

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 18, 2007
Indiana Memorial Union State Room East
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: James Biles, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, James Capshew, John Carini, Andrea Ciccarelli, Angela Courtney, Diane Dallis, James Drummond, Robert Eno, Christine Farris, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Brian Horne, Kevin Hunt, Owen V. Johnson, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, John Paolillo, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Richard Shockley, Sarita Soni, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush,

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Cary Buzzelli for Terrence Mason, Thomas James for Brian O'Donnell, Matt Jarson for W. T. Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT: Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, Stephen Burns, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, Paul Eisenberg, Jeremy Engle, Harold Evans, Pat Foster, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Csilla Kajtar, DeWitt Kilgore, Lloyd Kolbe, Christina Kuzmych, Mike Robinson, Paul Rohwer, Alex Tanford

GUESTS: John Applegate (Office of the President), Alan Bender (Biology), Amanda Ciccarelli (Office of Provost), Brad Wheeler (VP for IT), J.T. Forbes (Governmental Affairs), M. Grace Calhoun (Athletics), Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Julia Lamber (Law; Athletics Committee), Ken Sauer (Assoc. Commissioner for Research and Academic Affairs), Ted Miller, Robin Murphey (Faculty Council Office), Lebo Molefi (Faculty Council Office), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
September 4, 2007: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/09.04.07.htm>
2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Professor Lisa Pratt)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)
4. Question / Comment Period* (5 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt)

5. Indiana Commission on Higher Education (45 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Jeffrey Stanley, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning Studies ICHE, Dr. Ken Sauer, Associate Commissioner for Research & Academic Affairs, and Professor Theodore Miller)

6. Brief Recess (5 minutes)

7. “Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics.” (50 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Robert Eno and Professor Herbert Terry)

COIA Report: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/COIA.pdf>

COIA Website: <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>

8. New Business/Old Business (5 minutes)

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hanson: Okay, so we are called to order and the first business is the approval of minutes of September 4th, 2007. Anyone to make a motion?

Soni: Motion.

Hanson: Sarita. A second.

Groth: Second.

Hanson: All in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? Okay, the minutes are approved. Agenda Committee Business.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Pratt: I want to follow-up or let you know what we did by way of follow-up on the matter discussed last time, which was the condition and availability of classroom space. Obviously this is an enormous problem. It's institution wide; institution here in Bloomington, it's Bloomington-wide. It is going to require a high degree of collaboration with both the Provost and the President.

The very first few things that we are going to do are the following: we've asked the Educational Policies Committee under the leadership of John Carini, John where are you? There he is, if you would wave. If this is a topic that interests you, tell John you want to work with him on the EPC. We're going to start by having a very careful look at the scheduling situation to see how quickly we could begin to change the density of scheduling for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday 55-minute classes, to do a little bit better assessment of how much of an impact would that have. In other words, would it be an effective strategy in the short run or would it not be, and I don't think we know the answer to that right now because the time intervals on the data at the moment are a little too coarse to really—I think we're going to have to take it all the way down to almost 15-

minute sectors. John being a physicist, he's good for that data analysis and so we're going to turn that over to his committee.

We are going to have to have some conversations individually, in small groups and collectively about how we begin to advocate for capital priorities, how we communicate to the legislature and the trustees the importance of classroom, new construction of classroom space on the Bloomington campus or immediately adjacent to the current core of the campus. That's going to require some real deep thought about strategies. It certainly goes hand in hand with the President's plans to move forward with master planning. So we hope that we can have faculty at the table for those discussions and have them closely involved in how we are thinking about those sorts of things.

Then Karen is going to talk about some discussion that the Agenda Committee has had with her about a new committee to look at some of these issues but I'm going to leave that for her to talk about.

So that's where we are as a follow up from what we did at the general session two weeks ago. I think the agenda for today is evident from the speakers. I will say that this meeting will resemble the first meeting in that we are largely trying to present you with a group of speakers who will give you a lot of information and a lot of content to then carry to your sub-committee to worry about whether or not we need to change policy or we need to create resolutions, and then you'll bring that back to the general session. So today will again be sort of a fact finding mission and information session and that will deal first with the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. Ken Sauer is here today to talk to us about that and then we'll follow up with what may for some of you be an introduction to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. For some of you that will be a topic that you already know and that will be led by people from here within the Bloomington Faculty community.

Things that are coming down the road that are going to require the attention of one or more of the BFC committees are transferability of credit hours from non-baccalaureate so-called community college institutions. This is something that comes to us because of a regrettable situation in Indianapolis where—some of you may have seen the article in the Star, there was a problem with the number of credits that were being accepted for transfer from Community college institutions for IU degrees. Karen is actively involved in working with the Academic Leadership Council that involves administrators from many of the IU campuses to try to figure out what is an appropriate way to deal with those transfer issues and I think that Karen, are you planning to touch on that today?

Hanson: I wasn't actually.

Pratt: Well, Karen is not going to touch on that today. But it will be touched on in at least a couple of our committees as we work with Karen to figure out what's the right way to handle transferability for Bloomington. It will be looked at the University Faculty Council, the UFC level but we need to figure out what we want to do here in Bloomington and how it works with all of the different schools and programs on this campus and what they've been doing for the past 5 to 10 years.

Many of you will know that we are in a very difficult year this year with regard to the sunsetting of the current family-leave benefits. We have to work on that, we are working on it. The UFC is also working on it. I had a very frank and collegial discussion with President McRobbie last Friday. Bart Ng and I brought this up with the President. He was concerned that we not only get this right, but we work on it early this year so it doesn't end up pushed up against the end of the spring semester. We had a discussion about the possibility of actually getting one or two of the Trustees designated as the liaison so that we do a lot of the threshing out of this before it gets presented in a Trustees meeting. So we're going to work with Michael to try to figure out the right way to connect the BFC Benefits Committee with the UFC Benefits Committee with a subset of the Trustees.

One other topic before I turn it over to Karen. Master planning – we are all hearing a lot about the master planning; about the search for a new master planning architect. No formal announcement has been made by the President's Office although we anticipate an announcement perhaps even before the inauguration events. We again talked to Michael about this last Friday and it certainly sounded like many faculty will be asked to be involved in that process. I hope if you're asked you will agree to serve because it is critical for what this University does not only over the next decade but over the next several decades because decisions are going to be made that will deeply influence academic programs, academic policy and the faculty. If we want to be involved, we are going to have to agree to serve on these committees even though some of them are going to require very deep time commitments from the people who sit on them.

I think that's everything I have from the Agenda Comm. and I'll turn it over to Karen.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

Hanson: Just to pick up on one of the items that Lisa mentioned, one of the things we want to do is to have a campus committee on these space issues connected with the educational mission and so far we've had one volunteer but we would like—this came out of the conversations last week, think about it again, think about either volunteering or talking with people in your units to see whether or not we can get a broad representation so that we can get a lot of views on what is or isn't working in the referred classroom space. That's a committee we want to have going this term with some results before the end of the term and we expect the discussions about these matters to play into the master planning planning.

The master planning exercise is going to be system-wide. So we want to be attentive to the issues that are specific to the Bloomington campus through some of our own committees but we would like to have these conversations, not just parallel but intersecting in various ways. So both of these things are issues about space that we need to have at the forefront of our thoughts for this term.

Another item that really came to from the Agenda Committee; this was something that I guess the BFC passed last spring and was a mandate to the Provost—and they held it until I came into office. You may remember if you were on the committee, it had to do with coming up with some plans for summer session calendar, which would then be brought back to the Faculty Council and

Calendar Committee and as they reminded me about this, I've been trying to get together a group of administrators who could look at this. We don't actually have the committee to announce today but we have been talking with Jeanne Sept, Pat Connor from RPS, Roland Cote, Jack Rhodes who does orientation and summer session registration, and people from the various schools, to try to put together a committee and we'll have that done within a day or so, so that we can indeed meet the mandate which is to respond this fall. And then obviously the issues about the calendar go back to the Faculty Council.

