

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 2, 2007**  
**Indiana Memorial Union Oak Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Moya Andrews, Jack Bielasiaak, James Biles, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Stephen Burns, James Capshaw, John Carini, Angela Courtney, Diane Dallis, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Pat Foster, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Kevin Hunt, Owen V. Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, John Paolillo, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, Paul Rohwer, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Sarita Soni, Alex Tanford, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Matt Jarson for W. T. Wright

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Eric Arnold, Andrea Ciccarelli, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, Jeremy Engle, Csilla Kajtar, DeWitt Kilgore, Christina Kuzmych, Valerie Markley, Brian O'Donnell, Mike Robinson, Robert Shakespeare, Robert Terrill, David Waterman,

**GUESTS:** John Applegate (Office of the President), Alan Bender (Biology), Barbara Bichelmeyer (Dean of Faculties), Catherine Hageman (WFIU), Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Sue H. Talbot (Board of Trustees), Roger Thompson (Enrollment Management), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Robin Murphey (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolution  
Professor Ilinca Zarifopol-Johnston.  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B4-2008.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 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. Academic qualities and demographics of the incoming class. [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)  
Roger Thompson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

6. North Central Re-Accreditation. [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)  
Professor Jeanne Sept, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculties.  
Professor Terrence Mason, Associate Dean of Faculties and Director Center for Social Studies  
and International Education  
Globalization and the Internationalization of the IU Bloomington Campus  
([http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/ExecSummary\\_IUBAccreditationSelfStudyGlobalizationInternalization.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/ExecSummary_IUBAccreditationSelfStudyGlobalizationInternalization.pdf) )

7. Brief Recess (5 minutes)

8. Follow-up on the Future of Higher Education in Indiana. [DISCUSSION] (40 minutes)  
Provost Karen Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt.

9. New Business/Old Business

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

#### **AGENDA ITEM #1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION**

**HANSON:** I think we need to call the meeting to order, though. I think everybody has an updated agenda. We won't be approving the minutes of the meeting at this meeting. But there is a memorial resolution for Ilinca Johnston it's correctly spelled on the yellow sheet. ILINCA dear friend of mine and I'm sure many other people in this room as well. I hope you had a chance to look at some of the remarks from her colleagues and students, very untimely death, very unfortunate for all of us. If we could take a moment of silence, (period of silence). Okay, Agenda Committee Business.

**PRATT:** What? Jeanne were you going to...

**SEPT:** I was actually going to read, a slightly longer version.

**PRATT:** No, I think we should do that. Yeah, she's going to read a resolution. Yes, please. And apparently we're having trouble hearing in the back.

**SEPT:** Do you want me to stand up front?

**PRATT:** Would you, oh that may only be for recording. Are we live?

**BOBAY:** Yes it's live.

**PRATT:** Jeanne come to the....

**SEPT:** Since some of you may not have had an opportunity to see the materials about Ilinca, let me just read you an abbreviated memorial resolution on her behalf. Can't hear? Can you hear any better that way? Okay I will lean in.

Ilinca Zarifopol Johnston died at home in early 2005, after a five-year struggle with cancer. She was born in Bucharest, Romania, the daughter of Radu Constantin Zarifopol and Mioara Economu, and a family of notable scholars.

Ilinca graduated from the University of Bucharest in 1975 and came to IU for graduate work, earning an M.A. in linguistics, and a Ph.D. from IU in 1990 in comparative literature; in 1990 she joined our faculty in Comparative Literature.

Ilinca served as director of both undergraduate and graduate studies in Comparative Literature. She won an Outstanding Junior Faculty award in 1993 and two teaching excellence awards. She was awarded year-long fellowships by both the National Endowment for the Arts (1993) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (1999), as well as a Presidential Humanities Initiative fellowship from IU in 2002, among other awards.

Her first book, *To Kill a Text: The Dialogic Fiction of Hugo, Dickens and Zola*, was published in 1995. In the decade that followed, Ilinca's research interests had returned to her native Romania, specifically as the highly respected translator and editor of the early Romanian texts of the French philosophical essayist E.M. Cioran. In 1992 she published Cioran's "On the Heights of Despair" with the University of Chicago Press, and in 1996 his "Tears and Saints," also with Chicago Press. The latter was nominated for the Modern Language Association's prize for outstanding literary translations.

At the time of her death, Ilinca was engaged in a critical biographical study of Cioran, tentatively titled, "Portrait of the Philosopher as a Young Man." This manuscript is now moving towards publication. In addition she was writing a memoir of her own life, called "The Escape Artist: Memoirs of a Communist Girlhood," and another memoir of her work with Cioran in Paris. Finally she was engaged in translating her father's landmark four-volume novel "The Moldavian Quartet."

Her colleagues describe her as spirited, imaginative, witty -- a vivid intellectual, a fierce defender of academic principles, and academic freedom. She was someone both frank and gracious, at times impatient, but always compassionate, always elegant, always inspiring. She is survived by her mother, her sister IU Professor Christina Zarifopol Ilias, her husband IU Professor Emeritus Kenneth R. Johnston and their son, Theodore, and her step-sons, Lucas and Matthew and their families.

Thank you.

**AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**PRATT:** Okay, Let me see if my voice is loud enough to carry. Can you hear me in the back? Or do I need to get to a microphone? I'm seeing nods, so I will just move forward from there. I thought I would update you at this point on related activities that have engaged me as either the president of the BFC or as co-secretary of the UFC, noting that in this year's cycle, Bart Ng is the senior co-secretary so he presides at the meetings. In the last couple of weeks, we have had both the September meeting of the trustees of Indiana University and the September meeting of the University Faculty Council. Let me just update you a little bit on my perspective about the trustees quite interesting: they have made a decision to shorten their meeting schedule for the 2007/2008 year. I think in large part they feel that President McRobbie is somebody that they know and understand and I think it appears that it is an attempt on their part to perhaps be less involved in some of the day to day operations of the university and leave more of that in the hands of the administration, although that may be just my reading of it. But it's quite an interesting shortening of their schedule. It does mean we have to be very careful in watching documents that need to be taken to them for approval in this year because there will be fewer opportunities to either discuss things with them or actually have documents brought in for formal evaluation. I think most of you know that Steve Ferguson was reelected to the board and reelected as president. Sue Talbot, who...is Sue in the room? She has been attending some of our BFC meetings. Sue has been reelected. If you're not aware of it, I think you need to know that there is now very strong representation from the health science industries on our Board of Trustees in addition to Steve Ferguson who of course you know his role locally with Cook. William Cast and Phillip Eskew are both MDs, Derica Rice who some of you may not have previously had contact with is a VP and CFO at Eli Lilly, and of course Jack Gill who is familiar to many of you is involved with venture capital particularly in the high technology end of many healthcare related businesses, so we have a very strong shift towards a health sciences knowledgeable Board of Trustees. I think it's quite clear that the board is turning to, and here is Sue, who we just mentioned who's just come into the room, the board has really embraced President McRobbie's description of the University in terms of globalization and increased internationalization I think we will all have a much clearer view of his goals and priorities once we hear his inaugural address. He has really tried very hard to keep us in waiting until that event and of course that is now just a little over two weeks, two weeks from today and I think that will then allow us to really at the meeting in November that he will chair with this group, I suspect we will have an extended question and answer session and we will build that into the schedule to ensure time for all of you to react to his inaugural message. At the September meeting of the University Faculty Council, a number of pressing matters were put on the table. I think we've talked some to this group we've been primarily talking to one of the sub-committees about the family leave policy. This policy is in a continuation mode this year because the policy that the BFC and UFC developed, brought to the trustees last year, was not approved and instead went for a one year sort of continuing resolution, but that will terminate at the end of this year. So Bart and I were really very concerned about ensuring that this progresses appropriately this year and that we don't get into a stalemate situation at the end of the year. So let me read you briefly a message that we have sent out to the individuals who will be co-chairing a committee to work on this on behalf of both the UFC, the IFC and, did I say that BFC, the IFC, and the UFC. And those individuals are Elizabeth Johnson, Richard Shockley, and Mary Minnick. The first part of this is just a welcome from Bart and I. And here's the part I think you need to hear:

“Given that our last two attempts to develop such a policy, the family leave policy, were met with a great deal of resistance from the Trustees we need to approach the task this year with

some new thinking and perhaps a collaborative strategy. We thought that if we are to succeed this year we need to get President McRobbie and the board of trustees involved in the process as early as possible we have now met with President McRobbie and have shared our thoughts with him. President McRobbie agreed with our approach and he in turn suggested that the University Faculty Council invite Trustees Patrick Shoulders from Evansville and William Cast from Fort Wayne to one of the meetings of the family leave policy group early on, and establish a mechanism to seek their input as we proceed with this work. Since Trustee Sue Talbot chairs the academic affairs and university policies committees which will eventually deliberate on the proposed policies we suggest that the FBC, which is the committee, include her as well. To follow up on President McRobbie's suggestions, Bart has spoken to Trustees Shoulders and Cast as well as Talbot, and they've all expressed their willingness to be involved. By this message we ask that you begin your work, Julie Knost from IUB Affirmative Action office has been helpful in providing data and we trust that she is again ready to help. Please feel free to call on other members of the FBCs at IUB and IUPUI as well as volunteers from other campuses."

