

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 21, 2009**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, Julianne Bobay, Purnima Bose, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Lucas Fields, Julia Fox, Thomas Gieryn, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen hanson, Patrick Harbison, Patricia Henderson, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Padraic Kenney, Paul Losensky, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Amanda Meglemre, Jennifer Miller, Michael Morrone, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, Richard Shockley, Sonya Stephens, Jerold Stern, Richard Stryker, Alex Tanford, Herbert Terry, David Waterman, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Geoff Conrad, OVPR (Sarita Soni)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Leslie Blaha, Valerie Grim, Robert Hatten, Lloyd Klobe, Lockman Meho, Brian O'Donnell, Dan Ondrik, James Perry, Lisa Pratt, Daniel Sloat, Neil Theobald, Basti Torres, Maxine Watson, Susan Whiston

**GUESTS:** Haley Adams (IDS), John Applegate (VP, Policy and Planning), Alex Benson (IDS), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Elizabeth Johnson, Richard McKay (Dean of Students Office), Jonathan Plucker (FAC chair), Erin Rykken (Faculty Council Office), Brad Wheeler (VP for IT & CIO).

1. Approval of Minutes  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/08-09/03.24.09.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)  
(Professor Herb Terry)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)
4. Question/Comment Period (5 minutes)\*  
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry)
5. General Education Progress Report (15 minutes) (Professor Russ Hanson and Professor Barb Bichelmeyer) [DISCUSSION]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B25-2009.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/GEC09courses.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/GEC09Report.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/GEC09whitepaper.pdf>

6. Affirmative Action Report (15 minutes)  
(Julie Knost, Director, University Office of Affirmative Action)
7. SAC Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct Procedures for Bloomington Campus (10 minutes) (Diane Dallis, Head, Information Commons/Undergraduate Library Services, Wells Library, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee)[ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B21-2009rev.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B22-2009rev.pdf>
8. GPSO – SAAAC Resolutions (10 minutes)  
(Professor Brian Horne and GPSO President Nicholas Clark) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B20-2009rev2.pdf>
9. EPC Resolutions on Extended X Policy and Religious Observances (15 minutes) (Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair of the Education Policies Committee) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B23-2009Amend.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B24-2009Amend.pdf>
10. Discussion of Promotion and Tenure Issues (10 minutes) (Professor Herb Terry and Professor Jonathan Plucker) [DISCUSSION]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/U8-2009.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/PTMemo.pdf>

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or Professor Terry 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)

## **Minutes**

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

**HANSON:** I'm going to call this to order because we have a slightly shortened meeting today because the retirement reception is also today. So we're going to try to go through some things at quite a fast clip, but we'll get to all the business we need to get through. First of all, the first item of business is the approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 24<sup>th</sup> '09.

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** So moved.

**HANSON:** Moved? Second? All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? Alright, Agenda Committee business.

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

**TERRY:** Okay, as the Provost noted, we have a short amount of time. We're supposed to adjourn at 5. We will pay attention to the time limits that are in the agenda as much as possible. The changes that we adopted to the constitution have passed with a huge voter turnout. We had a 141 votes in favor of the changes, 5 votes against them, and 3 votes were invalid (some equivalent of hanging chads, I don't know). But anyway, they have passed. Speaking of voting, the Nominations Committee for next year has almost completed assembling the ballot for the officers of the Council and I expect that the ballot will go out to next year's Council members next week so that we will know the results by the time of something I'll remind you of in a moment. I don't have to say anything about the retired faculty reception, but speaking of receptions. You should have received today in campus mail an invitation to a slightly rescheduled, but traditional end of semester, end of academic year, reception for the Faculty Council. It will be on May 1<sup>st</sup>, from 5-7PM in the Wells House, right?

**HANSON:** Mm hmm.

**TERRY:** And we've changed it a little bit. We're going to invite all of this year's members plus the new members that will join us next year. It's kind of an 'in with the new, out with the old' celebration. I hope that you will be there for that. I am happy to announce that Professor Venkat Munirpallam of the School of Business has accepted our nomination, our appointment actually, as the BFC co-Chair of the General Education Committee. Padraic, when he gets to it on Item 9, will have one additional document for brief discussion. It's a faculty statement on principles for assessment of education. It's in your packet at your desk, and finally I would like to quickly ask unanimous consent of the body for the approval of circular B26-2009. Rather than read it for you, you can read it while I'm talking. The purpose of this is to thank somebody who has provided more continuous years of service to this Council than I suspect anybody ever has, and that's Dan Seldin. Dan Seldin has been running our elections in various ways for 32 years and is finally retiring and so we ask that you adopt this resolution thanking Dan for all of that service to us. We will invite Dan to the reception on May 1<sup>st</sup>, and we'll also thank him and honor him there, but we thought we would get the resolution passed first. So may I ask for unanimous consent? If anyone objects, please say so. Alright, we will regard that as unanimously consented to. And that's it.

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

**HANSON:** Thanks, Herb. One thing I'd like to note is that Professor Venkat is here! So would you like to say hello to the rest of the Council? You know plenty of people here, but.....

**MUNIRPALLAM:** Hello.

**HANSON:** We are very grateful you're taking that on. I've worked with Venkat particularly when I was Dean of Honors on a lot of undergraduate initiatives and he'll just be superb in this role, so we are very grateful that you've taken on the Faculty Council chore. Let me also add about Dan Seldin that he is among the retirees being honored at the reception that immediately follows this and so it will be a nice time to go in and say hello and congratulate him at that point. Again I want to underscore the reception at the Wells House on May 1<sup>st</sup>. This is the traditional time of the year for the announcement of administrative reviews. You should know that the, I believe I mentioned this last time, that the three year survey mandated by the Faculty Council is going to go out very soon, probably this week, on the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The beginning of this third year was actually the beginning of this term because he started mid-year. Also due for third year surveys at the beginning of the Fall term, the Deans of HPER, Bob Goodman, the Dean of the School of Informatics, Bobby Schnabel, and the typical route to the construction of those surveys is that there is a list of questions that has been agreed upon by the Faculty Council and then there's consultation with the policy committees of the relevant schools in order to produce another set of questions and then those surveys really go to the, in general, to the schools. The full reviews are going to be undertaken next year for the Dean of the School of Journalism, Brad Hamm, the Dean of the Kelley School of Business, Dan Smith, the Dean of the School of Library and Information Science, Blaise Cronin, and I will remind you that the surveys, I mean the administrative reviews for the Dean of the School of Education and the Dean of the School of Law are currently underway. I think that constitutes all of the reviews. It's quite a few, and the Faculty Council has an important crucial role to play in generating the names for the review committee members. Most of them are supposed to come from the school, but it would be good if the Faculty Council would start thinking about those names now so we can really start those in the fall. I think that's it. Any questions?

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

**MCCORMICK:** Herb, I don't know if this is the place to put in a request, but I thought it might be. I recently was involved in a request from Peter Kaczmarczyk who is President of the CWA Local 4730 in relation to the blue ribbon panel on healthcare and I wanted to just bring this to the attention of the Council. In a letter yesterday morning to Professor Terry, Mr. Kaczmarczyk indicated that as a representative of staff from IUB and IUN, "has been active in expressing our displeasure at the lack of staff representation on the Blue Ribbon Healthcare Committee. My understanding is that we are not the only constituent group in the University that feels this way. We would like to present a letter to President McRobbie officially stating our feelings, a draft of which is attached. Our thought was that if the Faculty Council were willing to sign on first it would be easier to get other groups to step up and lend voices as well. CWA 4730 is certainly willing to add our names to this joint effort." From what I understand, his argument presented at the GPSO from the support staff, essentially their concern is that on the blue ribbon committee on healthcare, their feeling is that there is not adequate representation of people from support staff ranks that's, really, from the lowest levels of pay in the university.