Another announcement, some of you may have already seen this but if you haven't I want to make sure that everybody has heard this; that President McRobbie who was the Provost when the search was going on for the Dean of the Libraries, has announced that he has asked Pat Steele to stay on as the interim Dean of the Libraries for two additional years. That means that a new search for a new Dean of the Libraries will begin to take shape later this year.

You mentioned the transferability issue so I will go back to it even though I hadn't quite planned it. As Lisa mentioned, an issue about how a degree was granted from the School of Continuing Studies came to the attention of the University Faculty Council. The Academic Leadership Council has been looking at it. The Agenda Committees of the BFC and UFC have been looking at it. I asked the Deans of the schools on this campus whether or not they would have any difficulties with certain kinds of caps on transferability. There are ways in which whatever is done by the governing bodies, faculty governance bodies, must take into account various transfer and articulation agreements and state mandates. We know that some schools on this campus already—the College of Arts and Sciences, has a cap of 60 credit hours for transfer of community college credits. The Deans of all the schools on this campus suggested that if the cap was set at no more than half of the credit hours for the degree, that would work for them and obviously that has some intuitive sense for community colleges which are supposed to be supplying associate degrees in no more than two years worth of work, and in many ways a cap of that sort might indeed encourage students in community colleges to think that after two years they should think about getting their degree and moving on with those two years worth of credit. But there are a lot of details to be worked out. So that's something that we're working on.

I think that was it for announcements.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

Hanson: Were there questions? One question came in email and I'll just touch on it. It had to do with the formation of the Search and Screen Committee for the new Dean of Optometry. I answered it by email. The person who asked the question particularly asked for this to be a public question. But you should know that your Bloomington Faculty Council Nominations Committee is supplying names for the Search and Screen Committees, even for Deans who report to the Indianapolis campus as the School of Optometry Dean does. Those nominations have been taken seriously and those people have at least some subset, I actually haven't seen the list for the Dean of the School of Optometry. But the committee formation up there has been attentive to the nominations from the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Pratt: Although I must say that we have been supplying names even when we weren't asked for them.

Hanson: That's true.

Pratt: But Karen is right. When we have supplied names, either by request or otherwise, it's had an impact on the individuals named to that committee.

Hanson: I think that was it for questions received by email. Anything else?

AGENDA ITEM #5: INDIANA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Hanson: Well, then we are delighted to have a distinguished visitor with us; Dr. Ken Sauer from the Higher Education Commission. He is the Associate Commissioner for Research and Academic Affairs and I believe—Ted were you going to introduce Dr. Sauer and the discussion?

Miller: Well, I don't have to introduce him anymore, he's already been introduced. My name is Ted Miller, for those of you who I do not know. I was invited to come here today, very happy to do so actually, to introduce the discussion item focused on the Commission for Higher Education. One of the reasons, I presume anyway, that I was asked to do this is that over the last couple of years the Commission has been engaged in what I think is really a very important project for higher education in the state of Indiana and for several reasons that I will talk about here just a little bit, I really tried to follow what the Commission was doing as closely as I was able to. So I know a little bit about this topic although I didn't attend every Commission meeting and there's a lot that I don't really know very much about. But some of the issues seemed to me to be very important issues from the point of view of Indiana University. So as I said, I was as attentive as I possibly could be.

You all have a copy of the resulting document that the Commission approved at the end of the last academic year, "Reaching Higher: Strategic Directions for Higher Education in Indiana." As I said, I think this is a very important document. I'm not sure that I agree with every syllable in the document, I doubt that anybody probably would. But in general, my view is that this really is a step forward for higher education in the state of Indiana and I am sincere about that Ken. I really do feel that way.

On of the reasons... You also have a second document; I guess I could reference that too. It's sort of a one page which sort of highlights some of the basic important points in the consideration of the Commission. Actually, one of the reasons that I was interested in this project is something that isn't one of these five big points that are on your summary sheet. It's kind of down underneath it all; it has to do with this idea about transfer and articulation; although it is a somewhat different notion than was discussed by the Provost just a few moments ago. The Commission has been—one of the continuing interests of the Commission, really long before this new project was started was in transfer and articulation. When I was President of the Council ten years ago, we were dealing with that issue then as well. So it's been going on for a long time and I think that in the document that we have in front of us here, there is some good news for the faculties of the universities around the state. The consideration of this topic; transfer and

articulation, in this current two year period—it's kind of interesting because it paralleled in a way the consideration of similar questions within Indiana University. The Trustees as many of you know, the Trustees have been very interested in transfer and articulation as it pertains to the IU campuses. Now, the Commission is interested in that but of course they have a broader scope as well. They have a variety of institutions that they are concerned with.

One of the interesting things to me is that in both of these forums, there was a good bit of discussion about trying to deal with transfer and articulation problems by developing a common general education program that would be implemented at every public institution, including of course the campuses of Indiana University, so that all the state schools would have a common general education program and that more or less by definition would resolve some transfer and articulation issues—a good number of them.

This was something that was in play within Indiana University. We had a number of Trustees of the University that were very interested in this. President Herbert was very interested in this and really over a two year period, and longer than that, the faculty of IU and I think the faculties elsewhere, really tried to make a point that this would not be in the best interests of higher education in the state of Indiana, and it would not be in the best interests of Indiana University to have such a general education program.

Finally, I think in both places; both within IU and at the Commission level, there was a recognition that allowing each institution to develop its own general education program would be acceptable if there were some way of connecting these things together in a reasonable way. I'm not sure that the final chapter has been written on this particular story. I think this is something that is going to go on for a year or two probably. But in my view, the tool that we have access to is what many of you know as the Core Transfer Library. The Core Transfer Library presents a vehicle for solving a very, very, very large proportion of the transfer and articulation problems that students have in the state of Indiana. I'm very, very hopeful that on the one hand we can pursue our own ideas about general education. It turns out by the way that even when faculty on various campuses pursue their own ideas about general education, they end up having fairly similar ideas about this. There is a lot of commonality, but of course it's not perfect. At each place, there are some unique things that people are very, very focused on. But I hope that we can have a system where we can have each campus with its own ideas about this and then use this Core Transfer Library to tie it together in a way that will satisfy not only the Commission but the Trustees of Indiana University and the Administration of the University as well. I think we're at a point now where the Commission and where the trustees are willing to give this a shot and I'm very, very hopeful that we can make this work in a reasonable way. It's going to take some work to do it.

Of course one of the things that—one of the prerequisites to make this work is that a campus has got to have a general education program that actually specifies courses. They have to be courses that satisfy the general education requirements. That's a prerequisite, I think, to making this Core Transfer Library thing actually function and to the extent that there are campuses that haven't gotten to that point, this is potentially problematic. Well okay, so this is one of the reasons that I was very interested in what the Commission was doing and as I said, I am very pleased at the end of the day as I read the final language in this document, that there is a willingness to allow the

campuses to have their own special ideas with the understanding that there will be some sort of glue that kind of hold this thing together in a reasonable way. I hope that's a fair characterization.

Sauer: Yes it is.

Miller: Well, so that's number one. Number two; the second reason that I was interested in what the Commission was up to was because in part what they were dealing with was the structure of higher education in Indiana. And of course as many of you know, the higher education landscape in Indiana has been perturbed rather forcefully by the creation of a Community college. I think in the part of this document that goes to the structure of the system for higher education, what the Commission is really trying to do is to point out issues that sort of result from that; from the creation of the Community college, and try to get us on a path where those issues are resolved. One of the big issues for Indiana University of course in this regard are issues regarding the regional campuses. There are a bunch of questions about where the regional campuses are going. Which ones of them are going in which direction and so forth? The Commission is encouraging the universities to really get together and think seriously about that because it is very clear that some consideration like that has to be taken.