And that's really where we stand right now. We are looking specifically for other individuals either within this body or if you have colleagues in your home units or academic departments who have a particular knowledge or expertise with family leave policies, we would certainly welcome their volunteering to serve as consultants. Laura Ginger has already secured one consultant for us in the form of a consultation, a coffee consultation with her husband, and we would really encourage the rest of you to do the same because this is a very difficult policy. We can't simply look at what other universities have done, we can't use a model based on corporations. We're really going to have to work on this on our own and make some very straightforward arguments to the trustees about why doing this right may be expensive in the short run, but are just where we need to go in the long run in terms of recruitment retention and development of a sense of commitment from the faculty to the university and from the university to the faculty. Intellectual property is another area where we thought we had moved forward and we have apparently not moved as far forward as we had hoped at the UFC meeting last week, we revisited the policy that was passed here in Bloomington and also a policy that was carried forward and we considerable negotiation and renegotiation was ultimately passed by the UFC but we have been asked by the president and in particular by John Applegate on behalf of the president John is the back of the room, and if you would wave, John, in case there's anyone who doesn't know who you are. I'm now going to embarrass John by reading a message that we sent him just so that you understand where we are with a partial possible revisiting of the intellectual property policy. John has pointed out on behalf of the president's office and faculty council that the wording of the rather long policy that we passed is difficult to handle in terms of implementation and he has asked that we cooperate with those offices in clarifying the language in that policy. However, after we received that request Bart and I sent a response back to John that reads as follows: "UF2007 is result of countless hours of tough negotiation and hard work by a large number of faculty across all campuses over a period of nearly three years. The policy was developed with a great deal of input from the University Faculty Council office. Dottie Frapwell was copied on every draft and email during the original policy development as was then-Vice-President Michael McRobbie. The UFC will therefore strongly resist any attempt to re-write UFC2007. However, the UFC would welcome any effort to develop a guide or roadmap to accompany UF2007 that would explain in straightforward language to faculty and administrators how the IP works at IU." And that's really where we stand at the moment, unless John has any clarification on this. We intend to discuss this further with John and the President and Dottie and

try to figure out how we're moving forward because I think there is recognition that the document is long the language is difficult to understand on a quick reading and we appreciate the situation that they're in with trying to figure out how to provide a shorter simpler document that is easier to manage for people first encountering it. So that's where we stand on Intellectual Policy. I want to tell...

**APPLEGATE:** The...

**PRATT:** Yeah?

**APPLEGATE:** The only thing I'd add to that is just to make clear once again there is no suggestion that the idea is to re-write the substance of the policy. There is no issue with that. It's an implementation issue and as some of the people who need to actually implement the policy in a consistent, fair way it's important that it be capable of that happening, he says inarticulately, but that really is it and I just want to be absolutely clear that it's not about re-working the formulas or the categories or something like that.

**PRATT:** Thank you John, that helps. I want everyone to be aware that at the UFC meeting, there were a number of people who felt that there really were significant problems emerging with the operation of the motor school, the motor school ?, the motor pool and the bookstore. We are now trying to work with various university staff to find a way to collect all complaints in a single place that we can see the number of complaints there's already individuals in place who are acting on complaints in particular about the bookstore operations and negotiating with their folks to see to it that these problems get resolved. We're working for a similar day-to-day evolving relationship with the motor-pool but if you have problems, or if you hear problems from your colleagues, it's very important that those comments be put in writing that they don't just, you know, get thrown around verbally because we want to be sure at the end of this year we can tally up the complaints and comments and we can make sure there was follow up on those. So we're seeking clarification of how to centralize the information on those matters. It was also brought out at the UFC meeting that there are continuing problems with Oncourse. Now this is not just the problems that many of us encountered the week before classes started where you uploaded documents and the next day the documents had vanished and many of us, myself include, had that problem and kind of worked through it. But people at the Indianapolis campus are finding that they continue to have the site spontaneously disappear when they are logged on. It's happening not just to students but to faculty so once again the president was quite alarmed at that and he said he would follow up with Bill Wheeler, is Bill here?

**HANSON:** No, Brad.

**GINGER:** Brad.

**BOBAY:** Brad.

**PRATT:** Brad, not Bill, Sorry. Is Brad here? I don't see him. But the President assured everybody at the UFC meeting that this is of a great, that is a concern to him and he will identify somebody in the system who once again will serve as the point person so we can all send our

comments and complaints to a fairly high level individual and not just the help desk so that we keep track of what the problems are and how the problems are being solved and the last thing. Actually, two more items; one, it was announced by the President at both the Trustees meeting and the UFC meeting that he is moving forward immediately to constitute a committee of individuals including quite a number of faculty to work with him directly on interviewing and selecting a firm to be designated as the new master planning architectural firm for the university as a whole. The members of that committee have not been named, although he indicated that Bart and I would both serve on that committee as representatives of the UFC, so we are sort of holding our breath waiting to see the constitution and the charge to that committee but I think it's quite good news that the President himself will be chairing that committee again we're waiting to hear what he says in his inaugural statement and I think many of us will follow up with questions when he joins us here at the front desk in November. I want to just, one last note, I want to thank Bob Eno, Dave Mackey and Lisa Bingham for their follow up questions to the higher ed. commission we have sent those questions forward in writing and we have asked the commission to respond both to those three individuals and to copy the BFC office, Craig and myself on those answers. And if those answers are interesting and substantive we will then share them with the group as a whole and I think you know that we intend later today for some follow up discussion about what we heard from the commissioners and with that, Karen, I'll turn it over to you.

### **AGENDA ITEM#3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**HANSON:** Okay. Just a few items of business. One of them a tag on to the comments that Lisa made about the master planning thing. The committee that will be announced to engage in the process of choosing the master planner is not really faculty heavy. I mean, that's mostly administrators, the two faculty council co-secretaries and we'll have two additional faculty members, but it's, there's representation from both campuses and regional chancellors as well. But the rest of the folks are basically administrators. But there is going to be an IUB space committee that I'll convene, and I would like, again, anybody that wants to nominate himself or herself or suggest somebody else, please do give me your names. This will be a committee that will be looking again at research space needs following up on the committee that did that in 2004 but also at teaching needs, the residence halls, everything connected with this campus. So if you know of someone who should be on that committee or if you want to be on that committee yourself, please send me the names.

### **AGENDA ITEM#4 QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**PRATT:** Will you ask Nom Comm? BFC Nom Comm to also make recommendations?

**HANSON:** Sure, so that's on the space planning stuff. I just have a couple of other small announcements. As you recall, those of you who were on the BFC last year, you passed a resolution in April asking the Provost to panel a committee of administrators to see whether or not something can be done about summer session calendars that would allow for the meeting of certain other desiderata that you had specified and that committee has been formed; Roland Coté is going to convene it and Pat Connor from RPS, Jeanne Sept from Dean of Faculties and Academic Affairs, Jack Rhodes from Orientation, Tom Swafford from Space Management, Mary Winters or a designee from Music, Tim Londergan from the College, Jerry Pugh and Dick

McKaig. If there are other people you think should definitely be on that let me know, but that's the committee as it stands and they'll be back and report on recommendations before the end of this term. As we were directed to. And the other thing is that today, well, yesterday was the deadline for the articulation of the no smoking policy for the Bloomington campus. I did send one to the President and we will shortly be getting out publicity about that. The no smoking, the smoke-free, or tobacco-free campus implementation date is January 1<sup>st</sup> so we have some publicity that we need to do in the meantime and some plans for that. Any questions about that?

**PRATT:** I believe Jeanne is the designated compliance officer on this are you not? Do you want to...

**SEPT:** Just for the academic.

**PRATT:** Oh just for the academic...

**HANSON:** Would you like to say anything about that? Or...(laughter)

**SEPT:** Not particularly other than I do think it's appropriate to seek faculty BFC guidance on how that should be implemented particularly for the academic appointments but Karen's already said that it's also important that we coordinate the approach with the Dean of Student's Office and with Dan Rives who are going to be appropriate, they will be the enforcers for the staff and students, and so we're going to have to find out a coordinated approach.