And, so I simply wanted to bring that to your attention. I think the request was merely for an endorsement of the request so that the President considers adding a broader array to that committee.

**TERRY:** If I may comment for one moment. Normally we pass things like this through our committees before we bring them here. And I think we should probably do that in this instance as well because I haven't had an opportunity to consult with Fringe Benefits or with the other members of the Agenda Committee, but I hope you will anticipate that the Fringe Benefits Committee, if it thinks it's a good idea, may at least comment to the blue ribbon task force and perhaps to President McRobbie saying that he should consider the request of the professional staff for representation on the committee. What I can tell you is that our Fringe Benefits Committee and Jim are working closely and effectively with the blue ribbon task force. Speaking personally, I think there should be staff representation on the thing. I hope, personally, the President will take this into account when he receives the petition. I don't think given our agenda today that there is time to take it up and it would out of our normal procedures to do that.

**HANSON:** Any additional questions or comments? Okay, let's move to Agenda Item number 5, Gen Ed Progress Report. Russ Hanson and Barb Bichelmeyer.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRESS REPORT**

**R. HANSON:** We're here to report briefly on the implementation of the General Education curriculum, which goes into effect summer session one of 2011. The bottom line of our report is that we're on track to do that, although there is still a good bit of implementation work to be done. The General Education Committee has been hard at work in vetting courses for this curriculum and we're in good shape there. I should say, from the outset, that we've made two important changes to the committee itself. We enlarged the General Education Committee in order to restore the principle of proportional representation, which was originally behind the structure of the committee, but because faculty sizes in the schools have changed at differential rates, we needed to add people in order to maintain that proportion and also give us additional expertise in areas where we had a back log of courses that we wanted to fill. The second change is that we've constituted a new working group or subcommittee within the General Education Committee for the purpose of monitoring the impact of General Education and Barb will say something more about that later. As far as the Common Ground portion of the curriculum, which is the set of required courses, the Gen Ed Committee and its working subcommittees have spent part of the year fine tuning the rubrics which they used to identify those courses which will be part of the curriculum, and importantly, began to identify learning objectives for each component of the curriculum. That's important not only as a signal to instructors as they begin designing these courses, but also for the purposes of assessment. And both the refined rubrics and the learning objectives are stated and included in the BFC Circular B25-2009, which is the updated version of last year's updated version of the previous year's updated version of the original circular. We also adopted several policies by vote in the General Education Committee this spring. These mostly have to do with the procedures we'll use for

making exceptions to the general rules. So, for example, there is a policy for accommodations for students who have learning disabilities and how we will handle that, a policy on whether the rules will apply to transfer students, and they will, and a variety of other more technically oriented policies. They're included in the appendices to that BFC circular. We also completed the third round of vetting of course proposals that came to us from the various schools. There were only about 70 new proposals this year, but we did have a back log that we managed to clear with Herculean efforts by our committees this spring. So we now have a list of approved courses for meeting one or another component of the Gen Ed curriculum. There are about 719 courses approved. That includes almost 200 in foreign languages out of the total number proposed of just over 1300, so it's a lot of courses in one sense, but it still constitutes only about ten percent of the master course list. One of the issues that will have to be attended to in the upcoming years is to make sure there are enough courses in the right areas to meet the student demand as we could estimate it for 2011. I should say that most of the courses that were not approved for General Education were at the 3 and 400 level and it was the policy decision of the General Education Committee that those courses which were more oriented towards majors, should not be part of the General Education curriculum. Some departments which have courses numbered at that level are renumbering them so that they could be used in Gen Ed where that's appropriate. The second component of the curriculum is the Shared Goals. Each unit is deciding how those shared goals will be realized and how they will be monitored. We've met with the chief academic officers of these units and all report that they'll have no difficulty meeting them. Many of them, in fact, already meet them. Although it may not have been packaged in quite this way, it will be a relatively straight forward matter for them to address the Shared Goals component of the Common Ground curriculum. Barb will speak about assessment and implementation. And shortly I'm off to class at four o'clock.

**BICHELMAYER:** Actually, I'll speak about the implementation first in terms of where we are going next. First of all, this spring we have begun constituting working groups to move forward with implementation. One group that we've constituted is the campus-wide implementation team that involves representatives from the Office of Communications from Admissions, Enrollment Services, University Division, the Registrar, and representatives from colleges and schools to look at implementation in terms of the life cycle of the student, to make sure that every aspect of the student's experience that's touched by the General Education curriculum will be appropriately addressed. We are also working to prepare ourselves so that we can conduct a ghost year of implementation between 2010 and 2011 to make sure that all systems are in place as needed so that when the curriculum goes online in the first summer session of 2011 everything will have been tested and tried and we'll know that it works appropriately. We have a second committee for implementation dealing with advising and training for advising that has representatives from University Division and from all academic units to make sure that tab sheets are addressed and to make sure that advisors are appropriately trained. Thirdly, we've constituted a forecasting group to look at setting some baseline data in terms of course patterns, enrollment patterns, impacts, and that first meeting was just this morning to determine how we would track information and data in that regard. And finally we've begun transferring information and operations manuals and databases and key documents into the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education's office to make sure that we have actually created

an institutional support mechanism for Gen Ed that will be in existence moving forward. So, the last thing we want to talk about today has to do with assessment, and one of the documents you saw in the package of materials you received today was a white paper for what we're calling monitoring of the General Education program, and we see monitoring as addressing three areas and one is assessment of student learning. Two, is curricular evaluation and three, is program review. Now that document outlines things that should be addressed at each one of those levels. I should say that this document was written by Russ and myself, but it was based on a number of interviews and conversations and sources of data that are listed on the last page of this document. What we tried to do was get the best thinking and the thinking of key stakeholders and we've engaged in this conversation over the past year and we've tried to put that together in a way that's workable to present a framework and guidance for this subcommittee that we've constituted by vote of the General Education Committee in our meeting last Friday. This is meant to be a guide to that group to move forward, to think about several things; and number one, they've been charged with determining if these are the appropriate measures, the appropriate issues that should be addressed, if the guiding principles are appropriate or if they need to be framed, and then to put together some more detailed working document for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education to determine how exactly General Education on this campus will be monitored, so this is a starting document that charges to constitute the committee and the committee makeup is listed on the second to last page of that document, and our best thoughts about how monitoring the General Education program should occur. And with that, we will be in a meeting in the near future turning over the responsibilities and the open items we have to Venkat and to Sonya to take forward and to lead the charge from here on out, and at this point we can answer any questions you have, if you should have any about the documents or about any of the materials.

**HANSON:** Bryan?

**MCCORMICK:** There appears to be a change, when I look at the Common Ground particularly in relationship to English composition and mathematical modeling. An initial iteration that was zero to three to four credits, if I recall, and now you can't test out of it essentially, is that right?

**R. HANSON:** There is still a test out option. It's just not incorporated in that numerical; it's incorporated in the text itself. And the various thresholds on various tests that one would have to meet will be specified. In the College of Arts and Sciences both, since that's where these courses typically will be offered, but we do have for all of the requirements, test out options for people who have met them.