The other part of the structural thing that was of particular interest to me was—it really kind of grew out of the mission differentiation project that President Herbert initiated, which led to this idea that we have a multi-campus university where the missions of the campuses really are different. We're actually willing to recognize that the missions are different and we kind of wrote down ideas about what these missions might be. One of the aspects of that situation that I was particularly interested in was the one pertaining to Indianapolis because it really did seem to me that the Indianapolis Mission Statement, as it was ultimately approved by the Trustees, was somewhat ambiguous. I last year made a presentation to the trustees where I think the term I used was that the Indianapolis Mission Statement was dysfunctional. I will say that my colleagues in Indianapolis did not appreciate that characterization of their mission statement at all. I really, and I continue to think that there is kind of a mission oriented problem with regard to the IUPUI campus. This is not focused on the medical school but it is on the other part of the campus.

Hanson: We are getting kind of worried because of some people having to leave after a certain period and we were wondering if you could....

Miller: Alright, I'll just say one more thing. I was very, very pleased. One of the things that pleased me the most about the Commission has done in this document is that they have made a very clear statement about what they think the mission of the Indianapolis campus is. My own personal view is that they've got it just right. So with that, Ken...

Pratt: Ken are you okay to speak without a microphone?

Sauer: (laughing) Alright, I have to say that maybe we should just close the book here and go home. I like this endorsement of getting something right here.

Pratt: Ken are you okay to speak without a microphone?

Hanson: Would you like to sit here?

Pratt: Why don't you move up here and we will see if this is on.

Sauer: Okay, whatever your pleasure is.

Pratt: Can we tell if this is on? Oh this is on. So why won't you join us up here.

Sauer: Well thank you Ted for sharing your thoughts and I do appreciate your attendance at the Commission meetings and you, as I recall, did share some of your thoughts with the Commission itself, certainly conversations afterwards. And the strategic directions document was in fact the focus of the Faculty Leadership Conference and Ted made some good contributions to that discussion as well. I thought what I would like to do is talk about the document for perhaps fifteen minutes and then open this for question and answer. And in a sense Ted's description of transfer and articulation represents the spirit with which the Commission approaches this Strategic Directions document which is to say that some of the issues discussed in here have been around for some time. The Commission has tried to be clear about where it thinks the state ought to move with respect to some of these issues, but the Commission very much wants to engage in the kind of dialogue which Ted has described with respect to transfer and articulation in general and the notion of a common general education core. And I think that dialogue, that give and take, has resulted in some...resulted in the state, I think being in a pretty good place with respect to transfer and articulation and a general education core. I would not say that the conversation is ended. I think there are some other aspects of both of those issues that need additional attention, but I think the process that Ted described this statement and the call and response kind of notion and the dialogue trying to work together to agree upon a common vision for higher education is very much the spirit with which the Commission approaches this strategic directions document. So in that sense, I think that Ted's introduction was right on the mark.

With that let me talk about the document, this is the result of about a year's worth of effort. The Commission started talking about this in the summer of 2006. The Commission formed a committee which worked specifically on developing this document. There were numerous presentations made to the Commission including several from nationally recognized experts and researchers from other parts of the country. And then there was an intensive period of writing this document earlier this year, which concluded in the Commission adopting it at its June 2006 meeting. Now there is an implementation effort which is under way as well, and that is the sheet to which, I guess it was Karen, who referred you there and I would like to end the formal presentation by talking about that sheet. But in any case let's get back to this Strategic Directions document. I'll try to go through this pretty quickly, hitting the high points, and making a few comments along the way. And then I'd like to conclude by talking about the implementation effort which is under way.

The document begins with a Vision Statement and I would call your attention to two aspects of this. First, that we're really, the Commission, is really focused on developing a true system of higher education where all of the components do fit together. They have unique roles, but they are complementary and really need to form a genuine and true system of higher education. And

in addition to that there is a reference to global standards. The Commission tried as much as possible to set the bar high and I know it's not unusual to hear lofty aspirations but the Commission is genuinely concerned about the future and has tried as much as possible to set goals that are high and that will be good for the state.

Why set these goals, what are the imperatives for change? I do want to spend at least a couple of minutes because I think it's important. There is a sense of urgency that the Commission feels and I hope that this sense of urgency is shared by others, by you and others, as well. And some of these statistics you've heard before, but they bear repeating; Indiana ranks 35th nationally in personal income. If we're going to change that we need to change the educational attainment of the population in a way that it's never been changed before. You've heard, I'm sure, on a number of occasions the fact that our educational attainment ranks in the lower 10%, 20% depending upon what data point you're looking at and we really need to change that. The adult education is particularly in need of attention. We've made great progress in getting our high school students to go on to college, we've moved from being 34th in the nation to 10th in the nation with respect to the proportion of high school grads who go on. That's something to be proud about. It's taken a lot of effort over a couple of decades to make that change, but it's something we can point to with great pride. The picture is different with respect to the adult population. We need to reach adults in much better ways than we're currently reaching them. While we can also feel good about our bachelor degree production, 15th per one hundred high school grads, that's 15th in the nation, when you look at the international data there's reason to worry. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the statistics that the OECD has put together, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, but they clearly indicate that the country as a whole and certainly this applies to our state as well, is getting into a precarious situation because other countries are paying great attention to increasing the educational attainment of their populations and we have been at a steady state for a while and relative to the rest of the world we're beginning to lose ground.

Many students leave college with a great deal of debt. Having three kids going through college including one through IUPUI, I can attest to the fact that yes, indeed there is a great deal of debt that they graduate with and the whole affordability issue needs attention. While we have made great strides in trying to better prepare graduates of Indiana high schools by putting in place the Core 40 curriculum and emphasizing the Core 40 with Academic Honors and Technical Honors curricula, when we look at the results of the end of course assessments that we have undertaken, the results are not good.

And we find that even though we're putting in place the right standards, and the right coursework, and having a much more robust high school experience, something is not working because at least for the pilots that we have done they indicate that the end of course assessments have not been where we would like with respect to the ability of high school graduates to actually do college level work. And so that's another aspect of this high school preparation that we really need to address. And then finally while our research and development expenditures on a per capita basis have been improving, and are reasonably competitive, we believe, the Commission believes that they need to be increased even more if we are to have the kind of vibrant economy that our state needs.

Now the document then turns to a system efficiency issue having to do with the Community College System. Actually this is a structural issue to which the document returns later on along with a couple of other structural issues, but it is so important that the Commission felt it needed some special attention up front and that deals with the so-called inverted pyramid, the idea that relatively speaking Indiana educates far fewer of its students through the Community College System and hence we have overall lower participation rates, again particularly with respect to the adult population in other states. This is...we need to bring more students into the system and we need to do that through the Community College System, and I should add the Regional Campuses.