**HANSON:** It's the Dean of Faculties for academic employees, for staff, Human Resources, and for students, the Office of the Dean of Students, and we've all talked about these things a bit. It's not as if people are looking to arrest people and yet, you know, you can't put out a policy like this and say there's going to be no enforcement, I mean that, the idea is that moral suasion and a sort of community spirit will be appealed to and the implementation process may take some time even though things are to be effective as of January 1<sup>st</sup>. Talked with Bob Meadows in the architect's office about having a banner on buses that will circle the campus in part to notify people of the perimeters. There are some complicated issues for this residential campus obviously and there are possibilities for exceptions but the aim is to have this in effect by January 1<sup>st</sup> and do the best we can with maintaining collegiality and cooperativeness as a mode of implementation. So, anything else about that? Okay I think, one other quick announcement, I need to go to a reception for emeriti faculty at the break period so I regret that particularly since one of the very interesting things you're going to be doing is talking about the future of higher education in Indiana. (laughs)

**PRATT:** Well then I think we'll just do the, should we just do this as is?

**HANSON:** Okay, and I do want to say about accreditation if I end up having to leave on part of that, it is very important that everybody listen to what Jeanne and Jerry have to say about this, we do want people to understand that this is a process going on this Fall and to be ready in case the, you know, questions are asked about it that you understand what is going on with this process and be prepared to speak to the committee that's visiting if necessary, but to understand this is an

important process for the campus. But those are all the announcements I wanted to make. Are there questions for Lisa or me? Okay, then, should we move right along?

## **AGENDA ITEM# 5 ACADEMIC QUALITIES AND DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE INCOMING CLASS**

**PRATT:** I think we'll just stay with this the schedule as written. Roger? Roger is going to report on academic qualities and demographics of the incoming class and he's prepared to have a discussion.

**THOMPSON:** Yes, absolutely.

**HANSON:** So and for those of you that know that we have had a policy of no Power Points in the BFC I will say that it was only with a great deal of very special pleading that we're breaking that policy today and hopefully we can keep that policy in force most of the time in the future.

**THOMPSON:** Well I apologize for pressing it, I had a number of graphs that I wanted you to see and I thought it might be easier to show them in this manner. So I'm going to try to be brief in terms of my comments and really try to move us along to the questions and issues and discussion that you're interested in, so, let's just jump right in. You probably heard a fair amount about the entering class of 2007 here's a couple points that we think are especially relevant. It's the most academically talented class in the history of Indiana University as measured by grade point average and test score. I'll show you some data about both of these in a second, but suffice it to say the GPA went up, the test score went up and by virtually any measure that you want to utilize for academic quality whether it be the math assessment exam that's given to freshman when they enter IU or other measures, all of those reach new highs. It's the most diverse class as measured by ethnicity: 18% of the freshman class is non-white. That's a new record level. More students than we've had and I've built upon last year which was also a record level for diversity. It was the most competitive admissions process that means that students who potentially got in three years ago as an example may not have been admitted this year. And we'll show you some data that relates to that. Suffice to say for the fall of 2007, students had to be better prepared in every respect. And lastly, we had the highest SAT increase from one year to another in IU history. So let's look at some of these. These are in your handout, but I think it's also helpful to see them up here. So let's start with applications. You can see in 2004, we were roughly 21,000, went to 22 in '05, jumped to 24 in '06, and jumped to 28.5 in 2007. As you know, high school graduates in the state of Indiana are primarily flat slight increase over the next ten years, however many states in the country are growing rapidly in terms of high school graduates and more importantly we got a higher percentage of Indiana kids to apply this year, so as application growth goes up, that makes things more competitive. We've had some discussion in the popular press about sort of how we ended up with a more competitive admissions process and were we moving too quickly on some of the Trustees' goals for admissions. And I like to tell people that I think we're representing the faculty of this campus well when we say we don't want 10,000 students in the freshman class. I think that's still correct, right?

**PRATT:** It certainly is from my perspective (laughter) I don't know about the rest of you...

**THOMPSON:** So if the number of students interested in IU is growing, as an example from '06 to '07 by 18%, we are not going to grow the freshman class by 18% so naturally it becomes more competitive. When we look at the next slide, this gives you a sense of what we call selectivity. This is the percentage of students that applied that were actually admitted. So, here in 2004, we were at roughly 83%, 2005 we jump up to 85%, as we get to 2006 we are at roughly 80%, and this year we were at 70, 69.8. For those of you that follow US News and put some relevance into those rankings. It's important to note a couple things, first: selectivity is becoming less and less valuable in the US News rankings formula. So it's important for me to say that to you because sometimes people say, 'Well we're trying to become more selective to boost our US News rank.' Nothing could be further from the truth. If we were standing here in 1993, when selectivity made up, you know, well over a quarter of the US News ranking, I might tell you, 'Sure, that's very valuable to us.' What drove selectivity more than anything else was the fact that more students applied and we simply didn't have room to increase the class so that made it more difficult for someone to get in. Next slide is an interesting one, this graph highlights what we're seeing in terms of SAT composite scores. This section on the left represents our students here at IU. The middle section represents the national averages for the SAT composite. And here we're only looking at verbal and math, this doesn't include writing. And over here on the right, we're looking at the state of Indiana composite scores. So a couple things jump out here, I think. First: the national average for the national SAT composite has dropped in the last four years from roughly a 1026 down to a 1017. The same is true while the IU or the state of Indiana has held relatively steady, it did drop in comparison to the last couple of years. There's a lot of discussion, I was just at the MAC AC conference in Austin, Texas until this weekend and there were several sessions there talking about test fatigue. That seems to be the common, well the common theory or hypothesis for why nationally, SAT scores are dropping. That's probably part of it. Students sit for a test a lot longer than they used to, but another big component I think that isn't getting as much play is that our participation rates have increased significantly in terms of the numbers of students that are taking the SAT today as compared to several years ago. In any event, the good news in this slide is that as you can see national trend line is down somewhat, state trend line down somewhat, Indiana University's trend line is increasing, and increasing pretty significantly. Here's another way to show that. As we look at the SAT scores of IU beginners, and let me point out we're now calling this IU Beginners as opposed to IU Freshman because one of the phenomenon we are seeing is that we have more students beginning at IU that are bringing significant credit hours in AP or dual enrollment or honors courses that count both ways so we're beginning to see students that I think of as a freshman they've never been to college before, but they're coming in with maybe 30, 32, 36 hours and that technically gets them in a sophomore classification because of all the work they've done. So we've changed the label slightly to call it a beginner the vast majority of kids coming are not coming above the freshman level but our folks in the Registrar's office rightly want to be as precise as they can be with the terms. So as we look here, 2004 we're roughly at 1100. If we were to take the ten year average from 2004 back to about 1996, I guess that's not quite ten years, but that's when the SAT was rescaled, you'll see that our average at Indiana University hovers somewhere between the high 1090's and the low 1100's. So this number is pretty representative of where we were for the better part of the 1990's. As you see in '05 we jump to 1111, '06 1121, and then we have the big jump to 1146 this year. A 25 point gain in SAT is something that I'm extremely proud of, I hope you are too. I think it's the result of many people working in the recruitment area to talk to the best and brightest students and encourage them to come to Indiana University. The other area that is

generally of interest to folks is where did the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile end up and what's the trend line on those data. So as you see here, we begin in '04 with a base of 990 and 1220. Those percentiles put us at the bottom of the Big Ten conference if you were to compare us with our peers. We were certainly well below Michigan State. As we go across time, in fact we were the only Big Ten School below 1000, which was not a distinction we particularly liked. At least I hope you didn't like it. I didn't like it. So as you see, in this freshman class the upper tier of students has increased basically 40 points over a four-year period. 20 points here from last year to this year and on the bottom end of the chart. You've gone from a 990 to a 1000 and then our jump up to 1030. These are simply test score ranges, and the important part any freshman class is when you in a classroom begin to see a difference in terms of the quality of student that you're teaching on a regular basis. I hope these measures will translate into differences that you see in your classroom. I was very pleased when the Dean of the college sent over the math assessment score exams for entering freshman on their math ability, and that went from a 14, was sort of a typical score was sort of the high-water mark as a mean for us. This year I think it was a 15.1, so significant increase in terms of math preparedness. That was all the data that I brought. I thought it was more important to take ten minutes to do that and leave the rest of the time for any questions or issues that you might want to discuss, but there is a very quick snapshot of what the freshman class looks like. I think we accomplished a great deal in improving the academic stature of the students that are entering. We still have a long way to go, but it is certainly a good place to start. (Cell phone chimes) I'm not going to pull a Rudy Giuliani and play as if that's my wife calling.

**HANSON:** It's the theme music...

**THOMPSON:** Yes, thank you.

**HANSON:** Are there questions or ...?

**THOMPSON:** Yes ma'am.

**BINGHAM:** You indicated in 2004, we were at the bottom of the Big Ten, where are we now?

**THOMPSON:** Well we don't know, because they all haven't reported yet. We certainly know that our mean SAT is higher than Purdue, so we know we're at least higher than one school in the Big Ten. On the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> I would suspect this'll move us above probably Minnesota and Michigan State and Iowa. But again, I've been traveling so I haven't been looking for what they've reported. At the time we put this together before I went to Texas we didn't have the numbers out yet. So it'll certainly move us up, and we just don't know what the others did. Yes sir?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** How do the IU beginners compare with the students who were admitted to IU?