**MCCORMICK:** I have to say that that's not been clearly transmitted to some of the other schools. In the School of HPER we're currently trying to implement this and as a major coordinator, we're now looking at three credits. There's not opt out in our sheets.

**BICHELMAYER:** One thing we would encourage you to look at, Russ mentioned that the circular has changed, a large part of our role over the last couple of years has been to determine policy and interpret policy based on the initial circular. You will see, starting on page fifteen and

moving forward there, key policies that have been adopted by the Gen Ed Committee, that have to do with testing out and exemptions and there's also language under each one of the distribution areas in the circular now that talks about test out options. So there's quite a bit of detail in here, much more than we received in the first version of the circular that we had two years ago. So, there's quite a bit of information in there about how exemptions and testing out can occur. I'm sorry?

**MCCORMICK:** I said it's the first time I've seen this document, so I didn't have access to this information until today.

**BICHELMAYER:** Other questions? Thank you very much.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Russ and Barb. We'll hope to see you [unintelligible]. The next item of business is the Affirmative Action Report. Julie?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT**

**KNOST:** You should have received a draft copy of the 2008 Affirmative Action report, and this is primarily a report, for those of you who have not seen it before, that tries to assess the state of the campus in terms of the status of minorities and women. This is primarily a statistical analysis. We do it now over a 15 year period of time so we can look longitudinally as well as at the current state of the campus. And let me start with a few general comments that might help you look at the information that's been given to you. We break down the faculty by tenure, tenure track faculty, librarians, research ranks, and instructional ranks, which include all other faculty. Administrators count as faculty members, which is different than our Affirmative Action report that goes to the Feds where we have to extract them out. So Karen counts in philosophy, for example. We also now try to look at CIC comparisons, and I'm going to just go through who the CIC is, in case there are people unfamiliar with it. That would include IU, Purdue, University of Michigan, Michigan State, Penn State, Ohio State, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa and Northwestern. And in this report, minority would include African American or Black, American Indian, Hispanic, Latino and Asian or Pacific Islander. So, let me start with telling you that probably the most informative page is going to be page 3 if you haven't looked at it. Most of what I'm going to talk about today is on there, and then I will try to elaborate a little bit about some of the break down. I don't have time to go into too much detail.

All the data here is from October of 2008, so it is the current campus basically. The size of the faculty last year increased. However the librarians decreased. The librarians, anybody from the library knows, have decreased pretty consistently for the last ten years. The portion of women on the campus continued to increase and it has increased every year for about the last ten years, and so it's now at 32.4%, around a third of the faculty. Again it's hovered around that for a while, and probably the last couple years, and it's pretty consistent with comparable statistics across the CIC. Last year, 40% of the new hires were women and that's important because with women in particular, what you see is a cohort effect going on. In a minute I'm going to talk

about resignations and retirements, and you see turnover going on as younger faculty come in, or newly hired faculty come in. The total minority count last year increased by 14, but that's somewhat misleading because the distribution was very uneven. We were down one in total count on African Americans/Blacks, up 14 in Asian, up 2 in Hispanic and down 1 in American Indian. Again, that variability occurs across years a fair amount. In 1993, I'm now looking at that 15 year data that we have for the first time. Minority faculty made up 9% of the faculty, in 2008, it makes up 17% of the faculty, in the CIC, the average is 17% as well, and within the CIC, we're about in the middle. Those with lower minority counts are Minnesota, Iowa, Penn State. One thing I have to note here is that because Asians are included, the presence of an engineering school and a medical school effect the counts, so in certain ways we're doing very well because, for example, Purdue isn't in here but their minority count, because it includes engineering in particular, tends to be skewed to a higher end of it. Let me go then to a few other points that are relative to the CIC. Within the CIC, only the University of Illinois has a higher Hispanic count, there are only three institutions among the CIC that have higher percentages of black faculty, as of this year. That would be the University of Michigan, Michigan State, and the University of Illinois. However, IU has the lowest percent of Asian faculty within the CIC. Again, some of that being accounted for by the constellation of the different campuses. Minority representation among full professors at IUB continues to be very low, despite the fact that there was an increase of one last year. Currently minority faculty represent 9% of all full professors at IUB compared with 13% among CIC institutions. IUB has the lowest percentage of minority faculty at senior ranks among all of the CIC. Last year, 92% of minority hires, all but two faculty, were hired at the assistant professor level, and there continues to be very little minority recruitment as the senior ranks. Again, I'm going to get to resignations and retirements, and this is a particularly important point, because we are losing at the senior faculty rank as well in terms of resignations and retirements. Female representation increased in all three ranks last year. It increased the most at the full professor rank, however, that was primarily from promotion. Female representation increased 5% in that rank last year. Among CIC institutions, IU has the highest percentage of women faculty, however large departments such as engineering, again do not exist on the IUB campus and those are predominantly male and tend to skew the CIC statistics. As I said, 40% of new hires last year were female. Since 1993, the number of librarians on the Bloomington campus has declined by 15 librarians and it's increased its minority representation by 3 librarians out of that time. There's not as much change within the librarian ranks. I want to talk about new hires from last year. In the current year, the people that were hired that became new professors on the campus this year, there were 92 new hires. There were 5 more women than had been in the previous year. The previous year there had also been 92 new hires. Most hires were at the assistant rank. And, as I said, almost all minority hires were at the assistant rank, and 76% of the women hires were at the assistant rank. There were fewer minority hires overall than the previous year. Faculty retirement accounts for a significant number of determinations in any year, and in 2008 there were 40. In 2007, there were 44, however resignations account for a very large number of the terminations at IUB. There were 41 in 2008 and 35 in 2007. Resignations account for a larger portion of the terminations of women and minorities than for men and non-minorities. Additionally, 50% of all minority resignations were at the senior rank and 42% of all of the female resignations were at the senior rank.

I want to talk about, just briefly, what I know about the coming year, which is a projection at this point, but it's a pretty good one. We have better mechanisms of finding out who has, what offers have been made an accepted at this point, and since May 1<sup>st</sup> is the sort of AAUP deadline we have a pretty good idea of where we're going for next year. Generally, hiring is down, and really this is a total guess, from my count it looks like we'll have approximately 52 new faculty next year. There are 21 retirements coming through as based on the retirement reception tonight, unless there are some that aren't mentioned in there. And of the accepted offers, what I know is that we're doing better on the minority hiring than we did this previous year. We have positive accepts of 4 to 5 African Americans, 3 Latinos, 0 American Indians, and 67 Asians. So what I expect to happen is that probably the total faculty is going to remain fairly constant because we have fewer resignations and fewer retirements and we have fewer hires.