The Commission felt that it was important to express some aspirations on behalf of the state and there is a section of the paper that deals with the five aspirations, along familiar categories: access, affordability, student success, college preparation and contributions to Indiana's economy. These are really familiar areas, these are really the five areas that the so-called national report card "Measuring Up" which began with a biennial reports starting in the year 2000 have addressed. This is the way that discussions about higher education have organized themselves at the national level, and we have certainly talked about these topics before. Let me go through them very briefly and comment on certain aspects of the Commission's aspirations in these areas. Access, yes we need to provide more educational opportunities, but an important emphasis in the Commission's aspirations here is quality. It's not just enough to have students have opportunities to pursue coursework in degree programs. We need to also focus on quality education, and by the way I think that's something that Fred Cate, the Commission faculty member for the past two years, his term ended earlier this year, that was something he emphasized very much during the conversations about this document. Affordability is really the idea that no student ought to be barred from higher education because of financial need. We need to make opportunities available to everyone irrespective of their financial circumstances. Student success, it's not enough just to prepare students well, hence the comment earlier about Core 40, Core 40 with Academic Honors and Technical Honors, but they need to be prepared so they can succeed. And to return the comment about our pilot end of course assessments which provided results that we were not pleased with: college preparation, again our students, our recent high school graduates ought to be prepared so that they can immediately start, which is to say without having to enroll in remedial courses and to start their college education and succeed in their Associate or Baccalaureate degree. And finally contributions to Indiana's economy, there are references to dynamic, cutting edge economy but also references to improving the culture and quality of life of Hoosiers.

For the the interest of time, I'm not going to go through the specific strategic directions that have been identified underneath each one of the five areas that I've just mentioned. There are quite a few of them, several dozen in number, and it would simply take too long to go through all of those, I certainly would invite your comments about those specifics that have a particular interest for you, but I don't think there's really any need to go through this whole list which is quite long and certainly deserves a lot of attention, but I'm very interested in hearing what's on your mind as well. So I will skip the detail there. I would point out there is a section, if you have the paper before you, it begins on page 9, the critical cost-cutting values, and what this really boils down to is a need for transparency and agreed to measurements for progress in these different areas. We are in the age of transparency. People want to know how the system is doing, they want to know

how data were collected, how data were defined so that it is clear and available to everyone to see. Not just to sort of the insiders, not just to legislators, but to parents, students, to anyone, certainly to the faculties of all of the different colleges in the state, really anyone with an interest in higher education. So that's the general point. The document does go on to talk about the clusters of measures, one that purports to deal with quality and student learning. I'm not frankly sure how well this does this. Ted mentioned he didn't agree with every word in the document. I don't necessarily think that we've done as good a job as we ought to have done in all areas and probably this is one that needs a lot of attention. There is another set of measurements on page 11 dealing with what are termed dashboard metrics. And I think these are key indicators that we need to pay attention to see how we are doing with respect to the aspirations for our higher education system in those different areas that we talked about. I should point out that this is an initial list. Again in the spirit of Ted's remarks earlier and mine introducing this topic, the Commission very much wants to engage in dialogue here, to get the dialogue moving it has tried to be as clear as possible with respect to what might be considered an initial set, but we welcome comments on this list.

The document then goes on [End Tape 1, Side A] to discuss, to pick up the notion of structural issues. I mentioned one earlier about the two year, four year distribution of enrollments, the inverted pyramid. That's mentioned again with a little more detail with respect to the community college system and the need to really have a first-rate community college system. I think we started with a technical college system. The decision to move to a comprehensive community college system was made in 1999. I think over the course of the period from 1999 to the present, I think we have made enormous progress in developing a comprehensive community college system, but we want to have a first-class community college system and we need to push harder in order to achieve that. Two other sections deal with other structural aspects of our system of higher education, one dealing with the regional campuses, again I won't go into detail here, I invite your questions. And certainly one dealing with the major residential campuses, and clearly the research campuses are an important aspect of this. I think that's where I'm going to conclude the conversation about the document itself.

I do want to call attention to the one-pager, which I hope everyone has that is essentially dealing with the implementation of this strategic directions document. Right after the Commission approved the strategic directions document in June of this year, it then immediately set about to create an implementation committee which is chaired by Jerry Bepko and Mike Smith, who's a relatively new member of the Commission. And that Commission is now focused on trying to identify what it now feels are five areas that ought to receive special attention over the next year leading to certainly changes or leading to having an impact on the budget recommendations for the next biennium, the 09-11 biennium, and other aspects of higher education. Those five are, and by the way, each of these is to be accompanied by a white paper, the first of which has already been produced. If you go to the Commission's website, you will see on the right-hand side featured prominently there is this document, the strategic directions document, there's also the first white paper dealing with completion, degree completion. So that has been, and that was discussed, at the Commission meeting earlier this month, and there is a set of recommendations there that have been developed for discussion. In addition to degree completion, there's another area dealing with affordability, another dealing with the community college system, taking it to the next level, another dealing with accountability, that really is the dashboard metrics that I

touched upon briefly earlier and then there is the major research campuses, Bloomington and West Lafayette, and we're actually hoping that there might be enough material available already through your own efforts, that perhaps the staff could forego the need for putting together a white paper on the two major research campuses, but we'll see how that goes. We would certainly look to any vision statements and other documents which pertain to Bloomington and West Lafayette which could be useful in trying to help you and the state have your campus and the West Lafayette campus achieve even higher marks with respect to research quality and structure, community engagement, etc.. So with that, I'm going to stop and I would invite your questions or comments.

Pratt: Thank you for moving through that quickly. Karen would you like to recognize the questions from the floor?

Hanson: Okay I know that Neil Theobald wanted to ask a question, but he had to leave. Other questions?

Biles: This may be a naïve question but I was wondering if you could entertain the fiscal implications of the proposals here. I mean I think we're in an environment where there's a contradiction between the recognition that we need higher education to improve competitiveness but we're in an environment where funding and resources are limited so to what extent is this document a non-funded mandate for universities and the community colleges of the state of Indiana and to what extent are we looking at a transfer of resources, particularly if we're talking about promoting community colleges and shifting students from a four-year university system to a community college system?

Sauer: Let me take your last point first. Certainly there is absolutely, I can say this categorically, there is absolutely no intention of transferring funds or students from one sector to another. In one sense, this question came up when the community college system was created. I certainly understand why there was some anxiety on the part of some campuses, particularly the smaller regional campuses that this would result in great decreases of enrollment on those campuses because all the students would be going to the community college instead. And, by and large, that did not happen. We are very much looking at future growth so we are, the question really is, how do we bring more students into the system. Particularly with the adult students, the community colleges and the regional campuses are well-suited to bring those students into the system and that really is a big area of need in our state. Earlier reference, the progress that we made of getting recent high school graduates to go to college, and by the way there is still room for improvement there, but we can really feel good about the progress that's been made and I think we're on a good track. Unfortunately, I can't say the same thing about the adult population and we have to figure out ways to bring the adults into our system. And again I think the community colleges and the regional campuses are well-suited to that. As we think about degree completion and getting community college students to succeed and as we continue to make progress in transfer of credit, we've made tremendous progress to date, that will also result in additional students who want to continue their last two years so that they can earn a baccalaureate degree. So we're really looking, we're not talking about one sector diminishing and another at the expense of growth in another. We really are talking about growth across the board. Certainly the community college system will likely experience much greater growth rates

than other sectors. We would expect the regional campuses to grow significantly. And in fact other campuses will probably grow too but at more modest rates.

Now with respect to the unfunded mandate, it's true you certainly don't see a lot of budgetary figures associated with this document and in part that is, and I don't know if I'd say it's necessarily by design, but I would say it is, it certainly results from where we are in the budgetary process. We just finished a budgetary cycle and the Commission put this document, concluded this document and put it out for discussion so that we could begin working on what eventually will translate into budgetary recommendations for the 09-11 biennium. That sounds far off but it really isn't and it's important to try to get the basic principle, the basic directions, down and have them clearly articulated so that we can then begin working on the mechanisms to implement those directions including financial mechanisms and I guess clearly some may argue that the state has been, the extent to which the state has been generous or not toward higher education, I think from a Commission standpoint we feel that given the resources that are available we've done pretty well in this past biennium and we think that there is recognition, perhaps not as much as we would like, on the part of the general assembly and the governor's office, that higher education is playing a key role in the state and is essential to the state's future economic development. So while it's far too early to talk about the next biennium in specific dollar amounts, I think we're confident that if we can continue in the direction of developing strong arguments for higher education, we can make a good case in the next biennium for additional resources so that we wouldn't have an unfunded mandate as you suggest. I don't want that, and you clearly don't want that either.