**TERRY:** Good question.

**THOMPSON:** Yeah the average SAT on an admitted student this year was almost a 1200. So you can see that while we yielded, (yield is a term of converting those that are admitted to enrolled) while we did a better job on converting higher ability students obviously to get the 25 point gain. There is still room for us to grow in terms of converting those students. As you all know the better the student quality, the more difficult they are to convert because they have more options and so you begin to compete with different caliber of institutions, but yeah. Good question. And the GPA was almost a 3.7, just perspective.

**TERRY:** In a way I follow up on that. We've charged Admissions with bringing us these wonderful students, but, and you do a good job, but I'm also wondering if you, based on your national experience can suggest ways perhaps from other universities other programs that we as faculty can help you to convert?

**THOMPSON:** Yeah. Great question. Did everybody hear the question? How can faculty help in converting and, you know I always say, I would say a couple things when folks ask me that question. First, how can faculty help us convert? Well, be the best faculty member you can be, for one. If a student goes to look for you during office hours, please be there because otherwise, they'll go back at Thanksgiving and say that we're not accessible. Secondly, I think you'll see us about this time next year kick off a faculty communication program. I had the experience when I was at the University of Southern California of going through the Rodney King riots at a private university that had no support and watching our freshman class fall apart to the point where for the first time in that institution's history, we had layoffs, we had salary freezes and we had hiring freezes. Not a good environment. But it was very tough to tell a kid in Indianapolis that it was safe to come to Los Angeles when they could flip on CNN and see the city burning down. Now the fact that it wasn't happening on our campus didn't much matter to someone that was far away. Anyway, from that horrible civil unrest several really good things developed at that institution. The first was I think we began to make a connection between student enrollment and faculty resources which I thought was very important long term for the institution. Secondly and maybe even more importantly, we had a number of faculty who said, 'How can we help? How could we have avoided this? You know, riots two weeks before the national commitment deadline?' And from that point forward, we put in a program where we sorted students by their interest group and we asked faculty, 'are any of you interested in helping us?' and a fair number were. And we began sharing the top students in our prospect list and faculty began to write personalized notes that simply said, you know, 'I'm Professor Terry and I'd really like to have you in my radio-television class. I see that's your interest, hope you'll come to IU.' It's not a big deal, but you would be amazed at how that impacts a 17 or 18 year old. We've got to do a few infrastructure things on our end to get a little bit better before we start asking for your time. The first one of those is putting in place a CRM system so we can put a little technology around how we communicate, and we'll have that done probably February or March, and then we're going to try to engage folks in those kinds of ways. You know, we have a very good relationship with so many faculty on this campus. When top students come in fact, I'll use the Provost as an example. When she was dean of the Honors College, I can't think of a single time that we asked if she had time to meet with a top student, she always did. And it makes a difference for kids when they can actually connect because when they take the tours, in fact Thursday of this week, I'll be in Wisconsin playing a parent, and I won't have a child with me, but I'm taking the tour at Wisconsin. I'm very interested in what their messages are, because some of the good kids that

we lose in Illinois especially, that's where we lose them. And so I want to see what kinds of messages they're sending to students. Yes Ma'am?

**FOSTER:** Give us an idea of the ----- sort of related to that, instate versus out of state population?

**THOMPSON:** Yeah, this year out of state grew a little bit larger than we had anticipated. The freshman class was 41% out of state, 59% in state. Our goal for the freshman class quite honestly was about 400 kids smaller than what it turned out to be and most of those came from out of state. Right now when you look at our out of state markets, we're doing extremely well in the north shore of Chicago, in fact we enrolled more students from Adlai Stevenson High School than the University of Illinois did. I am meeting their guidance counselor tomorrow in fact. I'm heading to Chicago when this is done. And he jokingly said, "Indiana University North" when I called. That's a pretty good sign. That school's profile, which is in my bag over there, I think they're students are averaging about a 1270 on their SAT in their senior class. So, we did real well in Chicago, we continue to do well in Ohio and the east coast and California. We don't really want to be quite as big out of state as we turned out to be this year, but you know it's social science. We can set up models, but at the end of the day, we're trying to predict what a 17 or 18 year old's going to do. And clearly we didn't predict that very well, although the students that came were of much better quality than what we'd anticipated. We didn't expect to have a 25 point jump in the SAT scores as an example or see our average GPA go above a 3.6 in the entering class. Yes sir?

**MCCORMICK:** The growth and improvement in the class has really been pretty impressive. My question really goes to though at the same time we've been investing more into enrollment and recruitment and those sorts of things where do you see that going at this point? I mean, is there a point at which we reach (tape ends)

**THOMPSON:** -----There was a great story in the Indianapolis Star yesterday. I don't know if you caught it. It quoted my counterpart at Purdue and her comment was that she felt like the admissions and recruitment game had become an arms race, and she dreaded that. Mike Sample called me and said, left me funny message that said, that he read that and thought that that was the difference between her and I. I kind of relish that as opposed to dread it. It is an arms race and here's an example. At IU when I arrived fifteen months ago, we were spending about \$700,000 in our recruitment budget. The Big 10 average was 1.6 million. The University of Michigan which arguably has one of the strongest public institution reputations in the country was spending 3.2 million. Some would think they need to spend less because of their reputation. They're actually spending more. My point to that, and we certainly have had strong support from the administration to enhance from our \$750, no question about it. My point is that we don't have to spend what Michigan spends, but we have to become more competitive if we're going to continue to move it. And you do get to a point where you can then back off but I don't think we're anywhere close to that. I'll give you another example. The University of Florida. About ten years ago, Florida decided they were going to be one of the leaders in the enrollment of National Merit, Hispanic, and Achievement students. They felt like that was a way they could raise quality on their campus. So they put millions of dollars into scholarship programs for National Merit, Hispanic, and Achievement students. They accomplished just what they wanted.

In a ten year window they began to enroll more of those kids than just about anybody in the country. Two years ago, they announced they were quitting that program. Has it hurt their freshman profile at all? No, because the reputation of Florida is completely changed. Florida is now not just beach balls and frisbees, but there's actually people studying and learning there. So it is an arms race, to answer your question. And you do hit a point where you know maybe you've maxed it out and you're not going to get any more mileage. I like to think now is the time to pour it on. When you get a 25 point gain, you begin to build momentum. You're beginning to get the right kinds of kids out of high schools that the friends that they bring with them are the kinds of kids that will help grow your quality. So it's certainly many people in higher education I guess feel as though a lot's being spent on recruitment I'll simply answer that by saying "yes" and you either decide you want to be in the game or you don't want to be in the game. It's just that easy. At my former institution, we did the same thing with National Merits. I've kidded people who saw that in my tenure we went from enrolling 45 National Merit, Hispanic, and Achievement students to 198 in a five year window in a school without half the academic stature that this one has. How did we do it? We modeled Florida. We simply went out and benchmarked it. So it depends on what your values are.

**HANSON:** One more question.

**THOMPSON:** Yes sir.

**CARINI:** Is there also more money for financial aid?

**THOMPSON:** Yes!

**CARINI:** I've seen you streamline the scholarship office which...

**THOMPSON:** Yeah thank you! That's actually a key part of what I left out. We've had a number of questions about financial aid. You know our goal I think has been, we've really had four goals in recruitment for last year and they continue for this year. One is to improve the quality of the freshman class. The second is to increase the diversity of the freshman class, third is to enhance and build upon our international reputation, and fourth is to keep IU affordable for Indiana residents. Our new financial aid initiatives come in a couple different forms. We put in some need-based packages the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholar Covenant which reaches out to students who are on subsidized lunch programs in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade and supplements their cost of education. The Pell Promise which reaches out to families who are Pell grant eligible, basically middle-income families from about \$40,000 to about \$85,000, helps to pay their cost of education. And then we've put in some new merit-based programs as well, IU Excellence being the primary one. Each of those we feel we need to better coordinate with the schools and the college and Honors and all the different people that have sort of pieces of this financial aid pie. And I'm very hopeful that by creating the scholarship office, we will create a hub with spokes that reach out to those other programs and make sure we operate in a collaborative and strategic kind of approach to make sure we're getting the best kids that we possibly can, but financial aid is a big part of it. If we're going to compete for the best and brightest students the facts are they're going to get offers from everywhere in the country. Sarita sees that. Research Scholars, or Karen sees it with Honors when she was in that role. So we do have to be competitive, but as you sort of raise the quality

having spent ten years in the south, I like to say it's kind of like fire ants. If you poke a stick in a fire ant hole all the ants come to the surface. If you get the right kinds of students from a high school they all come and follow. And I think that's what we're starting to see. It's probably not the best analogy. (laughter) I only share that with all of you. I don't say that out on the road.