What can I say overall? There are some units, I think that have done particularly well this year. I wanted to mention in particular, Informatics has done very well in hiring women and so has Chemistry and Physics. So we're making some progress in the sciences. The Business School has done a particularly good job on minority hiring for the year. On the resignations, if you give me a minute, I also wanted to tell you that it was interesting; I went through and actually called departments and had followed up on where people went on the resignations in 2008. There were ten minority resignations and 17 women who resigned and we're mostly losing people to other institutions. People went to: University of Minnesota, University of Illinois, Northwestern, University of Michigan. One, who was in science, went into private industry. One went to Texas A&M, and one received a very good five year career fellowship and ended up going to a fellowship institution. I'm open to questions.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Julie. Alright, the seventh item on the agenda; the Student Affairs Committee changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct Procedures on the Bloomington Campus. Diane?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: SAC CHANGES TO THE CODE OF STUDENT RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT PROCEDURES FOR BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS**

**DALLIS:** As you may remember, we discussed a series of changes to the procedures for the Bloomington campus to the "Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities and Conduct." At the last meeting we identified one issue that we needed to hammer out before we could do the full vote, and that was the committee was kind of grappling with how to make up for the changes to the Dean of Faculties and that office no longer exist. And our committee got together with the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education was represented by the VPFAA, and the Dean of Students and members of the committee to go over and pick through all the places that refer to the Dean of Faculties office and insert what, based on procedure, would be the office that makes the most sense to replace it with. So in many cases, in section one, you'll find that it is the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and in section 2 it's a mixture. Sometimes the procedure is going to say that the Vice Provost -- I'll shorten these if it's okay; it's VPFAA and

VPUE -- it makes it a little easier for me to get through this. Sometimes it goes to one or the other, and sometimes it just states in the document that it's either/or. Just based on some things that might help you understand why we made these decisions; there are times when it's a graduate student involved in an issue and in those circumstances, we felt that it's appropriate for that person to go through the VPFAA to make a decision about either an appeal or a hearing commission -- a review board, sorry, or just some person in place to make a final decision. And I know that's really quick, but a lot of thought went into it. We sat down and thought about it and Dean McKaig and Pam Freeman, who are very familiar with this document, helped guide that process and talk about what would happen in each of these circumstances. And so that was the last issue that we need to discuss and we have the document as it's being proposed in front of you and I'm happy to take any questions and I'll point out, too, that it's already been here twice, and it's the second year that we've been working on this document. With that, I'll take questions.

**HANSON:** Any questions? Tom.

**GIERYN:** First, I want to thank Diane and her hard working, long working committee for redrafting these policies. I think they did a very good job. I also want to thank Pam Freeman and Dean McKaig for clarifying the procedures. Basically the revisions that Diane is talking about are consistent with the actual procedures that are being used right now by both Pam and Dick McKaig. One of the reasons why in the second part about student disciplinary procedures, one of the reasons why we had to toggle back and forth between a different Vice Provost and why we couldn't use the Dean of Graduate Students as the point of appeal is because the Dean of Graduate Students is involved in these deliberations at an earlier point, and therefore it would be inappropriate for that office to have the appeal process come there, which is why it went to my office, just to clarify that, which was one of the, I think, outstanding changes in the meeting.

**HANSON:** Any additional questions or comments?

**TERRY:** Just one brief comment, since we're all thanking each other, I want to thank Tom and Sonya and Dick McKaig and others and especially Diane and her very hard working committee. There's been a flurry of activity since the prior readings of this thing. I'm very pleased at the work that has been done. Some changes in the Code itself will still have to be decided by the University Faculty Council, that's on the UFC agenda for next week, and assuming that those pass, they will go to the Trustees at their May meeting for a first reading, and at their June meeting for a final adoption by them and hopefully you will have all of this in place in time to affect next year.

**FIELDS:** I just want to add that Bryan Stuart was the IUSA director of student rights this year and he spent a lot time working with Dean McKaig and Dean Freeman on this and was really pleased with the result of the Code that came out. So we felt really comfortable putting IUSA's support behind it, and if that's of interest to the Faculty Council, I want to let you know that the students also support the document.

**HANSON:** Thanks, Luke. Any other questions or comments? Are you ready to vote? All in favor [Aye] Opposed? Abstentions? It carries. Next action item, GPSO and Student Academic Appointment Affairs Committee, the S triple A C resolution. Brian?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: GPSO – SAAAC RESOLUTIONS**

**HORNE:** We have covered this information before. Essentially, I would like to take action on it today and again as I just want to clarify, as I reread what was circulated to you and I believe that I reached my goal of finding the most convoluted language that I could and writing it, and so I want to review that today.

We passed the two paragraphs that you see that are offset on March 24<sup>th</sup> just to get a sense of the senate so to speak, to see if you concurred with this policy change at all and the group did. So I asked for information from Roland Cote, Susan Cote and from Aimee Heeter to see if they were able to come up with information as to what would happen if we implemented these changes and unfortunately they were not able to get -- Susan did not add anything that she had not in previous meetings either with the Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee or here -- she did not add anything to it. Roland sent me something today that did not take a stand whether he's for or against any changes but just had statistics in, you know, basically a table form, which he had presented before the SAAAC earlier in the year, which indeed indicate that there's a great deal more activity in the first week than there is the second week, that it falls off dramatically in the second week indicating that the policies that are in place do have an effect, but we don't have any way of knowing if they are the administrative fees that students pay for making a change, or if they are the tuition refund schedule that students who are on a flat rate tuition pay. What a part of it is it that's currently in place that would govern student behavior in that way. And again, he did not take a stand either way and let me know that he could not come today, so I have those statistics but essentially they are just going to say that a lot of students make changes in the first week, not so many make changes in the second week and beyond, and we don't quite know why that is. So what I'm here to do today is to ask you to vote again on the same language but then it will be essentially a formal vote of the Faculty Council recommending to the administration and presumably then would, since this is a statewide system policy, it would have to go further up the chain, but we would endorse it going further up the chain. When I first presented this information, I personally was not necessarily in favor of the resolution but the committee was mixed as I reported. So I decided to go ahead and present it here. I thought that was the best thing to do. I have come to think that it would be the best, well my one little vote, but I've come to think that we should again pass this. And I don't know that it will have a dramatic effect. I don't personally think that the financial impact is something we should consider, though I don't have any information, I wasn't able to give you anything anyway. But I don't think the financial impact is something we should consider. If it were a dramatic impact, I don't think we should be balancing the budget on the fact that, 'Boy, we can make money from the grad students on this, can't we?' I don't think that should be the effect. To me the main issue is whether it would have a dramatic effect on destabilizing the schedule of courses, and if we would return to the state of affairs that we had

in 1995 when this was put into place, when a policy to kind of stabilize things earlier was put into place to begin with. So I think that we should pass this and then keep an eye on it, and it would have to go on further up the chain to decide, you know with the Bursar certainly, and to other institutional kind of bodies to see if they would actually implement this change or not and then keep an eye on it to see what it does to the course schedule and I personally think that would be the reason why we would either chose to continue the policy or undo the policy and back up to what we currently have. So what I'm asking you today is to vote on those two paragraphs that you see indented which you already approved four weeks ago in spirit pending further information and of course I don't have further information, I wasn't given it, so I can't tell you anything new. Yes?

**R. ARNOLD:** Is the intention for this to apply strictly to graduate students because in, for example, the second paragraph in the third line, it says "policy be changed to allow students to make course changes" and doesn't specify graduate students?

**HORNE:** No it is not my intention to do that. The GPSO is the one who presented it and I will let Nick speak to it himself, but they are the one who presented it and they have made an argument that they feel there is a difference, you know, between the graduate students and undergraduates. I personally don't feel, and it is not current policy, to make a difference between them. It is a matter of who pays the flat rate tuition and certain schools do and it is not my intention to do that either. This is being presented as any student who does that and I have not, the SAAAC concurred with this. I mean, at least they didn't write me to tell me that they didn't concur with this.

**CLARK:** I would say that it's, I mean it could be specified that the graduate students but they're the only ones subject to this -- well we're calling it a penalty -- but it essentially involves the reimbursement schedule and how much your tuition is reimbursed in a given week, and students that pay a flat fee, which are most undergraduate students, most business students, most law students, aren't subject to this repayment schedule and therefore, that second penalty doesn't really apply to them.