Hanson: There are other questions, could I just ask a follow-up on the budget thing, because there is one specific element in the report on page 10 about the guideline that debt service not exceed 10% of the total higher education operating appropriation. Could you say a little bit more of that? That's something that kind of worries us, as you could tell from our first discussion about our very old classrooms.

Sauer: Yes, absolutely, absolutely. The Commission has been very concerned for some time about the proclivity of the General Assembly to fund buildings. Just open the coffers and authorize new buildings. It has this past biennium. It far exceeded what the Commission recommended and it was unfortunate because when the General Assembly authorizes new buildings it's also locking in the budget to some extent for the next biennium. There are only so many discretionary dollars that are available in any biennium. And if the General Assembly authorizes a building, it's also authorizing funds to operate and maintain that building in the future. And the higher that debt service owed gets built into any given budget it's going to mean that there are less dollars for operating funds. So the Commission has been very concerned about that. It has tried as hard as it can to communicate that message to the General Assembly, but unfortunately the General Assembly has not been listening.

Hanson: Well our concern goes in the other direction though, because this is a campus with very old buildings, very much in need of new buildings and new spaces for both research and classrooms and probably more debt capacity than we're using.

Sauer: Well this is not really my area, so I can't get into the details here. But I can say that the Commission recognizes the need for facilities on campuses if they're going to achieve their mission. And if Bloomington is to achieve even higher acclaim, it's going to need additional facilities. And the Commission recognizes that. I think that the Commission has worked pretty well with the University to try to identify capital projects that are a high priority and that will contribute to the mission of each campus. And I think this certainly is true for the Bloomington campus, but there is a concern here on the other side which is that the general assembly is, and recognize that the General Assembly Financial Committees, they have representation from all across the state and everybody wants to be able to go back to their constituents and point to a new building that they got in the budget process. So there really is, it is a very difficult dynamic, and it's very hard, these are hard realities, and they do limit the extent to which the Commission and the state can respond to priorities. But I will say that the Commission recognizes the importance of helping Bloomington and West Lafayette to achieve even greater prominence and the Commission understands that that is going to mean capital expenditures.

Pratt: Karen, I think unfortunately we're going to have to probably cut this off.

Hanson: Well, if there are additional questions, I know that people prepared...

Pratt: You know, Rob Hatten had, he actually spoke to me before the meeting, and had a question, if we can just take a minute or two to address one more question and then we'll take a very, very brief break and then we'll have to move on.

Hatten: I'll try to keep it brief. The report deals with a lot of issues and that in sort of very interesting ways. There's a lot of beneficial things here, but it seems to be driven by economic priorities, what's good for the workforce of Indiana, and this doesn't represent the full breadth of what I see as the mission for higher education for any state. And I think that one of the centers of this is the word "culture" appears once, rich in culture, you've mentioned it, but it was just a sort of a marginalized comment. It doesn't really reach to the core of the document which is being driven by many other factors, and I just wondered what your vision is for the arts and humanities, for things like critical thinking skills for ways in which the arts and humanities don't just improve a kind entertainment culture of the state or increase tourism to Bloomington, what marks the quite fundamental role in the way lives are lived. I just don't see those values as being quantifiable, being economical, driving this statement which should have something of the philosophy of higher education in it.

Sauer: Let me respond in a couple of ways, I'll try to be very brief. You mentioned critical thinking. I think that's one of the reasons why student learning does get some attention here and why the common general education core gets some attention as well. The model that Missouri has developed which emphasizes identifying skills that students need, including critical thinking skills, as part of a general education core. That they, Missouri has identified the competencies that students ought to acquire during the course of a college education. Each institution, each campus, then figures out what coursework will lead to that. So to the extent that there's a discussion here about student learning and what ought to comprise a college experience, I think there is some attention given to at least part of the issue that you've raised. And again I point to critical thinking and that being something that could receive attention with respect to

measurements and some discussion of what a common general education or what a general education core ought to comprise at a particular campus. In terms of the arts, it is true that I agree with you. The arts are not mentioned in the document except in a few passing references. I think as we look at the missions of different campuses and how one would measure the extent to which those missions are being fulfilled, there's certainly room for addressing contributions that campuses will make in the arts and one presumes that those would be reflected in the dashboard measures, if you will, the metrics that are developed for a particular campus. And the Commission I should say is certainly aware of the contributions that the Bloomington campus makes in areas other than science or business or other professional areas. For example, the area Studies, the Commission is aware of the tremendous strength this campus has and the extent to which in many ways it has unparalleled strengths in foreign languages and foreign cultures and I think it's important that as we develop measures of success as to how well we're achieving some of these goals, that measurements appropriate to these areas be included.

Hatten: It would be nice to see from this side as well.

Sauer: Good.

Pratt: I think that's a good place to stop.

Hanson: I want to thank you Dr. Sauer for coming and talking with us. I know everybody read this attentively and they may well have additional questions which we may gather up for you and I know that we'll continue to dialogue. So thanks very much for coming.

Saur: Thank you. [Applause]

AGENDA ITEM #6: BRIEF RECESS

Hanson: We will take a short break.

Pratt: I think we will give people quite literally 1 to 2 minutes to grab a cup of tea or cup of coffee or cup of popcorn and then we will turn over the discussion to Bob Eno.

AGENDA ITEM #7: "FRAMING THE FUTURE: REFORMING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS"

Hanson: [Start of Tape 2, Side A] That was meant to be a brief recess, though people will keep streaming in. But to make sure that we have some time for the second agenda item "Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics," we wanted to get started and Prof. Eno and Prof. Terry will be presenting some material.

Eno: Okay, I'll get started. Well my job here is to give you some background as to what the organization that produced this document "Framing the Future" is, the fact that we're members of that organization and that we have a certain obligation to pay attention and to re-educate ourselves periodically as to what they're up to and what we want to say about it. The organization is the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics or COIA and it is a coalition of faculty

senates with Division I-A athletics programs that have voted to join this group and to support its basic objectives. There are 55 faculty senates that have joined. There are a total of about 117 Division I-A universities. So it's at about 50% of what all of the universities of Division I-A have senates that have voted to join this organization. It's managed by a steering committee which currently has 15 members selected from various institutions to try to have representation of different athletic conferences and different types of institutions. It has an operating budget which is easy to remember, it's zero. It is all volunteer effort on behalf of or on the part of faculty and it's been in existence for about five years, depending on how you date its start. I'm going to talk a little about the background and then Herb Terry is going to talk about its present activities.