**PRATT:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** Thank you.

**THOMPSON:** You're very welcome.

**HANSON:** If you have additional questions, Roger is always very responsive.

**THOMPSON:** Hate to end on that fire ant. (laughter) Anyway, thank you all.

**HANSON:** Light the fire under us, thank you Roger.

**PRATT:** Thank you so much Roger.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6 NORTH CENTRAL RE-ACCREDITATION**

**HANSON:** Reaccreditation? Jeanne and Terry?

**PRATT:** Yeah I think if you don't mind coming to the microphone, it does help.

**SEPT:** How to follow the fire ant story other than to say make sure if you poke it with the stick, you take the stick out before the ants run up under your arm. Well let me, I think we'll be brief. I was going to ask you if we have time to read this into the record today, but I'll spare you that. I think as many of you are aware, we've been over the last several years we've been gearing up for our ten-year campus reaccreditation cycle. Many of you have been involved in this process. We've tried to establish a process that really reached out to faculty and to administrators across campus to solicit their best advice and give us feedback on the sorts of issues that we wanted to raise with the higher learning commission. This is the Higher Learning Commission - North Central Administration. And right now we have our ten-year reaccreditation visit. It's scheduled for November 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> which is a Monday and Tuesday. We'll be advertising open meetings for the staff, for the students and for the faculty and we'll encourage any of you, in fact I'll probably send personal little messages to all of you to attend the open meeting with the reaccreditation team if you're at all interested in that. They want to make sure to be able to hear from people all across campus as they pursue our reaccreditation process. I think many of you are probably aware that North Central developed a new series of five criteria that they'll be evaluating us on. Just as a quick review that's mission and integrity is criteria number one, preparing for the future or planning, number two, teaching and learning, number three, acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge is number four, and number five is engagement in service. In addition to that we took advantage of an opportunity this round to do a special emphasis self study which focused on the Bloomington campus. In the internationalization of the Bloomington campus in a global context which we'll be talking about

in a second. And all of this is our self study process has taken information that all the academic units and all of you have given to us and tried to distill it down into what is actually a fairly succinct document considering all the material we had to pull together. And I'll just invite all of you to explore this particular document online we have a central website called accreditation.indiana.edu. All you have to do is be able to spell accreditation and you can get there. The complete text of this, all the supporting materials and the wide range of other resource materials that have been submitted to us are available there and so I invite you all to look through these materials. We tried to take an approach that was both descriptive and selective. We tried to illustrate case studies from campus that do justice to the units across campus. So I think, I hope all of you will see your own units represented. Not completely, because then it would've taken a number of these phonebook sized things to represent you, but what we tried to do was to isolate particularly distinctive or high impact programs while acknowledging the work of each and every one of our faculty in the best ways we could. So in general I guess I should say that nothing like this happens without the help of lots and lots and lots of people. So not only have many of you given us input and advice on this process but I particularly wanted to thank Ray Smith who wasn't able to be here today for really leading our reporting on the five key criteria demonstrating how we comply. We've been calling it the 'compliance piece.' How we comply with the Higher Learning Commission criteria. And I particularly wanted to thank Terry Mason, Associate Dean in my office, who came on board into the office to really grapple with the coordination, distillation synthesis and writing of our globalization and internationalization self-study piece. And it's his power point that we're waiting for. And Terry, do you want to say a few words while it kicks up or should I keep babbling up here?

**MASON:** Let me talk a little bit about the self-study special emphasis on internationalization and globalization. Some of you in this room are already aware of the existence of this. We started about a year and a half ago, actually before that, but I came on about a year and a half ago to help coordinate and lead this effort and we did a number of things. Obviously, we wanted to review the campus' history with regard to international work as I'm sure all of you are aware Indiana University has a long history of international activity both in terms of research, teaching, service. It dates back to Herman Wells' era and even before that. So we were already beginning knowledge of the distinguished history and lots of really important work in international areas on this campus that have been have gone on for a long time. But we approached the self study with kind of a dual focus. On the one hand, the purpose was reaccreditation, that is the North Central Association would be coming to look at our programs to make sure that they are indeed high quality and we could be worthy of the reaccreditation. - So I should reboot that maybe? Aha! Thank you. It's a little small, can you see that map? - Here we started by looking at other documents related to and involved in the importance of internationalization and globalization in higher ed. around the country and around the world. So we surveyed a number of things and we discovered that in fact this is a ubiquitous issue that universities everywhere are interested in their role internationally and how they can enhance it. So we knew that we were on to something and as I said this has been a part of Indiana University's culture for a long time. So we did that. We also wanted to refer to the fact that the Trustees have identified this as a priority, internationalization, and have made statements to that effect for some time and then of course our current president Michael McRobbie has also indicated that this-international activity in all the various spheres-is going to be an important part of Indiana University of the future as well as it has been for the past. And as this was mentioned in his inaugural address, we can expect to

hear sort of some concrete recommendations and plans for how that will materialize across the IU campuses. We start with a set of issues that were articulated in the beginning to provide a focus for the self study. We were interested in the extent which globalization was impacting research, teaching and service. It does, we know that it does, but how it does in particular ways was of interest to us. Also, how globalization might bridge academic structures across campus. What does it, does it provide opportunities for integrated kind of activity? Interdisciplinary work, multi-disciplinary work, and what would that look like. Also, our undergraduate and graduate experiences overseas; we have a very successful exchange program for our students, overseas study programs. We wanted to look closely at them and see how effective in fact they really work. Again, to what extent our graduate programs emphasizing international and global issues; that's an important dimension here. And again, technology. Obviously the international activity is highly dependent upon technological means of communication and as we know that's another strength of our university, but we wanted to see just exactly that strength in technology translated into our international and global outreach. And finally, in a broad sense, how would we as a university respond to the institutional challenges of globalization. How are we going to recruit the best students? How are we going to make sure that our programs are reflective of the realities of the current context, current global context. So on the one hand, we had to demonstrate to the North Central Association that we were a high-quality program in international terms, on the other hand, we wanted to use this as a real opportunity to do a self-study. That is, to actually engage in the process of inquiries that would help us understand ourselves better and hopefully make some changes for the future. So when I came on board that was what I was told we were going to do, and guess what, I took it seriously. That was what I thought we would try to do. We, in doing so, we tried to engage as many people in the IU-Bloomington community as possible; faculty, staff, students, in a variety of ways. One of the first things that we did was to, based upon those issues that were identified, was to develop or convene six research groups. One on undergraduate experience, one on research scholarship and Ph.D. activity, one on teaching, one in preparation of graduate students, one on area and language studies and one on information technology. Since these seemed to be key dimensions of international work or key aspects of the university we wanted to understand more about international global activity. So we put these research groups together and Herb Terry I know participated and John Applegate was involved in one of those committees. I'm not sure about the rest of you were. But we had faculty, staff and student participation in that. We also conducted a survey. An online survey of graduates and undergraduates to determine their understanding of the issues of global and international activity, what their levels of participation were, what they felt the needs and interests were in that area and finally we put together the research report that I'll mention based upon these data sources. In addition, we'd surveyed all the academic units on campus through the Dean's office to find out the critical dimensions and major efforts that they were engaged in on the international level. We used the research from the reports that came from each one of those and follow up interviews with members of those research teams. We had case studies that were generated that identified and investigated in depth a number of unique and specific international activities on campus. I mentioned the graduate and undergraduate survey. Also, our Title VI centers, and we have the most Title VI centers of any campus in the United States we have here at IU - Bloomington. We used their applications. They'd all recently undergone redesignation by the Title VI program and so we used their applications as data sources in a sense to find out what they had accomplished and what they were working on. Institutional data from the Registrar, Office of International Programs obviously, Office of Overseas Study and we went back to the 1997 accreditation report

to find out what was in there. Through all this information we were able to then begin to generate a research report just very quickly the timeline that we followed was from the spring of 2006 when these six research groups convened and generated their reports. We went from that to coordinating a committee and our advisory board that we had through the process and had them providing input to us. And from the summer of 2006 up until last summer we had a writing team in the Dean of Faculties' office composed of faculty, graduate students, and some professional writers who amassed all this information that we gathered and put it together in a report that was on one hand comprehensive, we think, but not that long that it wouldn't be impossible to for our visiting team to get through. We wanted to put all this into about 80 pages which was a task because as you know there is so much that goes on on this campus internationally that it was hard to make a decision about how to narrow that to 80 pages, but we did so. And for those of you who are not interested in the full 80 pages, in your materials today there is a five page executive summary which highlights some of the major things that are in that report. The report will be available in its entirety in electronic format for anyone who wants to see the gruesome details of that report, but if you're not the executive summary should help give you enough information to be dangerous, no not dangerous, but enough information so that if approached by the visiting team you'll be able to understand what we have accomplished. So that process that that report went through a vetting and a series of iterations where we in the Dean of Faculties' office read through it, we had our advisory board look at it, sent it back out to the chairs of the research groups. We wanted to make sure that we were thorough to the extent that we were covering and including clear and conclusive, including everybody on campus as best we could, while at the same time highlighting the key aspects of international growth. So in the report itself you'll find we started out...