**R. ARNOLD:** But in principle it could be the graduate students who don't pay the flat rate who are taking maybe ten hours or ten credit hours and would be paying per credit hour that would experience this...

**CLARK:** There are undergraduate students, you know, in that situation and they are currently subject to the second penalty and then yeah, with the current language it would apply to them, but I don't think there's many undergraduate students in that position.

**R. ARNOLD:** Probably many fewer.

**HORNE:** And if I could just add to this; this is why it was very valuable to have Roland and Susan at the meetings when we met to clarify this. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that this policy has changed over the years. So sometimes in certain strings of years, the undergrad tuition is

based in one way and then it changes and it's another way and this would keep it consistent. Also I'm not certain that this applies to the entire university system and I'm not certain that every undergrad student is billed the same way across the statewide system as they are in Bloomington.

**CLARK:** It is different from the rest of the system, but if I remember correctly, the Bursar was asked if this would have to be a system wide change at the last meeting and he said no. Indeed the language of the original resolution was to specify specifically those students subject to this penalty at Bloomington Campus.

**HANSON:** Additional comments or questions? Are we ready for a vote on this? All in favor [Aye] All opposed? [One opposed] Abstentions?

**HORNE:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** Alright, EPC Resolution on Extended X Policy and Religious Observances.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9: EPC RESOLUTIONS ON EXTENDED X POLICY AND RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES**

**KENNEY:** Okay, thank you. The BFC discussed these items at our last meeting. I was not here. It was presented to you by Bill Wheeler, who did a great job of conveying those issues to the EPC. Since then, we've reworked a few things. I just want to run through them very quickly. First, on Extended X, the changes since last time are minor. First of all, we took note of the concern with the problem with deadlines and in fact it is the case as I note in the rationale, that it does turn out that many students simply ignore the deadline and the information gets to the Registrar that they want to apply for the retake policy well after they've taken the class, and indeed, they did better the second time around. Our feeling on this is that this is an issue which we do need to address, the question of deadlines, and the EPC intends to take that up in the fall, but it seems to make sense to first take care of this policy and then go back and think about the question of deadline. We do express our concern with that and we were actually somewhat surprised to discover how often the deadline was entirely ignored, but we would like to go back and take care of that in the fall. Secondly, this was not a concern raised at the meeting but I did take down the need to go back through the document and try to clarify the language, the policy is referred to by six different names throughout the policy which didn't seem to make much sense. It is now down to two names (laughter) which I think simplifies it quite a bit, and I don't think any gremlins have come in as a result. Finally, Tom Gieryn and Julie Knost went though and no, I'm sorry, that's next up so I'll leave that. Can't blame you. Actually, Roland Cote helped out with clarifying some language on procedure. This is the incredibly arcane issue of whether there is an X next to the grade or an asterisk next to the GPA. The original policy called for an asterisk which never actually happened. This clarifies that there is an X next to the grade. So again, the changes are all rather minor and I hope we can approve this policy and go forward.

**HANSON:** Any questions or discussion? Anything else? Are we prepared to vote? All in favor of the resolution? [Aye] Opposed? Abstentions? It passes. Okay, Padraic?

**KENNEY:** Okay, now I'm back to you again with Religious Observance Policy which again was discussed at the last meeting. Here are the changes we dealt with since then. First, and the most minor of them, there was some discussion over whether it's federal law or federal policy. It was pointed out to me that the simplest solution would be to delete that phrase entirely since it will not affect what we do, whether it's federal law, policy, custom or anything else, we can sort of just go ahead and do it. I underlined that because some may want to keep that phrase in. Second, there were some questions about reasonable accommodation. I want here to make just one general statement that it's my understanding, that after all, there is a procedure for various levels of appeal but that what we certainly want to do is, while acknowledging the possibility of faculty or for that matter, perhaps students mistreating this policy in some way, we certainly want to assume that we are all reasonable adults; however a particular issue was raised, namely faculty changing the syllabus in a midstream for whatever reason. And so a sentence was added into point two, "any relevant change to the course calendar affords new opportunity to make such a request." Next, and here Tom and Julie helped in the recasting points five and six, or actually collapsing points 5, 6, and 7, into two points. The text is now as you see it. The final change was a question about where this would be publicized and it's duly noted that we can publicize it in any number of print documents but no one actually sees them because no one looks at print documents anymore, however, the document in which this will be publicized, among other places, will be the Procedures for the Bloomington Campus of the "Code of Student Rights, etc..." I think that takes care of everything. I'm willing to answer questions.

**HANSON:** Any questions?

**EISENBERG:** Yeah, I don't see that there's a deadline indicated in the case when an instructor changes course requirements in the course of the semester. Is that rightly omitted, or is that something that....

**KENNEY:** Well, one could say again two weeks, but that's simply going to raise, and here we want to get into the reasonable category because obviously we have a situation where a faculty member could change something in the last week, maybe even for good reason. You know, 'I'm sorry, I have to go out of town for an illness in the family, the exam is tomorrow,' you wouldn't want to do that (laughter). It's something we all get away with. At any rate, you wouldn't want to say two weeks because that would be inaccurate in the last week, but you wouldn't want to put in a complicated, I don't know, some sort of scale that the closer it gets to the end of the semester, the shorter the deadline, I really like....

**EISENBERG:** I'd be happy with that famous, but admittedly vague, language, "in a timely manner," or something like that.

**KENNEY:** Well, I could point out that...

**EISENBERG:** Otherwise this could go on for weeks and weeks and weeks.

**KENNEY:** We do have the word “reasonable” in there, but if you like, I can...

**EISENBERG:** It’s not the reasonable accommodation; it’s for when it’s requested.

**KENNEY:** Okay, “in a timely manner” would certainly -- I’m happy to accept that as a succinct and friendly amendment.

**HANSON:** Any additional questions?

**EISENBERG:** I made this point to Tom when we last discussed this and I want to bring it up again. Since the list of dates, as I said last time maybe you’ll recall, is misleading, I don’t know whether it should be incorporated into the statement itself or whether it’s just sufficient that you and your successors can maybe just take proper note of the fact that there needs to be kind of an explanation of the penumbral effect, if I might call it that, that you say that, let us say Passover begins at sunset on such and such a day, is very misleading to instructors who don’t know anything about the observance of the holiday may not realize that in fact the Hillel organization on campus is likely to have scheduled something before sunset, etc, etc, etc... I just brought up that example because I know that it’s come off for the [inaudible].

**GIERYN:** We chose not to give greater specification for reasonable accommodation. The committee chose to leave it up to an administrative interpretation so that we do send out a document, that last year anyway went to the entire Bloomington faculty and all instructors, called “Religious and Civic Observances” in which we indicate certain specific translations or examples of reasonable accommodation. This may or may not satisfy you. It probably won’t. Faculty do not have to consider accommodations for the purpose of allowing students to travel away from Bloomington for a religious observance. That was, again, this was prepared by my predecessor and whether or not we want to revisit that, we decided not to get to that level of detail in the policy but rather allow that to be subject to administrative interpretation so that I’ll revise this document and take into account the concerns.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Can I make a friendly amendment to change the very last line from the “orientation of foreign students” to the “orientation of international students?”

