sheet, is how do you count those four semesters? Will some of the Gen Ed be offered in the summer?

R. HANSON: We're counting that Fall and Spring. The summer schedule is so unpredictable that it may be that they're offered, but we're not assuming that. And there has...

PRATT: But if it was offered in the summer, would that count as having been offered in the bracket of semesters around summer?

BICHELMAYER: Our definition of “offered every four semesters,” is the academic year Fall/Spring, Fall/Spring.

R. HANSON: But this does raise one other task that we have to do next year. We know that we need some process for making exceptions to these rules. No single set of rules can catch all possibilities. We’ve been reluctant to go there until we knew what the full curriculum looked like so that we could then design an appropriate exceptions procedure. But there will have to be something that can take that kind of case into account.

PRATT: Well, and I think it’s awfully important for our students that if they were to be short one Gen Ed class for graduation, many of them sort of will scramble to do that in the summer. So I hope that there’s some way we can encourage or reward departments that offer Gen Ed classes in the summer time.

BICHELMAYER: Excellent point. In terms of thinking about that detail, just to note, one other major decision that we need to make soon is actually what Fall 2011 means. And it’s kind of interesting when you think about that question. For students who graduate from high school in May or early June and there are students, some students, who come early to get a math requirement out of the way for example to concentrate. So, in discussion with the Registrar and others, and we’ve had wonderful conversations with University Division advisors also who really look into the details of these issues and have challenged us in many ways; are we going to mean that Fall 2011 really starts in the summer so that students who come in early can take courses and they are bound by these requirements? Do we mean, the fall semester? What do we mean? So those are the kinds of details in terms of implementation that keep jumping up and striking us.

GROTH: Isn’t that just a certification date. When they certify in, or…?

R. HANSON: Different units certify differently. So what we’re looking at is how the creation of a standard certification date, which will have to be negotiated with academic units, kind of their own program.

CARINI: I think the original idea of the timing was to have it coincide with whatever the new admission requirements were applied and so, now I can’t remember. And I think we did address that and I think we did say start it in the summer of 2011, but we have to go back and check. But the idea being that admission requirements were preparing the students to be able to do what they foresaw being the General Education.

R. HANSON: We’ll dig into the archives.

HANSON: Thank you very much. We have reached mandatory adjournment time, we should move over to the home across the street.

Meeting adjourned at 5:31PM