**PRATT:** I don't want to cut you off, but are we close to wrapping up so that we can follow up with some questions?

**MASON:** Yes, I won't go through this actually, because in the executive summary you'll see the section of the report outline in a little bit more detail than I have it up here, so I think I can move ahead on that. And then we did have a section with conclusions and implications. I do want to make one comment about this process. On the one hand, the accreditation was focused on looking at international programs and evaluating that to a certain degree, at the same time a ten-year strategic plan for international activity was being prepared through the President and the Provost's office. These two processes were in communication with each other and were actually running parallel but not necessarily working exactly together. But we were informing one another. So the purpose here as we saw it in the end was that the strategic plan will set to some extent the policy for international work. What we thought we could do with the accreditation was provide some guidance in a sense about the issues that ought to be addressed in those policies. So that was the way we handled sort of the dual parallel system. Therefore, the things that we want to focus on as conclusions and implications are what are the institutional policies that need to be examined and addressed and I'll let you take a look at those; issues of curriculum and teaching, and finally recruitment and retention. Those are the three broad categories that an international strategic plan should be addressing; probably no surprise there. In the report itself there's more detail about what we have to say about those, but in general that was the areas that seem to be of the most pressing importance and that we wanted to share with the site visiting team when they

come in November. So, in a sense that's a rough overview of the process that we were engaged in, but I'd be happy to, and Jeanne would be happy to have questions. Comments?

**PRATT:** Questions?

**EISENBERG:** Well the emphasis of your talk now and things you've noticed with the board relies very much on cutting edge governments with other countries as they are now. I think in my own view of recent American history and ---- for that matter, indicates that one can't go very far without a delicate knowledge of the history of countries. And so, have you, in your report, considered the very many courses of this campus which are not concerned with current events but are concerned with history that goes back since at least a millennium, but that proves relevant I presume to the current world and population.

**MASON:** Well in the report itself, we don't address the history courses that would be relevant. But certainly when you look at the documentation that we have to support the report, there's quite a bit that talks about the courses such as history courses that one would have to take in order to understand as you say the current context. So it's there, it's sort of embedded in the documentation that supports the report itself. That's a good point.

**TERRY:** I've been here too long. This is my third accreditation. And when these things are done and the reports/recommendations are in, there's usually this little flurry of activity for a while. I remember the flurry the last time; by this point we're all supposed to have proof that our students learned something. I don't know that we have that for this accrediting report but that's what they asked for ten years ago. I'm sort of wondering if there is a plan for meshing the president's initiatives and the outcome of this report which is going to be in March, maybe, I don't know how quickly they turn these things around. And for really taking all the work, as you've said I was involved in, and then moving forward, doing something with all of this that accomplishes a bit more than I've seen with the prior two accreditations.

**MASON:** Well, the fact that there is a strategic plan, a process in place, it gives at least some hope that there would be more than this short term flurry of activity you mentioned. The question as to whether what we find here becomes integrated into that plan is somewhat up to the President's office. That is the material will obviously be available. These issues that we have identified will be made public. Given that, we hope so, but that will be at the level of the President's office and the administration.

**SEPT:** Let me add that I think all our work and the approach we took is predicated upon the idea that this self study will be deeply informative to processes moving forward. And I know President McRobbie is very committed to strategic planning that takes advantage of, that's in a sense data driven and information driven and my view of our activities, this flurry of activities over the last two and a half years actually has been in a way of coordinating and collecting information that will deeply inform the processes that move forwards.

**PRATT:** Do we sense that the important part of the process is our self study? That that's much more important than any response that the accrediting organization will give back to us? Or do you anticipate getting back something meaningful that from which we might learn something?

**SEPT:** Part of the, I tried to work very closely with both the President's office, the Interim Provost's office, current Provost's office, and the Higher Learning Commission to develop a team that had significant expertise in global and international affairs. So the balance of our team, it's a smaller team than we had ten years ago, but the balance of the team has expertise on it that we thought would truly be able to inform us as we move forward. Now whether or not that happens, we'll see. But that has been the goal all along, absolutely.

**PRATT:** That's not quite what I was asking. It seems to me that we're really, this document is the product of the self study and in many ways that's more valuable than the way an accrediting body responds to it in the review mode. I mean is there really any question about reaccreditation?

**MASON:** Oh, I certainly hope not. The only reason they let us do a special emphasis self study was because really there was no question about our being reaccredited and they wanted us to, the Higher Learning Commission shifted over the last ten years from a sort of a—not a backwards looking—but a descriptive framework focused on the past to a sort of a proactive looking ahead framework. And their specific goal is to encourage universities to use the self study process in their future planning. And I think that's what we'll be getting outside feedback on is some of the ways in which we can use this type of documentation to inform our planning process as we move forward. So I'm hoping we get some feedback on that.

**MASON:** We had a visit last week from the chair of the visiting team. And one of things that she asked was for us to generate a set of questions that we could, four or five key questions that we would like the visiting team to address in terms of providing the specific feedback, so we've done that. We've got some questions in place for them that...

**PRATT:** Do you know the members of the visiting team? Do you know who they are and what they, can you tell us something about their credentials?

**SEPT:** Well, I didn't bring the specific information off the cuff. I can certainly send that information to you. We had the last week and a half there were some team members who had to drop off for personal reasons, actually so we're down to a dozen. So there are, actually I would misspeak if I tried to characterize where they come from. A number of them come from AAU institutions. A number of them were required to have been through the Higher Learning Commission training process and some of those did not come from AAU institutions so it's an interesting mix. The AAU has, the Higher Learning Commission has a set of key responsibilities that they assign to different team members and so they were very determined to make sure that the individuals who were part of our team could cover those responsibilities and Interim Provost McRobbie and I worked very, very, very closely to try and get the quality of the team that we thought would give us appropriate feedback and with greater and lesser degrees of success.

**PRATT:** Are there questions from the session?

**BIELASIAK:** I have a couple of questions, or comments maybe. One I'm hearing two different stories here. One is that this is not pressing in particular concerns of accreditation, while it is part of a larger reexamination of globalization within the context of the president's initiative and my

concern is that if it's the latter is that I hear a lot about structure, process, information flows and very little about substantive issues, about what it means to internationalize and become part of the global world. So it's more sort of how the message the gets through and not what the content of the message is. And...

**SEPT:** Well if we have time, we could certainly talk about that.

**BIELASIAK:** I mean, I guess my question was, in summary form, what is the substance of this report?

**MASON:** Well we grappled with that a lot at the beginning of the process because we didn't understand that the very idea of globalization is highly problematic and highly contested. And so we wanted to make sure that we kind of provided a large net in a sense to look at it from a variety of perspectives. But on the other hand, you're right. There are substantive issues about what it means to internationalize and globalize the campus. Some of that is kind of left up to individuals as members of the faculty to deliberate out, basically. I don't think we took a position is what I'm saying on whether globalization is a good or bad phenomenon, we didn't.

**PAOLILLO:** I have a little bit of trouble taking the sides of the motion of globalization and relating it to these specific conclusions and implications. Perhaps your summary slide doesn't do justice to what your actual conclusions and implications are. These look to be very much smaller than what I would like to see addressed in a topic like globalization.

**MASON:** That was another constraint because they're two very different phenomena: globalization and internationalization and we do address that at the beginning of the report. It's even addressed in the summary if you want to read through that. But I think we ended up titling this report "Globalization and the Internationalization of the IUB Campus" which was by design because we wanted to differentiate the meaning of those two concepts and to recognize that what we do as a university is to internationalize. What globalization is beyond the walls of the campus for sure. But it's like I said, we really grappled with trying to reconcile those two concepts and make sense of them in kind of the same report. It wasn't easy.

**PRATT:** I think we can take one more question.

**HATTEN:** I like many of the things in this report. I would just supplement it by quoting a couple of things. One, that the concept of globalization you say it's contested and of course but it also suggests a kind of perspective that we ask, 'what's good for Indiana? How can we get the best faculty, the best students and so compete in the global market?' It's very much an economic type of concept. And I was thinking about, I do a lot of international travel myself, and where some of the things that I have experienced fit in this. But I didn't find it, so I'll just offer this as a kind of a supplement. One thing is oftentimes I've asked to go to a country from which we will not be recruiting students because they cannot afford to come here. It takes over twenty something thousand dollars they have to show that they have to be able to come here. But I go because I can offer them an experience they would not otherwise have. So it doesn't benefit the university in an economic sense, but there are values and benefits that accrue from this in a human international relation sense. That's one thing...

**MASON:** That, what you just said is in the report.

**HATTEN:** Okay, terrific. I just don't see the emphasis on that sort of thing here because the priorities are interdisciplinary research, field experience for our students, best faculty students and resources. The top layer of it goes in that direction. And then your final three points deal with, it's called service mission and of course you get into the issues of environment, health, economic development, and so forth. But it reads very much, the top layer seems to be what will be of best benefit to our institution in terms of helping us compete with other institutions to get the best environmental connections if you will, and I would just suggest that there are other kinds of values that we might look at and even enhance in terms of our international relations. Sometimes they don't even seem to, they just seem like a little drop in the bucket, but we're sort of like emissaries or ambassadors as we bring aspects of our own training to countries that perhaps could not afford or would not otherwise have – I mean places like Belgrade and Libya and even the Palestinian territories you know. These are not places where we're necessarily going to recruit students or faculty and I think it's very important for us to be aware of the opportunities that we have to go out and give, not just receive.