**KENNEY:** Oh, “international,” sure.

**HANSON:** Any additional comments or questions? Are you ready to vote on this?

**TERRY:** Could you specifically indicate the change for, “in a timely fashion?” Where are you going to insert...?

**KENNEY:** Right at the end of the new sentence in point two- “make such a request in a timely manner.”

**HANSON:** Anything else? Ready to vote? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you, that carries. Padraic?

**KENNEY:** Okay, I’m asking you for one more thing which is not on the agenda but Herb mentioned at the beginning. And that is the document, the white one, “Assessment of Education at Indiana University Bloomington.” The rationale talks a little bit about where this comes from, but just in case it’s not absolutely clear, let me just explain that, you know, there are various reasons why we’re talking about assessment this year and why it was felt necessary to have some kind of statement of principles. On the one hand, as you heard earlier, in Barb and Russ’ presentation on the white paper in front of you, we spent the first half of the year talking about the General Education program. And in that, as mandated by the BFC, is some level of assessment of, or as their also terming it, monitoring of the Education program. So at one level we were already thinking about assessment. This semester, our purview expanded somewhat to think about assessment across the campus, in part because of the awareness that at some point, the accreditation bodies and others are going to be asking whether we are looking at the learning outcomes and so on. And so we did, and we drew up this set of principles which is actually the second time this year we’ve done so. Last semester, we built a set of principles which are reflected in the principles on assessment that you have in the General Education white paper. One thing that was, I might even say dominated our discussion, was the problem of how to define assessment. And having spent more time than I thought I would looking at this question, I realized that everyone defined it in a different way. It was actually interesting to me, how many times I was told that such-and-such a document from such-and-such an university defined assessment only to discover that essentially if you take out the word assessment and put ‘puppies’ in there (laughter), the document would not change. They’re sort of saying, ‘assessment is sort of a nice thing that we do and it is a good thing that we do it’ – well we don’t do puppies, but you know what I mean (laughter). At any rate, so that made it incumbent upon us I felt as faculty to say to some extent what we think assessment is and that’s what we attempt to do in this document. Roughly to break down this document for you, the first document is essentially a drawing of a line, a thing that assessment should not be, so if you like it’s rather defensive point. The three in the middle states what we think assessment is, that it’s something we think is guided by the faculty, that it involves the examination of learning objectives, etc... and its purpose is to provide diagnostic information. And then the last statement essentially goes to the purposes of assessment, the description, development of curriculum and so on. I’d like to say something about these principles in just a moment, but I want to make one last statement about why we’re doing this. That question has been raised a number of times -- why are we doing this, after all this is not really an action item, we’re not passing it, it’s not a formal statement. The main thing is that some form of assessment is going to go on over the next year and onward whether we are interested in that or not, or approve of that or not. This path or voice vote—I’m not quite sure exactly what I’m asking you, but I think a general statement of your approval would be very helpful, essentially

allows us to enter that conversation. If you choose not to, administration will go forward without our input.

Okay, let me just point out two aspects of this that are probably, of these principles, which might be rather subtle and I want to draw your attention to them, while pointing out that they were passed almost unanimously by the EPC. First of all, point three, you will note the clause in the first line, “assessment involves but is not restricted to an examination of learning objectives and the alignment objectives of objectives with student requirements.” So what that means is that assessment can mean other things as well, like the assessment of student learning directive. The statement does not say that directly, in part because many on the committee felt -- although not a majority -- that assessment should just be examining learning objectives. In the end, we passed the document broadening that to include other things like the direct assessment of student learning. The second point I want to draw your attention to is point 5, “Any monitoring of student assessment at the campus and university level is intended exclusively for description and development curriculum, etc... and is not intended to be used for the evaluation or comparison of faculty.” The point was made that within a department, and possibly therefore within a school which does not have department chairs and so on, could have a need to use the monitoring of student assessment in order to evaluate faculty. This is a rather tricky point there. I think we can all accept that department chairs have the need to look at what faculty are doing in their classes, maybe in some general way, for example, a faculty member never assigns any writing at all and it’s a history class—that could play a role in the evaluation of faculty. We are in a sort of gray area here because by saying campus and university level, we are leaving it open to a Dean, for example, using that same kind of information and we may or may not have an opinion on that but because it’s relatively subtle point I do want to draw your attention to it before you approve this. Okay, I’m open to questions and comments.

**TANFORD:** Point 4; is there a reason for limiting that to undergraduate education?

**KENNEY:** You know, we never talked about that.

**TANFORD:** Particularly given your comment about 5, that some of the schools and things that have graduate programs...

**KENNEY:** We never talked about that, I think maybe because we’ve always been focused entirely on undergraduate education. That’s mostly what we talked about as you can see. I do not see a reason why it should be limited to undergraduate, but if any of you who were on the committee can tell me why we never talked about this, otherwise...

**TANFORD:** For example, I know you were focusing on the General Education requirement and that, but there are, for example, the law school has -- periodically our accreditation review team comes in and the word assessment is likely to show up...

**KENNEY:** I am inclined to add 'graduate' rather than delete 'undergraduate' because assessment of education -- somehow that doesn't seem to upset anyone.

**FARRIS:** Back to your point number 5. I'm just imagining possibly some contradiction with number 4. If you were involved in changing the delivery of instruction, the teaching and learning practices, in a context, it might be necessary to do comparisons across faculty teaching the same course. So, I'm wondering if it doesn't need to be a longer sentence there in number 5, "not intended to be used for the evaluation or comparison of faculty..."

**KENNEY:** In other words, the problem is...

**FARRIS:** You could very well be comparing...

**KENNEY:** ...faculty across the department, you know who is getting better scores on some assessment...

**FARRIS:** Right, but you mean for merit increase, for salary, for what do you mean? Because you would perhaps be in a situation if you're comparing practices in two different sections of a course taught by different faculty.

**KENNEY:** Right.

**FARRIS:** Or for revamping a course or revamping a program.

**KENNEY:** Right, so that would be evaluation really of a course more than...

**FARRIS:** But you would be engaged in a comparison inevitably because that is one way that one uses BEST forms, for instance.

**KENNEY:** However, this principle would then essentially say, if you want to see whether the different forms of teaching within sections of the same course have different effects and therefore you want to redesign the course to take account of that, that's one thing, but if you make that a problem with then taking that information to use it to then evaluate faculty for merit, salary and so on....

**FARRIS:** That's what I'm talking about, I think you need to spell that out in a longer clause or something because comparisons might inevitably be made in faculty delivering instruction differently.

**KENNEY:** Well, that sort of gets back actually to the previous phrase, that you can then "use it for the description and development of curriculum," so there the course question is resolved; in other words you're using that information, you're looking at the many different sections of one course to develop curriculum which would include rethinking a particular course, but not using it for faculty.

**FARRIS:** Okay, so you're actually saying at no time would the information gleaned from assessment of a course or the work of the majors, or anything ever be brought to bear in faculty teaching for purposes of salary and tenure or a promotion. Never.

**KENNEY:** Well, except note that this principle says "at the campus and university level." It does not say the dean of the...

**GIERYN:** And if I could just add that the problem of course is that some of those judgments automatically move up to the campus and university level if they're included in P & T documents.