The way that the senates relate to the main institution the COIA is through representative participation by the chair of each senate and by one designated liaison. Herb is the liaison from the BFC to the COIA. I used to be that, and that's why I'm giving these introductory remarks. The COIA started out in 2001, it was initially a response to a series of events precipitated by a speech by Myles Brand that he gave to the National Press Club about the need for a reform in intercollegiate athletics because of certain types of excesses that he, he said, were characteristic of the way that intercollegiate athletics were practiced now. Myles' speech was followed up by some activity among the PAC-10 Conference that vocalized some support of faculty senates to endorse what he had said. Faculty senates don't generally talk to one another. This was a new model. Nobody could remember it ever happening before. The Big Ten followed the same year, 2001, and did the same thing. It organized the faculty leaders of the Big Ten senates. It passed a resolution of support of things that President Brand had said, and senates began to consider that resolution as something that they might endorse. A year later the Big Ten faculty leaders came up with the idea, instead of simply having a resolution that senates endorsed to try to have this have some continuing existence by forming a coalition. Initially it was aimed at the BCS, Bowl Conference Championship schools which is just about half of the Division I-A, but it expanded quickly to all Division I-A schools. The idea was to ask faculty senates to join in a concerted effort to bring faculty attention to the issues that needed reform in intercollegiate athletics that President Brand had expressed, to articulate in much more detail just what those issues involved, to try to formulate some ideas about how reform could be implemented realistically over a fairly long period of time, but realistically so that it would actually happen rather than just adopting positions for that they seemed right or just. And then to start using a coalition as a type of lobbying effort to try to exert pressure on the NCAA and other institutions that are involved in intercollegiate athletics to move athletics in a different direction, intercollegiate athletics in a different direction. The coalition was formed initially as a faculty senate group in 2003 and it produced an initial document called "Framework for Reform" that had five areas that it focused on and this new document that you're looking at resonates with those five areas. The five areas had to do with: academic integrity; the way that intercollegiate athletics may or may not have a negative impact on the academic integrity of an institution's programs; the welfare of student athletes was secondary; the processes of governance of athletic affairs on campuses, trying to come up with best practices, trying to figure out what parameters are best to apply; issues of financial transparency and fiscal responsibility, having to do with the operation of intercollegiate athletics; and finally a sort of catch-all section which was called "over-commercialization". It was that document which was used to recruit senates into the coalition. Senate members of the coalition haven't had to be voted, there are senates that have had a vote whether or not to join the

coalition and this senate, this council, voted to join the Coalition in February of 2004 on the basis primarily of that document. On the basis of that document the Coalition began immediately to try to find allies in other organizations nationally, there was an existing faculty athletics reform organization called the Drake Group still in existence. It predates the Coalition and it was a coalition, excuse me it was an organization, of independent concerned faculty, which had staked out a pretty extreme position on reform in athletics. The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics was seeking to find a middle position that would allow it to lobby effectively with the NCAA and other groups involved with athletics while still borrowing many of the types of positions that the Drake Group had initially set out as objectives for academic reform of intercollegiate athletics. Among the groups that the Coalition first reached out to were the AAUP, which was very interested and already embarked on an effort to try to sketch out best practices for governance of athletics on campuses. The AGB, the Association of Governing Boards, which is the national association of trustee boards which we found unusually receptive to discussion along this line because of the frustrations that some boards, and particularly some presidents, at universities had found in trying to keep control of intercollegiate athletics, its behavior and its work. In addition we found that the NCAA Administration was extremely receptive to the programs that the Coalition developed. And it wasn't so surprising if you think about it, because in the interim the President of the NCAA had become a different person, it was Myles Brand who had been appointed to the NCAA, he's the one who had started the impetus for COIA started. Since the time of 2004, COIA has worked with a variety of other groups including the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, or FARA. Faculty athletic representatives are faculty members at every institution that belongs to the NCAA who are appointed by the chief executive officer of the president of the institution to represent the institution as a faculty member in the faculty in the NCAA faculty process. I don't know if Bruce Jacobs, excuse me, Bruce Jaffee is here...

Terry: He's out of town.

Eno: He's out of town. Well, Bruce Jaffee is our faculty athletic representative here at IU, he's been very much involved with COIA activities, very supportive. We've worked with the national association of the FAR's and in particular with the Division I-A association of FAR's which is now only four years old or something that postdates the creation of COIA, in fact. We've also worked with other organizations such as the National Association for Advisors--Athletics Advisors. There is another A in there. The N4A, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes. They have been very helpful. The Coalition has taken an approach to try to work with other organizations to learn more about the practical difficulties that are involved with the reform of intercollegiate athletics so that we can shape policies that are actually implementable, that can be lobbied for, that could be successful and have actual results. That means a lot of compromise, one of the problems that the coalition has always faced is trying to draw lines, to try to figure out when we're compromising too much and when we're not compromising enough. And my immediate position is that that's ever easy to do. What the Coalition has been very good at doing is articulating a vision of reform in a series of white paper documents of which "Framing the Future" is the last one, the most recent one. There have been documents that have been issued in 2003, 2004, two were issued in 2005, and this makes the 2007, dealing with issues that were covered in that initial framework document, having to do with academic integrity, governance on campus, student athlete welfare, financial integrity and

transparency and the issue of commercialization. I think it's just about done all it can in terms of producing documents. The big problem it's had, is that although it's produced a lot of documents that include recommendations for new NCAA bylaws as well as best practice documents for its member senates and member campuses it has yet to see a lot of payoff in terms of reforms, in terms of new NCAA bylaws. The NCAA administration has been tremendously receptive to these proposals. The NCAA administration is very different from the massive organization of the NCAA, a member organization that has thousands of people involved in the legislative process of coming up with the governance for intercollegiate athletics. And we also haven't been able to see a great deal of progress on individual campuses, campuses like IU, in terms of the way that the vision of the Coalition in being implemented campus by campus on a best practice basis. That may be simply because we don't have a lot of report back information. We know that the documents that are produced by the coalition are read and registered by senates, but whether or not they have any practical effect on campus, we have yet to tell. So at this point in the ballgame, we can say that we've produced a lot of detail, proscriptive and prescriptive material, that has to do with the vision for a reform situation in intercollegiate athletics that avoids some of the excesses that President Brand had first identified. But whether or not we have long-term prospects for actually implementing a change situation is still unclear. One of the jobs of each institution, each member senate, is to remind themselves periodically as its members change of what the coalition is, what the program for athletic reform may be, and what our obligations are in terms of participating in discussions, feedback leading to that reform. I've given you some background, Herb is now going to pick this up with the present story of where this situation now stands.

Terry: Thank you, Bob. Since we're running out of time, I'm going to truncate my remarks a lot, because what I'd like to get is some of that feedback from you on the recommendations that COIA has made and some comments from you on the systems that are now being put in place here in Bloomington to assess where we stand against these recommendations. What did happen is that COIA met out at Stanford University in May. A draft of this white paper had previously been circulated to the member institutions. The idea was to get as many representatives from those institutions as we could in one setting at Stanford and hammer out a final version that would go out to the member schools for their review, hopefully for their investment. What I want to stress to you, I want to give Bob some credit, that he wasn't willing to give himself. But Bob was an exceedingly influential figure in the formation of COIA and so COIA has long been an organization over which we have had, that has listened to us. And I want to stress that they continue to listen to us. At the Stanford meeting, suggestions that I had were, for the most part, incorporated by the group, and the group talked to me on the suggestions. Later Lisa and I engaged in some fairly extensive e-mail correspondence with the steering committee and through them with the members of the other schools and I think that everything that we asked them to consider doing is reflected in this document. So this is a document on which we have had substantial impact. As Bob mentioned, it's a fairly modest document. We joined President Brand in wanting to reform intercollegiate athletics, and that's what this document is intended to do. It's intended to get the institutions to focus on what a model for intercollegiate athletics would truly be and how that might be different from some kind of a semi-professional model for athletics at universities. We are now, I think, in the process of trying to do what Bob said should happen next, and that is to see what kinds of actions can actually happen at local campuses, at conferences, and at the NCAA. And here of course, our greatest potential for having some