**SEPT:** Let me just interject here. One of the reasons I invited Terry to join this process was because of his own leadership in service both in Macedonia and Afghanistan which exemplified exactly the points you're talking about. And so I think it may be true that in the little quick summary that we put together, maybe some of those things aren't highlighted enough but I do think we took great care in the materials we put together to try and represent the true, the depth and richness and variety of the different ways we interact with, as a public institution we have a wide variety of responsibilities to the public at large. In addition to ourselves so, but your point's well taken.

**HATTEN:** It would be interesting to see how the funding goes with the issues...

**SEPT:** That's a question for the strategic plan.

**PRATT:** I think we will take a very short break, and then gather back to continue the discussion of the higher ed. commission.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7 BRIEF RECESS**

**PRATT:** Lock the escape route! Why don't you just go ahead. Matt Jarson's going to make a quick announcement on behalf of the student government. And then we'll actually ask Bob Eno to lead off the discussion on the commission. So, Matt.

**JARSON:** Hello, on behalf of the Indiana University Student Association, we've embarked on an internal review of our effectiveness in our operations in the last several years. And as part of that, we'd like to kick off a symposium on the future of student governance, kind of where we all see it headed in the future, what role it might play and whether or not we should kind of evolve the current structure. And keeping with that, I'd like to issue a blanket invitation to everyone in the room as well as I guess to those that aren't present this evening. We'll be holding the

symposium I believe it's October 13. It's a Saturday morning, it is an away game for those of you that are big IU football fans, so it shouldn't be a big issue. We'll be holding it here in, I believe the Frangipani Room, from 10am to about 12:30. We'll kick it off with a panel, so far I believe we have Karen Hanson signed on just to kick off our discussion and then talk a little bit as a group, and then we'll probably have some breakout sessions on specific questions. So if anyone is interested in attending, please let us know. Just email [IUSA@indiana.edu](mailto:IUSA@indiana.edu) and I look forward to having you all there.

## **AGENDA ITEM #8 FOLLOW-UP ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIANA**

**PRATT:** Thanks Matt. Bob, do you want to start this off by just reiterating the principle questions that you were hoping to get the commissioner who came in person to talk about? Although I suspect he would have ducked them.

**ENO:** No, he wouldn't have. We talked about it before.

**PRATT:** Oh good! Well maybe you could share that with us.

**ENO:** Yeah, I don't know that I have them all in mind because I didn't know that Lisa was going to ask me to say anything but I'm always willing to talk.

**PRATT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ENO:** Ken Sauer who talked to us last time used to be chair of a committee called the STAC committee which I think was State Transfer and Articulation Committee. It was a committee that the Indiana Commissioner of Higher Education had deputed to try to resolve issues of articulation and transfer that had arisen. Some of us were sentenced to serve on that committee and I was one of those people. So during the time that I was on it there were certain principles that had been developed by the committee some of them quite positive that were guiding the way that transfer and articulation was going to be designed by the state. When Ken came last time with the document he brought and the discussion it involved, it appeared to me that several of the principles which not only seemed good to the members of that committee but which we had presented to the UFC, every institution in fact that has faculty governance in the state was supposed to consider these principles. Several of these principles had seemed to have dropped out, gotten lost, gotten muddled up in some way, so the questions that I was recommending that the Council convey to Ken were all related to highlighting the issue of to what degree these principles were still in play and to what degree we were supposed to learn that they weren't. There was a principle that was called the faculty primacy. I liked that name. And basically, the idea was you're not going to actually have good execution of transfer and articulation agreements unless you have faculty buy-in and to get faculty buy-in you have to have faculty participation and development of those agreements. And that didn't seem to be something that I was seeing in the documents as they were presented. Another feature that was extremely important to the way STAC went about its business was, and it's still in fact preserved in the document that exists today, is that all transfer and articulation, all transfer agreements should be done on a course by course basis and not on the basis of the transfer of any core of courses from

one institution to another. And the model that seems to have begun to emerge from current debates has to do more with transference of general education cores. This dovetails in some ways with the way that changes have occurred in our university. If you look at the document that Ken presented us, in some places it talks about the transfer of general education cores and in other places it says we have this principle of course by course transfer. Members of the STAC committee back a few years ago felt the course by course basis was the best way to be able to preserve faculty participation, faculty primacy and to be able to implement what was the third most important principle which was called the principle of constructive review. The measure of success that the state makes in these agreements is the measure to which students utilize transfer arrangements, and the measure to which they enroll in articulated course sequences between institutions. They don't measure the success of learning. They don't measure outcomes, unless you consider enrollment an outcome. And as some of us know when you have articulations between universities that may have very different missions, sometimes students that appear to be prepared on paper when they take a sequence course in the new institution are not prepared, and the articulation was not in fact carefully examined or has moved on from its original grounds and the students can't succeed. The principle was to have periodic review which depended on participating institutions like IU tracking success rates of students, the outcomes of students, their grades, their persistence rates, and so forth in the articulated streams that are agreed to, informing the state of the results of those, the data that are collected by the institutions and the state, participating with these institutions to make sure that we have constant ongoing review of all the articulations to make sure that when they're in fact not working well to get students to learn, that we re-examine them and redesign them. And those three principles were all very fundamental to the UFC's agreement that it couldn't -- that it would endorse the direction that transfer and articulation was going in the state. These things don't seem to be highlighted, at least; perhaps they're no longer in fact present in the current arrangements, and my goal was to make sure that the issues were raised, revived, brought to Ken's attention, as I mentioned just now to Lisa, I discussed some of these before. He's perfectly aware of the fact that these have become submerged. I thought it would be useful to try to get them to re-emerge.

**PRATT:** John.

**CARINI:** Well this related to the transfer agreements and articulation agreements. In General Education now, many of these things have been tended up being mandated by the state legislature and I'm sure they're, you know, getting these ideas from the Commission, because then they show up and say, well so for example the course, the course core transfer library was mandated by state law. The minimum number of articulation agreements with Ivy Tech and the four-year institutions has also been mandated. And now I found recently there's a mandate that we share some core of General Education, roughly thirty hours worth that we're supposed to work out somehow. And all these have shown up in state laws and by the time that happens, well, it's one thing to take on the Commission, it's another thing...

**ENO:** That's right.

**CARINI:** ...to take on the legislature.

**ENO:** The STAC Committee was very aware of the possibility of that procedure and a lot of what it is directed towards was trying to create a persuasive model that would forestall these sorts of state actions. And it does not seem to have succeeded.

**PRATT:** And I think at least in the initial look that we had, it's very difficult to figure out what's actually mandated by those legislative actions, because often by the time something gets to the legislature, the language has shifted enough that it's no longer clear how you implement what they've now legislated. And I think we really need to sort of think through how we want to move forward as a body if we want to sort of impact that process. Because it... yeah Julie...

**BOBAY:** One of the things the Agenda Committee talked about when we were discussing this agenda item, really led by Karen somewhat, was sort of the strategic thing about what action the Bloomington campus could take, the Bloomington faculty could take, in response to, or perhaps just in knowledge of this strategic view from the higher education commission, that we heard about last week. And one of those responses could be a response back to the higher education commission pointing out to them what we feel are omissions or problems with their document. But another alternative action we could take would be to create our own, to have our own voice in this discussion, to inject into the statewide discussion another point of view, our point of view. And one of the things that I was hoping that we could get from this discussion today was some input to the Agenda Committee about what action, if any, you think it would be useful for the Bloomington faculty to take now that we know about this document, this strategic vision, being promulgated by the higher education commission.

**PRATT:** Lisa.

**BINGHAM:** I guess I'm confused as to why you couldn't combine them into a single thing. Do we have to have a dichotomy? I mean the tenor or the gist of my question to the Commission was, had to do with the fact that they're making this argument for a systems approach to higher education in Indiana and yet when you look at the document, all the input side of any true model of the system is missing. So, this notion of measuring ourselves in relation to other states, I love the word, in terms of production of degrees. That word alone just made me insane. But we're not looking at things like budget per capita or the growth in tenured faculty lines as opposed to non-tenured faculty lines in relation to the budget. All the input side that would actually go into these desirable production outputs that they're looking at. So one thing, we could combine this notion of 'our voice' with the omissions, and essentially suggested improvements to their model.