**FARRIS:** Right.

**GIERYN:** So I'm not sure how we can prevent that.

**FARRIS:** I'm not either.

**KENNEY:** Yeah.

**REILLY:** Speaking as someone who is profoundly skeptical of the generic BEST forms that most of us are using and find that the evaluations that we receive from them are not very helpful or indicative of student learning outcomes. I don't want to stir the pot here, but is this a time to consider whether a discipline specific assessment of student learning outcomes should be something that people would agree to include in the evaluation of the success of a faculty member, rather than looking at hundreds and hundreds of BEST forms accumulated over five years, which are of marginal informational value? That's just my thought on this.

**KENNEY:** So you're advocating that a particular kind of assessment be erased?

**REILLY:** I think it might be worth discussing whether -- and of course you couldn't -- this is where if a department develops their own means, and this is where you set out what this is supposed to do and these are all very worthy things; "alignment of objectives with student requirements at the level of the course of the degree program." If this was done within a department and the department as a whole agreed on the discipline specific learning objectives, and how do they agree, obviously this can be opposed from outside, but they actually agreed on how to assess whether these things are achieved, then that seems very useful in the long run.

**KENNEY:** Absolutely. Yeah, I mean one of the things that I think is going to happen over the next year is looking very seriously at learning objectives because one of the things that we're realizing since we've gotten into this is that we can talk all we want—that is if we actually want to -- about student learning outcomes, but we can't get very far on that if we haven't talked about objectives. And for the most part we don't, and especially at the departmental level, the

course level, I know that I've never had a list of learning objectives on my syllabus, and having gone through this discussion this year, I think I will. But then there's a question of, 'we don't have that at the department level, at the college level and so on.' I expect that as we go through that process, which I hope we'll start this coming year, of looking at objectives, a great deal of confusion I think will be cleared away and it will be possible to think more clearly about what learning outcomes are.

**REILLY:** But then to exclude from the very beginning their use for assessing faculty achievement, I understand the danger of saying, 'Oh well someone's going to impose their form of assessment on you' and you may or may not agree with what these learning objectives are that have been imposed and therefore why should you be measured against them, but I think that just rejecting that in principle as a way of assessing faculty success might be a bit too preemptive.

**KENNEY:** Well, if that is the wish of the BFC then we can change that, but as long as we're aware of the possibilities, that on the one hand it's true and from what Tom said it's clear that just limiting the campus and the university really has no effect because if you can do it at the department level, that information will go up. So we have two and I think really quite clear possibilities. Either we say, 'Sure, use that assessment information' you know, how well faculty are making students master particular skills or a particular body of information and use that as a way of evaluating faculty, or don't. But we have to be clear that we are doing one or the other and we should be aware of the dangers of doing so and also maybe the limitations that we impose upon ourselves by not doing so.

**HANSON:** Tom?

**GIERYN:** Padraic, can I take you back to point 1, the mention of academic freedom and tenure. I can imagine what sorts of issues might come up, but I'm curious if you could just give us a very brief summary of the EPC's consideration and what lead you to put that clause in this document.

**KENNEY:** We talked about this one this least, because I think it sort of seemed clear to us that there might be ways in which assessment might infringe upon the faculty's freedom within the classroom. For example, I mean as a very crude example, saying 'you have to use this particular test in your class to prove whether such and such has been achieved' and a faculty member might say, 'you know I don't think that particular type of information is useful or that assessment of that information is useful.' And putting faculty in position where they are forced into something in a course which they think for, let's assume, very good reason should not happen, would be a problem in all of those areas.

**HANSON:** Dennis?

**GROTH:** I have two things. One is, just an acknowledgment of the BEST forms; that I don't think the BEST forms are assessment. I think they are imperfect, as you've said. We do have a

project looking at that now on how to improve that and each department already has the ability to customize those forms, or to specify the types of outcomes that they'd like to measure. So that's a project that will be ongoing. My question is on number two. Because I've had a faculty member actually point this out to me and making the information available to students, not that they would disagree with that, but that they would say then that a faculty member would not permit to make the information available to administrators.

**KENNEY:** Right. That's correct. We did that on purpose. It was pointed out that, after all, administrators have access to grades. But more broadly, this assessment of student outcomes would mean you assign a particular paper in a class and you grade it on four rubrics of different kinds of things—would you then make that information, internal to a class, available to administrators? You know, there's nothing here that says you can't do that. You can make that information available, for example, if you're writing an article on educational practices and publishing that in a refereed journal or, I suppose, in the newspaper if you wanted. But we did not want to specify.

**GROTH:** I think I was really talking about the specification of learning objectives, which is different than the assessment of the outcomes, right?

**KENNEY:** Oh, okay. Right.

**GROTH:** How could anybody ever assess whether objectives are being accomplished, if the only people that knew it were the faculty members and the students? Isn't there something in terms of the objectives themselves?

**KENNEY:** Well, okay. Learning objectives are a separate issue and we suspect that those are something that will be shared wide and be made available at the university level. We didn't specify what you're particularly concerned with, assessing student outcomes but learning objectives can be made available to anybody, and they'll probably be available in a more public manner than would be the assessment of student outcomes. I'm not sure—are you suggesting that maybe additional language would make it...

**GROTH:** Yes.

**KENNEY:** Okay.

**TERRY:** There's a similarity I think between this and [inaudible]. In each case, we're trying to develop basic principles on very complex matters. As Padraic said, this is the start of a dialogue over assessment. The dialogue and the assessment itself will proceed this summer because we must produce some data for the Commission for Higher Learning very soon, which has asked as a part of our accreditation process, that we do so. Although I don't know that we have to produce the data, but just a plan for how we're going to get it. What I anticipate if you give your general assent to these principles, is that they will be refined in light of these comments and many others that are likely to emerge this summer and very early fall. And they will

probably come back to the Council for formal adoption at that later point. I think it would be a mistake to write and adopt principles now because we will encounter difficulties in implementing them. And I think I depend on the dialogue between Sonya's office especially and the Educational Policies Committee, and for that matter the Faculty Affairs Committee to work in good faith over the summer. And I anticipate this will be back next year closer to 100% form. It's 90% there now, or 95, and it'll get there over the summer. So I hope we will approve these in principle, much as we did with the GPSO resolution last time, look at how they go—we've done this before; we did it with General Ed; we've done it with a variety of things, and a complex issue like this—a very important issue like this—requires that flexibility. But this will provide some guidance, I think, over the summer.

**HANSON:** I actually would just like to make a comment about how to proceed with that kind of guidance over the summer. With respect to number two—the issue Dennis raised is an important one. I mean part of what we have to do here, by next year really, is come up with something that's going to be appropriate for the thing that was flagged on our accreditation review, so this is mandatory in some way that these things be available to the administration. The other thing—I guess I have a comment that is in a way related to your “puppies” comment, and the amorphousness of this, but also to Diane's comment in looking at number five. If there is a comment there that we endorse about the limited use of these vehicles [inaudible] question raised by Prof. Ferris—it may confound some things that you might want to do that wouldn't be covered by this. I guess I'm looking at the force of number three and thinking about how it relates to numbers four and five. And one of the things that's been considered an option for responding to some of the forces that are requesting assessment data, is that the University make more prominent the NESSIE data and that it deal with the NESSIE data in a way that satisfies certain queries that come to us about how our students are engaged. And yet a lot of that may not have to do with the curriculum, it may have to do with what we think of as co-curricular education. So I think it may be a little early to be as specific as these items are right now, even to carry on the dialogue. I mean that's one of the concerns I'd have about having kind of a formal vote about this. Do you want to comment on that, Padraic?

**KENNEY:** I do. I'm trying to think about ways in which assessment of student outcomes or learning objectives might affect what we do with co-curricular activities. I just can't think of a way in which that might work.