impact is what happens on this campus. It's important to remember that at this campus there are many organizations and bodies that have something to do with how intercollegiate athletics functions. There is the Athletics Committee, there's our faculty athletics representative, there's the activities of the President, the Athletics Department itself, and so on and so forth. And I think one of the things we want to do in the coming year is work cooperatively to bring all those institutions together and try to see how the COIA recommendations can be implemented, which ones fit our campus and which may not. In June, Lisa on our behalf committed ourselves to supporting this document because we were not meeting, but I want to stress that that did not mean nor did COIA understand it to mean that every university was going to commit itself to implementing all 28 of these proposals or implementing them in exactly the same way. What this document should be viewed as is reflected in its title, it's a frame. It's a frame from through which you can look at your own athletic program and try to figure out where you stand and what might be improved. It's beginning now, it's already begun, as a matter of fact. Lisa and I have been working with the Athletics Committee. Bruce is obviously active between that and his new roles as a faculty athletics representative. The National Association of Faculty Representatives, the group of all of them, not just the Division I representatives, but all of them had some concerns about the COIA report. I think they thought they might be displaced by COIA, but we've had exceptional support I would say from the Athletics Committee here and from Bruce, and I think the goal is to work collaboratively. It's fortunate in a way that in November Bruce is supposed to give a report, an annual report, here on what's going on with his activities and to some extent with the Athletic Committee as well, because that will give him an opportunity and us an opportunity, I think, to comment on his report, to tell you in more detail what the assessment of our program against these standards is showing. It's providential, it's providential I want to stress, because at the Stanford meeting, it became very clear especially from Myles Brand who attended it, that this is a crucial year in the academic reform movement in athletics. Some NCAA, potential NCAA, sanctions associated with academic progress of athletes that were brewing for several years, will finally kick in and conceivably those sanctions could result in up to loss of the ability to offer some athletic scholarships. It will all depend on what the data shows. We submit in two weeks our data from last year and then it goes through a massaging process of the NCAA and elsewhere. Probably by about November it will be clear if this program has any sanctions it faces or not. And if it does then there is the long process, of asking if the athletic department and the institution decide to do it, asking them to reconsider those sanctions and that sort of thing. All of that plays out until April when finally the NCAA announces its decisions.

I expect, and that's what I want to stress to you here, I expect that the Athletic Committee and our faculty athletic representative will be deeply involved in the negotiations to take place at this campus and with the Athletics Department, over the implementation of that system. And I hope maybe Bruce can shed some light in November. Not so much perhaps the details of what's going on but are they consulted; is faculty input on that very important matter being taken seriously? I think it can be said up front that I think that we will fare relatively well against these standards. At the Stanford meeting I heard horror stories about where many other programs stand and we will look fairly good against some of these others where I think the COIA plan gives us some opportunity for improvement and I hope that Bruce can talk about it and we can talk about it with you elsewhere during the year.

The final thing I want to say about COIA is to at least mention the fact that it might be an evolving organization. I think that is worth considering here. As Bob pointed out, COIA started out with concerns about athletics. Concerns that faculty senates around the country had in common and that they had never talked to each other about. There was some thought that the May meeting might be the last COIA meeting. That it might have said all there was to say about athletics and that it might dissolve. Rather the members that were there, representatives of faculty senates, began to discuss the question of whether there are things beyond athletics that it would be good to have a formal mechanism for coalitions of faculty senates to discuss. Those might be such things as issues related to academic freedom and tenure; they might be related to such things as environmental sustainability, which is an issue on many campuses. We didn't resolve that question but we also didn't dissolve and I assume that the next time COIA gets together it will take a look at athletics and the impact that its actions have had, if any. But I also anticipate that there will be a discussion, Bruce will represent us at that, about whether there's a continuing need for some kind of umbrella organization of leaders of faculty senates to discuss and work together and to provide best practices guidelines and other sorts of things for consideration by universities across the country on matters that they share in common beyond athletics. With that what I would like to do is hear from you about anything you've read in the COIA proposals and that will help guide our involvement in the activities that will go on this year, seeing what you understand of it.

Wimbush: Thanks Herb, you did an outstanding job [laughter..comments lost]. The Athletics Committee, I'm James Wimbush, the chair of the Athletics Committee and the Athletics Committee has been very much intent about COIA since its beginning. Bruce who was the chair of the athletics committee at the time, at the beginning of COIA, who is now our faculty athletics rep has certainly played an integral role and not only helped me to understand what some of the COIA proposals are, but also in keeping the Athletics Committee apprised of some of the activities of COIA over the last several years, Dan Mackey before, well after Bruce and before me also was very actively involved. We're fortunate in a sense that the Athletics Committee has embraced COIA. We are always wanting to learn more about the recommendations from the organization, as a matter of fact, we're already scheduled for an October board meeting a report from one of our subcommittees, so that Julia Lamber, they're going to report on the recommendations and how we stack up, our athletics department, with respect to the COIA proposals. My sense is and the sense of many of the members of the Athletics Committee is that we will fare fairly well, but we don't know for sure and we'll certainly find out on October 3rd. We've asked Lisa to join us at that particular meeting and for that discussion. Unfortunately, you have to teach ...

TERRY: Yes

Wimbush: ...and so we certainly won't hold that against you, but if Bob wants to join us for that meeting you're more than welcome to do so, because what we're going to do is not only have an assessment of what we're actually doing versus what is being proposed. But we're going to discuss the core principles in general. Rick Greenspan has been made aware of the COIA proposals. He all along has not only been cognizant of them, but has also been aware of our concern for being aligned with the other schools that have embraced this document. So what we're wanting to do is to get a better understanding of the proposals as well as how we fare with

those proposals. We will give them on October 3rd. Then on November 6th is the annual report to the BFC from the Athletics Committee. So that report will be given by myself, Bruce will make a statement at that particular time, and Rick Greenspan will also be here and he will be able to address any concerns that might be raised regarding the COIA proposals.

Pratt: In fact we really wanted to bring this document to you now so that everybody has a little time. It's a difficult document to read on first contact, because there's a lot of jargon in it, and a lot of acronyms, so this gives you a little time to look through it and maybe talk to your colleagues and develop some sense of how the faculty feel about the reform movement in athletics prior to the meeting. I'm going to get the date wrong, is it...?

Wimbush: November 6th.

Pratt: November 6th when we will visit this issue again. And as James said, Rick Greenspan will be here and I think we've asked you, James to speak, we've asked Julia to speak, we've asked Bruce Jaffee and is there another person...? Okay, so there should be actually, at that meeting, there should be adequate time for really some commentary, some questions, some real dialogue between the BFC and very key people on this campus in athletics.

Terry: What I would recommend in preparation for that meeting is to look at Appendix A of the list of proposals. At the end of each proposal, you'll find an italicized thing in brackets. That's COIA's attempt at Stanford in June to figure out where the implementation of that proposal would come from and the ones that would be most relevant on November 6th would be those that say local. We can, through Bruce, certainly try to influence the policies of the Big Ten. We can through Karen and President McRobbie attempt to influence the policies of the NCAA. But the ones that are identified as local are the ones that matter the most at the local level and I would hope between now and November 2nd -- 6th -- you take a look at those and I assume that's what the report from Jim would primarily focus on and we can have a productive discussion about where we stand, do you think we've made progress? Perhaps they may conclude that some of these don't exactly apply to us and it will be an opportunity for a discussion of all those issues.

Hanson: Other questions?

Johnson: One, you've talked about cooperating with AAUP and the faculty athletic representatives in the NCAA and the athletics committees generally. One, there seems to me the bull in the China shop here is that the big money comes from the media. How have they reacted? Is it dismissive? Is there any concern, I suppose most noticeable around here with the almost aborted Big Ten network? Just saying "here, we're going to give you some more money", and the only aspect of this report that I can see deals with sort of fiscal responsibility within the university? How do you address this larger issue with this tremendous, I guess one would have to say media influence? The talk saying let's have a football playoff, let's do all of these things. They've made university teams public teams.

Terry: I think more than that, than is apparent perhaps is in here. For example, there's a section in here that talks about the scheduling of games and practice. If you look at the Big Ten Network, I think to some extent Fox was a little surprised to discover that by golly, most colleges

and universities played on the weekends and they would sort of like Tuesday games and this sort of thing, to the extent that COIA is saying that the scheduling of athletics by institutions should not conflict with the academic demands of the institution. We are indirectly saying don't monkey with the scheduling of your teams just to satisfy the demands of cable networks. When we talk in here in some general ways about commercialization, the impact is there as well. Yeah, the fact that this is a media event, is driving much of this and we have no regulatory authority over the media but it is the NCAA, the individual institutions, that enter into the contracts with the media and to the extent that we can address what they should enter into. This report indirectly tries to address that matter. But maybe by November we will see other ways in which efforts are being exerted by media to compromise academic integrity in order to promote their self interests. And this is a - assuming COIA continues to exist; this is a constantly moving target. That's one of the other reasons I think we did not disband. These proposals were pretty good proposals in the summer of 2007. There may be a need for others and if COIA continues to exist, it can be receptive to what the universities are experiencing and this list can be revised.

Pratt: James, it occurs to me that it might be appropriate, J.T. was here earlier, but I think he's slipped out. It might be appropriate to ask him if he could attend that November 6th meeting because he will be well-informed about where we are and the sort of ongoing evolution of the Big Ten Network and I know he's watching that very closely and it might be nice to have him in the room just to enter into this conversation about rather or not we are being at this point asked to reschedule games or anything else as a result of the existence of that new programming network.

Wimbush: Rick should be able to answer some of those questions as well.

Pratt: Yeah, that's true. Okay. Bob?

Eno: Just a quick response. I don't think COIA actually aspires to deal directly with networks. It's just not realistic. Controlling what's both the exploitation of intercollegiate athletics by entertainment, the entertainment industry, beyond what the institutions themselves would be prefer to see and incorporate their values, and also controlling the impact of the enormous scale of financial stakes that have risen ever since the entertainment industry got to us. This is going to have to be under the control of the university presidents. One of the big reforms in the NCAA in the early 1990's was that it restructured itself so as to give a great deal more power to university presidents than ever before. This was in response to recommendations made by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics which was an important player in all of this. The Coalition has tended to support the notion of increasing the leverage of the university presidents have over these issues on the grounds there's nobody else to rely on. Faculty are simply not going to be players in that. There's nothing we can do. But the university presidents can be if their powers are such that they are able to resist the pressures that come from booster groups, certain trustee groups, certain boards of trustees at strategic universities in the intercollegiate athletic game, and the public in general, and the press that represents, the media that represents the public. This has not been entirely successful. The NCAA formed a task force in 2006 to try to work to mobilize university presidents in Division I-A to see whether or not they could figure out a framework whereby they could better exercise the power that had supposedly had devolved into their hands with the NCAA reforms. One of the things that COIA was able to do was to be a player in that process. We were invited down by the Division I-A

Athletic Directors, by the way whom COIA has worked very well with. The Athletic Directors are by no means the enemy in this thing. COIA was a participant along with a small group of FAR's, Faculty Athletic Representatives, and a bunch of Athletic Directors to give feedback to the President of the Commission of the NCAA forum. We also sat in on some of their individual subcommittee meetings and our 2000 and, what year was it? December 2005 meeting was designed to respond to requests from that task force for advisement on the various areas that the task force was addressing and one of the key ones was: How can we create a structure whereby presidents actually get support from one another and from the NCAA administration, some sort of national level organization of presidents on these issues that would allow them to withstand the pressures that they feel locally. Because it is the local pressures from booster groups and trustees at various places and so forth that undermine presidents being able to control athletics on their campuses, their position in the NCAA tends to be marked out along those grounds. It's very difficult to do.

The task force designed some very interesting structures for this inter-support among presidents along with good models for financial transparency, fiscal transparency and so forth. How far those have gone, I really – I don't know. My sense is that everything right now in the NCAA which has to help implement all this is sort of on hold while the issue of the academic sanctions in the coming year is completely front burner, trying to hold the line on the first wave of academic reforms that came out of the NCAA. But that's a really good question, how we deal with this overwhelming pressure.

McCormick: One of the questions I had, had to do with, are the recommendations in structural relationship between athletics and campus governance bodies, because while its stated in here in 3: Campus and governance of collegiate athletics, some of the problems in actually implementing the recommendations in 4 are the oddities that we face here in Bloomington where, you know, to say that the athletics program should go through the same budget process as the academic units, but the academic units answer to the campus and the Athletics Department answers to the university. But it's the campus Athletics Department, I mean it's not, it really isn't a university entity. And so the challenge of structural relationships between those, I mean, I don't see it clearly in here. Is there, is it implied in there?

Terry: I think it's implied in here. It's also the case that I would have been booted out of the room in Stanford for trying to make this thing match us. We have a very unique, bad phrase, we have a unique relationship here where the activity takes place here, but the Athletic Department reports to the university administration. And getting to the bottom of that, getting to the budgetary areas, as you know, has been a problem. We are not bound by the COIA 28 recommendations. If we take a look at a local problem and we decide that there's some local problem that sort of relates to this, we should address it. I hope that we would do that. I hope that this is a process of providing useful information to President McRobbie. I hope that he takes an interest in this because, as Bob has indicated, this year is going to be a key year for the entire academic reform movement and it focuses on the possible imposition of real sanctions, for really falling short of academic reform of the systems that the NCAA itself has created. COIA as you'll note more or less lines up behind those NCAA procedures. There was discussion at Stanford as to whether we should make them tougher or different, and after great debate the group decided that we would get aboard with the procedures that the NCAA had itself created and try to make those work.

Pratt: I will take this opportunity to remind you that President McRobbie will hopefully be able to join us to actually chair this meeting, once in the Fall semester, once in the Spring semester and John Applegate, if you could kind of wave. For people who don't know, John he's the current Presidential Fellow. Is that what you're called? John has actually, at Michael's request, been identified as the liaison between the Agenda Committee and the President's Office in order to facilitate communication on this campus, because we do have a structural anomaly that in certain cases puts the Provost in a position where the topic directly impacts the campus and academic issues for the campus, but she's not the chain of command individual. So we're trying to find ways to facilitate communication. Do you want to say anything about that?

Hanson: Well the articulation of some of these things is under the control of the campus. The admissions, some of the advising things are now, but some of the advising things are still in athletics. The athletics budget has always been with the President and the Athletics reports to the President. There's just no question about that. But some of these things are within our purview and in any case there are issues of moral persuasion. Yes. We are almost out of time.

Carini: I just want to point out that the President now wears two hats. He could choose to presumably put on the Bloomington hat when talking to the Athletic Director. And second also, Neil Theobald, I guess, also wears two hats is in the same position.

Hanson: But elements of admissions, the Bloomington budget, and so on are not commingled with the university administration budget. And...

Carini: I'm just saying that there's two sides to the President's job now and

Pratt: And that is, in part, why we have asked him to at least once a semester sit here at the head table and participate in this process because we need to acknowledge that split administrative line. That we as faculty members are influenced. Maybe just...

Terry: If you've followed our request, you've all read this thing. Please feel free to send me directly any comments that you have on it. The goal is to make this a living document, and to make our review of it, our sense of how are we doing a living process. So please feel free to just write to me, terry@indiana.edu and I will take it up to the proper places.

Pratt: And be prepared to continue this conversation with Athletics on November 6th.

AGENDA ITEM #8: NEW BUSINESS/OLD BUSINESS

Hanson: We might ask for any new business, if you just want to put items on up for a future meeting, but otherwise we are at our mandatory adjournment time.

Pratt: Thank you.

Hanson: Thanks

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.