**PRATT:** Yeah, Bob?

**ENO:** Why don't we let Jim speak first?

**PERRY:** Well I think I was on the same wavelength with Lisa on this one. But I happened to be at a meeting on Friday at which I was the table moderator, and Ken was one of the participants and I was able to ask him a question. You know they had the five aspirations in there. In my personal point of view, I don't think all those aspirations are attainable. If one were you know running a systems dynamic model or whatever. I suspect that you couldn't get to all five of those given some of the context which Indiana University or the state of Indiana works. Like,

one of the aspirations was access and to provide loans and other forces or forms of financial aid but then there was also the issue of economic development and retaining people in the state when the economic, or Indiana is thirty-fifth in terms of personal income across the state. And I don't think for instance if you bottle that that with the debt that we impose on many of the students at that income level that they're going to be able to sort of, make ends meet to cover their costs for access. And that in turn is going to have a negative relationship with the economic development that the state is interested in. So my point to Ken was that I think you could model this much more effectively we certainly could, we certainly have lots of data on education and sophisticated econometricians or whatever, we probably have some in the room here, who could run those models to tell us whether or not it makes sense to be aspiring to those five things given the context in which we operate and I don't believe they're equally attainable, which says something also about the strategy that the higher education committee has to follow the state legislature about what comes first. You know, retaining the state's support or increasing the state's support so that it's more affordable so people can stay in the state and pay off their debt so that the economy can improve or we can develop the Indiana economy and I think there are a number of those relationships that they have to look at beyond the simply the five criteria they have or the five indicators of success because I don't think they're all simultaneously attainable with some of the circumstances. And that's something we can certainly take some talent from Indiana University to model and say to the higher, because you know Ken seemed to be intrigued when I proposed that to him, but I don't think they've run through that sort of analysis and I think doing that sort of analysis might inform among others the legislators who are looking at those reports that you can't go in all five of those directions simultaneously. So we need to do this one first and that one has to be deemphasized initially so that you know we can increase the personal income to twenty fifth in the country so we become more of a crucible for economic development keeping people in the state and that in turn will make things more accessible by virtue of putting more money in people's pockets. But I think we need to sort of challenge them to do that sort of analysis, and of course that's Ken's domain as research director or whatever his title is.

**PRATT:** Jim do you have a sense of whether or not it would be productive to directly address the present document or to try to just be more proactive and engaged as they develop the next. Because I think you all heard him say that this is a rolling a rolling target that they're already engaged in sort of the next step which is the implementation step. I mean, is it worth our effort to do anything about the document that was passed this summer or do we just try to get involved now?

**PERRY:** Well one issue is that I'm not sure what the next document is, but my inclination would be to look at sort of the fundamental assumptions in the current document see whether we can't add, enlighten both the higher education commission and the legislature. I mean we are the research university, or one of the research universities in the state so we ought to take that on perhaps as part of our ability to contribute to this dialogue.

**PRATT:** Any sense of how we would do that relatively, would we do that Michael or through Karen...?

**BOBAY:** Well this is one of the unfortunate things about Karen missing this part of the conversation. She was really keen on having this conversation with this group. The, I think, when we were talking in the agenda committee what she had mentioned was that to respond to the higher education commission's document puts them in control of the conversation. They define the issues and we respond. And I think that she was searching for a way to be informed by their perspective, but to find a voice at the state level that didn't necessarily contradict or argue with them but was uniquely the Bloomington perspective. I think was what she had talked...

**PRATT:** And uniquely the faculty perspective.

**BOBAY:** That's right, that's one more...Thank you.

**PRATT:** Even more because I think part of the problem is that we've been, much of our presence last year with the commission was through J.T. Yeah, Brian.

**MCCORMICK:** I don't see those as mutually exclusive, however, There are things in this document that I don't think we can go without comment on. There are mutually competing ideas to improve access quality and cost containment simultaneously. That's just not, it's just not going to happen. And so I think the reality is, there are certain assumptions in here that I think are flawed, and I think we have to say so. And that doesn't preclude us then, from developing our own perspective on it and saying that this is really the direction we think things should go.

**CARINI:** May I suggest that we just pick out the parts of this that we like and address them at least. Because you know this is supposed to apply to all of the state's higher education institutions and a lot of it just doesn't apply to Bloomington. So we should try to explain things in that way. Sorry.

**PRATT:** Bob.

**ENO:** We went through something like this before and I think there are lessons to be learned from it. We went through a great deal of pressure on our internal transfer arrangements within the 8 campus structure of Indiana University. The origins of all of the pressure on us were political. The legislature was going to take over our transfer arrangements if we didn't take them over ourselves. In fact Indiana courses don't transfer internally, they're all internal courses but that's another matter. For a number of years, the Bloomington campus resisted moving on this and came up with what I think were very good arguments for why making transfer and articulation something that was simpler, barrier free and so forth didn't recognize the various missions of the different campuses. They were very good, rational arguments, but they weren't going to go anywhere. This didn't come from a matter of reasoning out to the best conclusion. This was a political issue having mostly to do with accessibility. And the result was that the faculty did a complete turn around, took a different standpoint and we wrote policies to facilitate maximum transfer. And we did that on two bases. One, in the end, it's not going to make that much difference because there aren't that many inter-campus transfer students and the impact is going to be relatively small. And second, once we have it in place, we'll be able to identify whether or not we were wrong or they were wrong in terms of outcomes, because until that time

you're just dealing with basically ideological positions that you take and the state takes and the legislature takes based on different sets of values. But if we can demonstrate with outcomes that the easy transfer route, easy articulation route, without maximum level review does not work -- that we have students who can't progress, who don't accomplish their goals because there's -- of those there's no bridge for them as they transfer -- then we have something to stand on. We'd have data. We passed a set of resolutions \_\_\_\_ along those lines. Virtually all of the articulation barriers were removed within the system. So far as I know, we haven't seen any dramatic effect on the system, but I also know we have not been tracking the outcomes. We've gotten no closer to have any good information that would allow us to address the legislative pressures that got us to reform the internal system. I think if we want to have an effect on what's coming on to us on external transfers, it's probably best to recognize that any effect we have in terms of arguments or the preparatory phase are not going to have much traction. It probably doesn't matter a lot what we say at this point and that it will take us a lot of faculty effort to say something articulately and come up with very well tailored arguments that probably won't have much results. I think the best thing to do is to equip the university to accommodate transfer through new policies that do it and put into place data collection mechanisms through PeopleSoft and SIS immediately from day one and start examining them relentlessly and raising every negative factor that we find. If we don't find the negative factors then we were wrong anyway, and well, we really don't know that we're right. But if we do then we're equipped, especially if we build upfront the idea that we're going to be cooperating maximally with the direction the legislature wants us to go on the assumption that the legislature will be open to receiving data on how this works.

**PRATT:** I do think it's going to change, too, with the number of students that have been recommended who wanted as their first choice to come to Bloomington and those applicants when they were denied or waitlisted here were specifically transferred in the application process to one of the regional campuses. Plus, the so-called bridge program we've now got in place with students having residency on our campus but taking their first two years at Ivy Tech with the promise that if they do well at Ivy Tech they will be admitted here. There are a number of programs that are now in place that I think will begin to give us an adequate number of students that as you say if we have a data gathering mechanism already in place, I don't think it's going to be very long before we're going to start to have data.

**ENO:** We did not follow the data gathering in the first instance with transfers. In fact all of the policies that the faculty adopted when it initially addressed these issues both about transfer policies and about reform of the master course inventory which govern those transfer policies. All of these were delivered to the administration with the explicit message 'these must be implemented there must be an investment in making sure that we get the data necessary to implement them appropriately to reach their ends.' The administration had asked us to do this. Nothing was followed up on. Essentially it's undone work. If we want to rely on that process that I was just promoting it has to be with the understanding that the administration will commit the resources so that we can get the information get the data so that some years down the line, we can make corrections or argue for corrections.

**PRATT:** Well that does seem I mean those seem like very concrete recommendations at least for this part of the problem. You know how do we, what happens as we move forward and anticipate higher transfer percentages.

**KOLBE:** Well, for the broader problem including this element, would it not be incumbent on us as part of our response which I'm assumed is expected from the commission well we should perhaps presume that...

**PRATT:** I think that, I think we should indeed

**KOLBE:** ...that we build into our response, yes we agree with these things, they're very important and we compliment you for developing this. However we have these visions that perhaps should be considered and I don't know how leniently we might want to say that, with what force for diplomacy we might want to say that. But to have that be part and parcel of our response to the vision that was presented to us and organized. And then again, I don't know how this campus is constrained or unconstrained to work with the committees in the general assembly that address higher education commission but be sure that we build our bridges with those committee members and that they get a copy of what it is that we have prepared in response.

**PRATT:** Well I think since we are drawing up here on 5:30. I think quite clearly we need to continue this conversation with Karen in the room. She was caught off guard, did not realize until just yesterday that she had a conflict on her calendar and was really very, very concerned about benefitting from this discussion. So I think the Agenda Committee will try to distill the sense of this conversation and then get this back on the agenda before the end of the semester to follow up with Karen perhaps with some concrete recommendations for how we both approach the commission legislative component and our own administration with recommendations like Bob is describing for, first the follow up that was called for previously and then putting in place a path for the kind of follow up we need because I think we all anticipate that the problem is going to increase not subside. Alright, so we will, we will adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:29 pm.