**HANSON:** I guess what I'm suggesting is that there are many requests for assessment that go beyond the assessment of curricular and course objectives. And there are elements in these five statements as they go together, which might seem to preclude our exploration of those other issues. And I kind of think that's not something you want to endorse.

**KENNEY:** Okay, yeah, that's something we'll have to think about. I haven't taken into account at all the world beyond the classroom in this we're really focused on the educational experience entirely, but we'll try to see how that can fit in and we'll reword things.

**HANSON:** Well, in a way it is related to the educational experience. It's just that it's co-curricular and may not be course-based. Other questions or comments? What's your preference then?

**KENNEY:** Well I think there are a number of things, some key issues that we need to take into account over the summer before coming back in August, but I think it would be nice to have a general affirmation of the direction of this and then [inaudible] I can take the number of comments as evidence of that if you want.

**HANSON:** That's good.

**KENNEY:** So I think we stop there, after.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Padraic. Discussion of Promotion and Tenure Issues, Herb and Jonathan?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 10: DISCUSSION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE ISSUES**

**TERRY:** We'll see if we can conclude this. I mentioned to the Council before that the University Faculty Council has asked the co-Secretaries, Simon and myself and working with the administration, with President McRobbie's representative, John Applegate to try and develop some principles that will guide the promotion and tenure procedures on all eight campuses of Indiana University. The document you see as U8-2009 has been distributed to the faculty governance units of all eight IU campuses for discussion. And they will bring the results of that discussion to next week's University Faculty Council meeting here in Bloomington, if you want to attend, for final consideration by the Council. You may see that it is a little shorter than the earlier version that was distributed here. That's because as the three of us talked about what had happened, it occurred to us that we were tending to get far too specific, and every time we got specific, some campus or another found some reason for objecting to something, and threatened to object as a result to everything. And the possibility was that we were not going to, after all this work, get anywhere. So we reduced the principles that we found in the joint administrative faculty task force to eight of these nine statements; all of these can be found in the task force report. We also took into account the concerns of all campuses about some of the specific things that they thought they were going to have difficulty with. And so, if this passes the UFC next week, what we are doing is adopting this, kind of, in principle and urging all eight campuses to spend 2009-2010 trying to implement it in good faith. We require them, as you'll see at the end, to present a report to the Chief of Staff of the University Faculty Council, April 1 of 2010. The UFC Agenda Committee and others will take those into account and see what we need to do thereafter. Point nine is a statement of principle related to President McRobbie's December 5<sup>th</sup> 2008 memorandum which you also have before you on how promotion and tenure candidates will be notified of promotion and tenure recommendations at the campus—made at the system level, at the campus level for that matter. What point nine reflects is that the faculty, which has legislative authority over procedures and standards for tenure and promotion, understands that the President is going to go forward with this procedure for this year and next academic year. But he has agreed that he will take a look, at

the same time we are looking at principles 1 through 8, he will take a look at how this has worked, and I anticipate that there may be some changes made. I do not think the President's memorandum is something of concern to Bloomington. The President's memorandum does reflect essentially the way things, as far as I can determine, have been done with regard to Bloomington, and for that matter IUPUI, for a number of years. But it is of great concern to the regional campuses and that's the reason that point nine is in here, and if this is adopted the President will make a review, and we've put in a slightly later date so that he can take into account the tenure and promotion decisions that he will be making at the start of 2010. So that's where we are. I would hope if you have comments about this, please make them in the next four minutes (laughter) or send them to me prior to next Tuesday, and let's see if Jonathan has anything to add.

**PLUCKER:** Not especially, other than to note that given that at the beginning of this process we really didn't think this was going to take up too much of the time of people on this campus, it ended up taking a lot of time, but I especially want to note that the Provost, Vice Provost Gieryn and especially Herb have put a lot of time into this; just floating trial balloons and discussing it and thinking about it. People took this very, very seriously, which I think is great. So that's about it.

**TERRY:** I can tell you that I think we do have something the regionals will approve of as well. I hope we've reached that stage, but comments are welcome.

**DALLIS:** I apologize, I realize I have four minutes, and I don't want to make this too long, but you said you shortened it and I noticed at one point there was provision that librarians not really necessarily be required to have the four letters, outside letters, etc... and that we would follow our handbook instead. That's not here anymore, and I do appreciate sort of making it general so it doesn't open a can of worms here and there, but is it possible to have that included again?

**TERRY:** I think we can come up with something that will indicate that promotion and tenure dossiers for faculty are expected to have at least four external review letters and if you and I can work together, we can probably come up with something that will talk about librarians.

**DOWELL:** I would suggest that we just add the line that covered that issue in the previous version and just tack it on the end of this version.

**TERRY:** We can do that.

**HANSON:** Paul?

**EISENBERG:** Very quickly, do you think it would be worthwhile to have another numbered paragraph that says something like "in cases of conflict of interest the faculty member should or must recuse himself or herself?"

**HANSON:** This is a new consideration that wasn't in any of the previous...

**EISENBERG:** Yeah, I realize...

**HANSON:** Well I mean there are these procedures for recusal on our campus already.

**EISENBERG:** Okay, so that's already covered?

**HANSON:** Well, I guess I need to know more about what you mean by "conflict of interest," if people are from the same department, for example, then they recuse at the next levels up.

**TERRY:** Let me again point out that we will not adopt these things at the next UFC meeting. As it says on the very end the UFC is going to review this, and my expectation is as stated in the second paragraph, is that we will incorporate them into the *Academic Handbook* with some modifications next year. That's the line of the things that I think will come up. We may discover that existing procedures and policies at the campus level that cover recusal for conflict of interest turn out to be adequate. What I can promise you is I'll bring it up at the UFC meeting and have it reflected in the minutes of that meeting, it will be something we'll be on the lookout for before it comes around again.

**HANSON:** Other questions or concerns? Could I request that, in number nine, we once again say "Provost and Chancellors," which is what the memo says?

**TERRY:** I can do that.

**HANSON:** Any other...? Yes.

**EVANS:** Several people in the College have asked me to bring up the issue of proxy voting again and to point out that this is, in some departments of the College, at least, this is common practice. And so we are saying, by this document that that would no longer be the case?

**HANSON:** Tom?

**GIERYN:** Yeah, it hasn't gone away, but this is so much of an improvement I'm so pleased to see the language that is here. I've noticed that we don't specify what it takes to involve full participation. So you can be absent and still vote if you'd like. What is being ruled out is a proxy vote where that person is not fully participating, however that's defined or achieved, in the deliberations, okay? So physical absence from the meeting would not necessarily disqualify a faculty member from voting and I think we have language here as carefully worded as we could possibly get that would protect the interests of many departments on the Bloomington campus who do allow absentee voting as long as those faculty members are participating in the deliberation by reading the files, even by emailing, even by phoning, even by videoconferencing during the deliberations or shortly thereafter.

**HANSON:** There has always been this distinction between absentee voting and proxy voting. We weren't going to the mat for proxy voting, which is just giving your vote to somebody else, and I don't know of departments that allow that.

**EVANS:** That's right, I think the problem is a misunderstanding of the term "proxy voting." It might make sense in that case to say something that absentee voting is still allowed.

**HANSON:** Well, then... (laughter). I think we've reached mandatory adjournment (laughter).

**TERRY:** Please send any comments.

**HANSON:** Thank you.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM**