Minutes of the
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Peterson Room, Indiana University Foundation
Bloomington Campus
October 25, 2005
1:30 - 4:30 P.M.

Attendance


Members Absent with Alternates: Mary Pagliero Popp for Julie Bobay, James Baldwin for Giles Hoyt, Mark Urtel for Anna McDaniel

Members Absent: Bruce Bergland, Roseanne Cordell, Jennifer Delaney, Brian Fife, David Fulton, Adam Herbert, Debomoy Lahiri, Michael McRobbie, Joseph Near, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Nakisha Robertson, David Turnipseed, Brian Vargus, Michael Wartell, Nanci Yokom, Eric Zeemering

Guests: Alan Bender, Roland Cote, Steve Hinnefeld, Maynard Thompson

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
   September 27, 2005
   http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/minutes/09.27.05.htm

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
   (Vice President Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis)*

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
   (Professors Bart Ng and Theodore Miller)

4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)
   (Vice President Gros Louis and Professors Ng and Miller)

5. Indiana University Mission Statement [ACTION ITEM] (10 minutes)
   http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U8-2006.htm

6. Policy on Undergraduate Admissions [DISCUSSION] (60 minutes)
AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

GROS LOUIS: First item is approving the minutes from September 27th. Are there any comments on those or any changes, deletions, additions? Additions are harder to make. Hearing none I will assume that the minutes of the 27th are approved.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

GROS LOUIS: Under the Presiding Officer’s Business, you see in the footnote on your agenda that the President is dedicating a building on another campus today and so I’m sitting in for him. I think what I would like to do is to call on Maynard Thompson who I think most of you know has been appointed as a… is it senior counselor to the President? And ask him to say a few words about the nature of his responsibilities and then respond to any questions you might have, Maynard.

THOMPSON: Thank you Ken. Early this semester President Herbert asked that I spend some time in his office. The events of the summer with the attention to the way he was spending his time and his activities led him to reflect on what could be done in response to those comments. In doing so he recognized that a core part of his responsibilities was to respond in a timely way to issues that are important to the faculty and to be sure that he continues to be able to do so he asked that someone with academic credentials and academic administration experience come into his office and I agreed to do so. Although I continue to teach a full load this semester, in the beginning of the spring time I will spend most of my time working with him on matters that pertain primarily, but not exclusively, to faculty concerns.

For example the things he’s asked me to look into at the beginning of this task is to talk with people and give him some advice and recommendations perhaps on aspects of the new proposal for a faculty rank, the process by which it is handled. He’s asked that I work with those who are directly concerned with finances of the university to consider a review of the process of the use for allocating financial resources, usually referred to as the RCM system. That system of course was created some 15 years ago in a somewhat different environment and it may be that the present system is a system that would be best for us and it may also be that there should be some changes. Basically I’ll do what he suggests that I do and my task is to behave as if I were, as I am, a faculty member who has a vital interest in these things.
GROS LOUIS: Thank you Maynard. Are there any questions of Maynard at this time?

HAWKINS: Will you be attending the Faculty Affairs Committee in terms of this new rank?

THOMPSON: I don’t know the answer to that.

GROS LOUIS: Any questions?

JONES: Is it possible for you to repeat questions so that we hear them?

GROS LOUIS: Yes, I’ll do so, thank you. Marty?

SPECHLER: Maynard I’d like to ask you how your duties differ or perhaps overlap with those that Don Gray fulfilled some years ago and others have done as kind of a liaison with the faculty?

GROS LOUIS: The question is how the nature of the overlap between what Don Gray and others have done in the past and what Maynard is going to be doing.

THOMPSON: My understanding, and I wish the President were here to speak to that, my understanding is that he was looking for someone who would spend considerably more time than Don Gray did and Al Ruesink and Bill Schneider did in that role. In addition, several times in his discussions with me, he commented that he thought my broad involvement with the university and the number of different administrative capacities would be helpful.

SPECHLER: We’ll be glad to see you in Indianapolis, Maynard.

GROS LOUIS: Any other questions of Maynard? If not we’ll go on to the Agenda Committee business and I will call on Bart.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

NG: Thank you Ken. I just want to quickly go over what we talked about at the Agenda Committee meeting today. There were a couple of items that were really along the line of follow up. On September 27th a question was raised by a number of representatives from the regional campuses about what’s happening to the inter-campus research funds. They learned at the time that those funds have been suspended pending further review and we asked for a clarification from the President. And we have since been made to understand that the money for these funds is still there with an amount of about $100,000. At this moment Sarita Soni who is the Associate Vice President for Research is undergoing, is conducting a review of that program and she in fact has been traveling around the various campuses talking to the chancellors and the vice chancellors. Plus, she has been making contact with the faculty on these various campuses to ask for input and it is her plan that she will have the review completed at least for instruction by McRobbie by December and have a program in place again, perhaps in a revised form, in the spring. But questions were raised about the entire process of the review and it’s not entirely clear in the mind of the Agenda Committee that one person should be really conducting the review
despite the fact that she’s trying to get the faculty input. The question about process and in fact
we even raise a question about why should the program be suspended while the review is
ongoing. We have not heard a good rationale about why that is the case. So I will follow-up on
behalf of the Agenda Committee on this matter.

The Graduate School search, we have sent forth names from Bloomington, Indianapolis as well
as the smaller campuses. We have forwarded the names to Ken who is in the process of putting
the committee together and the search will go forth. We had a brief discussion about whether it
should be a national search or an internal search and the consensus I believe is that it will be a
national search although they will not be involving a so-called search firm in this endeavor.

There was also some discussion about what is now the UFC Finance and Facilities Committee.
You will recall there was a discussion in the last council meeting that we want to change the
name of the committee to make it more of the role of a Budgetary Affairs Committee and Bob
Kravchuk and his colleague Ben Boukai have made arrangements to meet with the President to
talk about perhaps a new role for the committee at the end of this November and they will move
forward from there. I think that’s all I have from the Agenda Committee for now. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

GROS LOUIS: Thank you Bart. Moving on to the Question and Comment Period, there were
two questions that were asked at the first meeting and the first one has already been answered by
Bart. It was a question about the Intercampus Research Fund. By the way, Michael McRobbie
sends his regrets but he had another engagement that he couldn’t break.

The second question dealt with the… Keith Moore from IUPUI had asked about the change in
Research and Sponsored Program Support in the absence of Mark Brenner. “Is this a permanent
change in reporting to have IUPUI go through the Bloomington administrator or will Mark be
replaced?” And here’s the answer I received from Michael this morning. “Mark Brenner who
headed the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at IUPUI reported to Chancellor Bantz
as Vice Chancellor for Research at IUPUI and to Vice President McRobbie. He left IU at the end
of August 2005 as most of you know. Vice President McRobbie and Chancellor Bantz are
working to identify a persona and to replace him on an interim basis. In April of 2005, Steve
Martin, Assistant VP for Research, took responsibility for corporate contracts and grant
processing in Research and Sponsored Programs, reporting to both Chancellor Bantz and Vice
President McRobbie”. That’s the end of the answer. My interpretation of that is that when an
interim is identified, then the interim will do what Steve Martin is now doing. So the answer is
that the report to Steve Martin is temporary only.

Those were the only questions I received in advance, were there any questions to the Agenda
Committee? Yes, Bill?

WHEELER: I would like to submit a request and also ask a question. First on the request, I’m
hoping that the Agenda Committee will find an opportunity for this Council to discuss the
Mission Differentiation report. I feel that is circumventing that this Council-- this Council has
been circumventing the way this has happened. That each individual campus discusses its own
things but this Council as a whole has not and traditionally this Council is the faculty voice on matters that affect the entire university. I think this one certainly does. Now I’m pleased that we get to vote on the Mission Statement today but I feel like there are certain things that deserve the merit of our discussion. For example, one of the recommendations in the Mission Differentiation Report concerns trying to select an academic or administrative practice that’s shared by all campuses and then to market that as the unifying aspect of one university with multiple campuses. You know, that this would happen without discussion by this Council strikes me as very unusual. Certainly this Council was heavily involved, or its predecessor was heavily involved in the discussion of the reorganization of the university in the 1970s and this is something that would serve the organization and I would hope that this Council would have an opportunity to address that.

I might note in passing that the President last time observed that there was one controversial part of the Mission Differentiation Report that he’s heard about. I think there would be other parts he could hear about if we actually discuss it at the Council. When that section was discussed on the Bloomington campus, Luis who is not here with us today, and I myself where the two who opposed the use of a certain phrase that has caused some anguish on other campuses and I think that it would be appropriate for this body to discuss that and I hope that the Agenda Committee can find a time for when we can do that.

The question then is to Bart, which has to do with the special status of IUPUI. The question I have is, does Purdue have a faculty body that’s analogous to our UFC which deals with the system-wide aspects of Purdue University and if so, how close is the relationship between the Indianapolis Faculty Council and such a Purdue faculty senate?

GROS LOUIS: First of all, did everybody out there hear the question?

[No we did not]

GROS LOUIS: Okay, there are two parts to it. The first one is a request that the Agenda Committee try to put on its agenda a discussion of various aspects of the Mission Differentiation Report in addition to voting on the mission today. And then the question to Bart was, is there a Purdue body analogous to the University Faculty Council that deals with matters that affect the Purdue missions on the IUPUI campus and if so, what is the relationship between that Purdue body and this body.

NG: The short answer to your question about is there a Purdue comparable body, the answer is I don’t think so although I’m not a 100% sure. It’s somewhat embarrassing for me to say that but all my years at IUPUI I have never ever heard of a so-called University Faculty Council comparable to that because I think Purdue’s organization is somewhat different. There is however a graduate council in matters that has to do with graduate education that Purdue has a system-wide responsibility. But in terms of the various campuses that Purdue does not really get into that kind of involvement. So, the short answer is no that I know of. But I can actually check further into that just to make sure.
GROS LOUIS: It’s conceivable that the university-wide Purdue body functions in secrecy. [Laughter]

NG: That’s correct, to make it even more interesting.

GROS LOUIS: Marty?

SPECHLER: Ken this is a question drawing on your experience and wisdom. It has to do with the quality of education which is offered by Indiana University and its various campuses. You may have noticed the New York Review of Books which had a long article which argued that research universities such Indiana University offer a systematically inferior education to its undergraduates as compared with small liberal arts institutions. Although the evidence was hardly overwhelming there was some evidence in the article and it did get me to thinking and I would like to ask your reaction. In pointed out that at universities such as Indiana University, we essentially say that a student who passes a certain number of courses with a distribution receives a degree and that’s that—there’s no general education nor is there any attempt to see whether graduates of research universities meet any kind of standard in fact when they leave.

Some universities do that and there are some departments, I understand, that make an effort to find out whether their graduates have really progressed to an adequate level. Now, I would like to ask your opinion based on considerable experience about whether you think at Indiana University we need to do more to evaluate, perhaps on a sample basis, whether students actually do meet any kind of reasonable standard for literacy, numeracy, critical thinking and the like, quite aside from passing the requisite courses.

GROS LOUIS: Okay the question has to do with the quality of the undergraduate education at Indiana University relative to that education obtained by a student going to a small liberal arts college.

I think there are several approaches to that Marty. I think, first of all, I’ve always felt that the benefits of a large institution rests in large measure in the variety of approaches even in the specialized areas so that very fine four-year liberal arts colleges may have one person teaching Shakespeare whereas Bloomington and IUPUI might have 4 or 5 people teaching Shakespeare and with different approaches and the same thing there too for African History, American History or any of the subjects you might name. So I think the benefit of a large university, for the student, lies in the variety of approaches even in specialized disciplines. In addition to that, I’ve always felt that you can make a large place small but you can’t make a small place big. By that I mean not only in terms of the variety of expertise in the faculty but the lectures you bring in, the concerts, the performances, the museums, the extracurricular opportunities that exist at large research universities.

Getting to specific measurements, I think the National Survey of Student Engagement, I know that George Kuh has initiated and has now spawned a number of other kinds of studies of high school students, of pre-college students etc., demonstrates, at least in the years since it has started, that the students are as engaged at large institutions as they are at smaller institutions and in some cases feel that they’ve been more challenged at large institutions than they have been in
smaller institutions—not true across the board. But the results as you know, are given to each campus and the compared to in our case, Research I institutions if its Bloomington, and then compared to AAU institutions, and then compared to the whole sample, which includes many of the small liberal arts colleges. So I think that kind of survey, which by the way is increasingly looked at as an important complement if not superior to the US News and World Report annual survey of colleges and universities.

Another point I would make is I don’t think we do as good a job as we could in identifying what our graduates do after they graduate. As you say, some schools do because their accrediting bodies expect them to, other schools don’t. Arts and Sciences certainly does not and the Enrollment Committee in Bloomington, and this may be true for other campuses as well, has recommended that working with the Alumni Association and with the Deans, that we try to do a better job of tracking our graduates. It doesn’t tell us about critical literacy and all those things but it does tell us the effectiveness of the undergraduate experience for the graduates as they go into their careers. So, other than anecdotal things, which I could go into, I really do believe and I think back in 1989, the CIC group, that is the provosts of the CIC institutions, realized that we had given more attention to research activities to the faculty in terms of the reward structure than we had teaching. And there was a significant effort to reverse that and part of the effort was to identify what was the value added experience of going to the large Big Ten public universities and from that a number of innovations I think that have improved, improved the quality of the undergraduate education. Do we have more to do? The answer is yes. And as you would expect, on a campus as large as this one and IUPUI, I’m sure the same thing is true and to a less extent the smaller campuses, the effectiveness varies from department to department and school to school.

NG: I actually want to come back to Bill’s first request for a discussion in this body about the MDP. We can do that in November. Thank you for the suggestion.

GROS LOUIS: Yes

BALDWIN: I’m Jim Baldwin here from Giles Hoyt. Since Marty started the practice of quoting eminent New York publications, the New York Times on Sunday had a story about, right on the front page, colleges oppose call to upgrade online systems, costs could be huge. Has IU got a policy on this and how much is this going to cost IU?

GROS LOUIS: I don’t know the answer and Roland Cote who is the Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services may have the answer.

COTE: Well, actually, our systems are already fairly adequate for…

GROS LOUIS: The question for those of you who might not have heard it, excuse me, is do we have an online? I think you need to come to the podium, and then I won’t have to repeat the question, for both the questions and answers.

COTE: During the extensive development and attention that our systems have gotten over the last several years and I know we’re all aware of that here, our systems are actually in very good
condition in terms of being able to comply with the regulations that might be coming out. And what we’re going to be concerned about with this is more likely not the technology part but the actual policy with regard to intrusion and privacy.

**Baldwin:** Just a follow up, from the story, it looks like the Feds want to have immediate access to all internet communication on the university campus. And what surprised me, it wasn’t mentioned in the story, would they be able to do that without a court order?

**Cote:** I can’t answer that.

**Baldwin:** It sounds like they would be able to do it and nobody would ever know.

**Cote:** I can’t answer that, I, I can’t answer that but the Feds can do a lot of things.

[Laughter]

**Baldwin:** It’s not funny.

**Gros Louis:** Any other questions or comments?

**Agenda Item #5: Indiana University Mission Statement [Action Item]**

**Gros Louis:** If not then let’s move to the next item on the agenda which is the Indiana University mission statement. You’ll recall at the first meeting of the year there was a draft and a number of suggestions were made. I tried to incorporate those suggestions and sent a new version to Bart and to Ted and it is the version that you have before you. I don’t think I missed anything, at least from my notes I know. My notes have been transformed into what you have before you. So the floor is open for your comments on this mission statement.

If you want, for those of you who may not remember, let me just recall that the major changes were to change in the second line where it now says “extended to” in the first draft it said “accessible on”. In the 4th line, where it says “and a world leader” it initially said “yet also”. In the next line, it initially said “broad access to students within Indiana” now that’s changed to “for student from Indiana” in order to make that balance the rest. Three lines from the bottom, “dynamic partnerships” was singular in the first draft, as was “model efforts” was singular. And the last phrase suggested simply dropping “while maintaining a” because it all follows “IU provides:” up to 5 lines. And instead of “humane set of values” changing that to “humane environments”. And those were the changes that I had anyway from the draft that you saw in September, any further comments or questions on this? This as you know will be going to the Trustees if approved today at their meeting next week on the Richmond campus along with the campus mission statements.

**Baldwin:** I’m Jim Baldwin again and I have to apologize because I hadn’t read this until the ride down here but I’m very disappointed in it. It’s got… it doesn’t read like a mission statement to me. And I was heavily involved in the IUPUI mission statement so I’ve been reviewing this
process recently. The first half of this is a history statement which doesn’t belong in a mission statement. Mission statements are forward looking, history is history. So I would suggest that the entire first sentence be removed. There’s another reason…only one of our eight campuses is mentioned, which seems to reinforce the idea that Indiana University is located in a place called Bloomington with branches around the state, rather than one university with multiple campuses. So I would like to get rid of the entire first line so that then it begins with “Indiana University is a major state-wide research institution grounded in the liberal arts”. It would also make it shorter, its way too long for a mission statement.

The 2nd half of it, the problem is with that colon, “IU provides:” that’s a strange awkward way of saying it. I suggest it should say “IU provides many services to its constituents:”. And then you get lost in all those semi-colons in the next 5 lines. It’s very difficult to read, shouldn’t it be bulleted, and I know bullets don’t belong in a mission statement either but I can’t think of anyway around this? It’s just that I was reading and couldn’t come back to where the lines begin because of all the semi-colons. The first half mostly is unnecessary, the second half is awkward.

GROS LOUIS: But other than that you liked it?

BALDWIN: I would suggest this go back to a committee for putting in some work. I think it’s almost embarrassing the way it’s written.

GROS LOUIS: Would you like to make a motion to delete the first sentence?

BALDWIN: Oh yes, I move.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, a motion is made to delete the first sentence of the draft, is there a second?

SPECHLER: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Any discussion? Dale?

MCFADDEN: Ken, what is the rationale behind the first sentence, how does that help with mission statement?

GROS LOUIS: I guess identify IU as the oldest and largest public university in the state.

BALDWIN: Isn’t Vincennes actually older?

GROS LOUIS: Not that I’m aware of.

SPECHLER: I think it is.

GROS LOUIS: Ok.
SPECHLER: I think Jim is right but I’m not embarrassed by the claim to be the oldest and the largest and certainly the idea that the university began in Bloomington many many decades before it was extended to other places is also a very important fact. But surely there’s an introduction before the mission statement where this can be inserted and perhaps including the fact that we have about 100,000 students and, I don’t know, 20,000 faculty and professionals, librarians, might also be included.

GROS LOUIS: Mary?

FISHER: I think if we eliminate the first sentence then the next sentence should begin “IU is a major public research institution” because we had lot that there.

GROS LOUIS: Ok.

BALDWIN: I like the word “state-wide” there because we’ve lost the word “state-wide”.

FISHER: Yeah, that’s fine, state-wide, public, that’s fine.

GROS LOUIS: Further discussion of the motion to eliminate the first sentence. If not, all those in favor of eliminating the sentence say it again by saying “aye” [aye], those opposed.

NG: We’ll need to poll them.

GROS LOUIS: I think we’ll have to have a roll call vote.

KISH: You really want a roll call? Let’s do the hands and then each site individually.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, the hands, all those in favor of eliminating the first sentence raise your right hand.

KISH: 17 in Bloomington.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, the motion as you know is to eliminate the first sentence of the IU mission statement, so South Bend how do vote?

FEMALE SPEAKER:: Two yes votes.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, and Northwest?

COFFIN: Yes

GROS LOUIS: And Fort Wayne?

MERZ: Yes

GROS LOUIS: And Indianapolis?
FEMALE SPEAKER: Eight people for from IUPUI.

GROS LOUIS: I don’t think we need to take the no. Okay the motion is approved, so the first sentence then is dropped. And now somebody will need to make an amendment to the opening of the new first sentence. Mary?

FISHER: I move that we add the words after major “state-wide public” between major and research.

GROS LOUIS: Is there a second?

LUDLUM FOOS: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, any discussion?

COFFIN: Can you restate the motion for those of us who didn’t hear it?

GROS LOUIS: Yes, this will now read, the first sentence would read, “IU is a major state-wide public research institution”. So between major and research, are inserted the two words, state-wide public and the rest of the sentence, unless somebody makes another motion, will remain as is.

JOHNSON: Would you change IU to Indiana University?

BALDWIN: Yes.

JONES: This is Betty Jones for Polly Boruff-Jones at IUPUI. I recommend that we, instead of saying IU, state Indiana University.

GROS LOUIS: That’s a good point. Is that a friendly amendment?

FISHER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, any other discussion of the change to what is now the first sentence of the mission statement? Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Here we get into an area where it’s starting to blur description and prescription. I don’t know how we can avoid it to tell you the truth. Because I think being a state-wide, public and research institution, are pretty critical descriptive words of who we are and it implies certain parables and so I think it’s appropriate that we start the mission statement with a statement or a sentence of this kind. I’m going to save other remarks for the many semi-colons that follow.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

IVIE: I’m wondering, is there any possible implication with using the word state-wide this way
that it would imply that the university’s reach doesn’t extend beyond the state. The way that it was written in the original document, it doesn’t come out that way at all. But when you write it in this way, it becomes a state-wide institution, not an institution with an international reach.

GROS LOUIS: For those of you who didn’t hear, the comment is that the concern is that the word state-wide may suggest that IU does not have an international reach. Mary?

FISHER: I think the other sentences counter back throughout the country and the world. I think those other dotted sentences make that clear that that’s not a limitation but we are a state-wide public university, I mean, as far as who we are. That doesn’t mean we only focus on, we are not commissioned by the country or the world, we’re commissioned by the state of Indiana. So that’s who we are.

GROS LOUIS: Any other discussion of the motion? So the motion now is to begin the second sentence, or it is now the first sentence, “Indiana University is a major state-wide public research institution”, with the rest of it following as it appears. Bill?

WHEELER: I’d like to propose an amendment as a I share the concern about the use of the word state-wide there, because what we’re really trying to say is that we’re an Indiana public institution and to say a phrase there that Indiana University is a something like I’d like to put that public institution of Indiana, after Indiana University. If you could read the whole sentence again, because I don’t have it written down here, I’ll say where I want to put it. So drop the word state-wide, but could you read what it says? Could someone read the motion as it currently exists?

FISHER: “Indiana University is a major state-wide public research institution”, and then the sentence continues as written.

WHEELER: IU is a major public research institution of the state of Indiana.

OGREN: Or instead of state-wide say state.

HAWKINS: There seems to be a lot of redundancy in that. When I hear “public” it sounds like it’s commissioned by the state of Indiana, and you don’t need to say state or state-wide. “A major public research institution” covers it.

FISHER: I think the state-wide is to indicate that it’s in more than one site.

BALDWIN: Which we lost when we removed the first sentence.

HATTAB: Can we say multi-campus, for example, instead of state-wide? This is Eyas Hattab from IUPUI.

FISHER: That’s a very good idea.
GROS LOUIS: Mary, I take it that as a friendly amendment that you made.

FISHER: Yes, multi-campus, I love that.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, so now the amendment is that “Indiana University is a major multi-campus public research institution” and the rest of the sentence as is.

HAWKINS: If you took the first sentence which we deleted and put it before the mission statement you would know that there were multiple sites in the state.

GROS LOUIS: But I thought the first sentence was deleted.

HAWKINS: Well it was deleted from the mission statement but the suggestion was made to put it as a historic preamble. And that way you then recognize how many other campuses there are, and you realize that it’s statewide.

GROS LOUIS: I think that would be quite unusual to do it that way.

HAWKINS: Oh.

GROS LOUIS: I mean in terms of missions, normally, if you look at websites, the mission statement comes first and then other things might follow. Any further discussion of the amendment on the second sentence, yes?

MCCORMICK: One last clarification on the wording, that is, I’m curious about the intent of “major” in that phrase, as opposed to a minor institution?

GROS LOUIS: Well, I assume it really modifies the word research institution, so what it’s saying is that this not the University of Southern Indiana, which is probably not going to put the word “minor” in its mission statement either but nonetheless. Other discussion of the first sentence? Okay, so again the first sentence would “Indiana University is a major multi-campus, public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical and technological education”. All those in favor of this being the first sentence, indicate by saying “aye” [aye] opposed. Those of you on the TV, any, let’s start with IUPUI.

MALE SPEAKER: All for.

GROS LOUIS: All for okay. Fort Wayne?

FEMALE SPEAKER: For.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you, South Bend?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Two yes votes.
GROS LOUIS: Okay, Northwest?

COFFIN: Yes

GROS LOUIS: Okay, thank you. The next sentence is open now for your discussion.

LUDLUM FOOS: The next sentence is open now for your inspection.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

DE TIENNE: You know in recognition of the fact that it is becoming more important for Indiana University to recognize its work and partnership with local communities which I think perhaps extend the clause between the colons to read “dynamic partnership with the state and local communities in economic, social and cultural development”.

HAWKINS: Is that a motion?

GROS LOUIS: You want to make that as a motion?

DE TIENNE: Yes.

HAWKINS: Second.

GROS LOUIS: So the phrase that now reads “dynamic partnerships with the state and economic development” would be “dynamic partnership with the state and …”

DE TIENNE: And local communities.

GROS LOUIS: “… and local communities…”

DE TIENNE: In economic, social and cultural development.

HAWKINS: Point of order, do we need to vote on just that change before other changes or can we friendly amend?

GROS LOUIS: Ideally if somebody is prepared to make a motion that amends the entire sentence that would be helpful.

HAWKINS: I was going to suggest that this really is the meat on the mission and that we might say something like “IU’s mission is to provide”, and even though it’s not typical to use bullets, it’s so difficult to wade through that text, maybe use the bullets for the items. Then it becomes something you can really grab onto.

GROS LOUIS: Is that a motion?

HAWKINS: That was an amendment to his.
OGREN: I think that the IU should be changed to Indiana University.

HAWKINS: I don’t like the IUs either.

GROS LOUIS: Barb would you read that one more time please?

HAWKINS: “Indiana University’s mission is to provide:” and then bullet the items.

GROS LOUIS: Ok so the opening of that sentence says now that Indiana University’s mission is to provide. Marty?

SPECHLER: Well Ken you must have noticed that there is no parallelism in this first item. It either has to be broad access from Indiana and throughout the world and the country and the world or there has to be another preposition in there. It looks as if it was written by an economist. [Laughter] So, I would say from Indiana and throughout the country and the world, instead of the comma, otherwise its improper syntax.

GROS LOUIS: So “broad access for students from Indiana and throughout the country and the world”.

SPECHLER: Right

GROS LOUIS: Barb is that a friendly amendment since you started off the sentence?

HAWKINS: We can add that to the amendment, he’s right.

GROS LOUIS: Now we have, “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access for students from Indiana and throughout the country and the world”. And how about the next clause?

WHEELER: I have a further question with that because it’s left hanging with broad access to what? So I would suggest “broad access to higher education to students from…”

FINKBINE: Educational opportunity or access to opportunity?

WHEELER: Broad access to higher education.

GROS LOUIS: Isn’t it redundant to say that Indiana University is providing broad access to higher education, isn’t that what the university does?

SPECHLER: Well for that matter you might as well say undergraduate and graduate education in order to identify that we provide degrees at all levels including the doctoral level. Undergraduate and graduate education, and that is a very important part of our mission, we have a full range.
GROS LOUIS: Okay Marty so your suggestion then is…

SPECHLER: “Indiana University provides broad access to undergraduate and graduate education for students from Indiana and throughout the country and the world”. That would be my suggestion.

WHEELER: Second.

GROS LOUIS: In the beginning that was “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate and graduate programs”?

SPECHLER: Well, you could say “degrees” really if the redundancy bothers us.

HAWKINS: We are getting into a quagmire because we do continuing education too and educate at other levels too.

SPECHLER: Ok, so education.

HAWKINS: So we could say higher education.

GROS LOUIS: So Marty change the undergraduate and graduate to higher education?

SPECHLER: Well I guess I’m not aware whether continuing education is classed as undergraduate, graduate or neither. But if it is neither, then it’s a good point, let’s put undergraduate, graduate and continuing education.

FINKBINE: I think its out, we have certificate programs at the various campuses also, those are…

FISHER: Continuing education. Those are not degrees so they would be continuing education.

GROS LOUIS: No, many certificates are not in continuing education program, well, I was going to say they’re not in continuing studies but education.

SPECHLER: But the idea of including our efforts in continuing education is an excellent idea to put that in. If anyone ever reads the mission statement they might like to know that.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, Bart points out that we’ll need to alter the agenda if we’re going to spend more than the 10 minutes allotted for the mission statement. Does that mean it requires a motion?

[Tape 1 Side A Ends, Some conversation lost]

KRAVCHUK: I’ll move.

GROS LOUIS: Second?
POMPER: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Discussion? All those in favor of modifying the agenda in order to give more
time to the mission statement indicate by saying aye [aye], opposed. And those of you in South
Bend, Northwest and IUPUI, since everybody here said aye you don’t count.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, so we’re now back to “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad
access to undergraduate, graduate…

MALE SPEAKER: Graduate and continuing education…

GROS LOUIS: … for student from Indiana and throughout the country and the world.”

POMPER: I would like to suggest to split the sentence up into three so that it’s now “IU’s
mission is to provide” and then whatever we provide to the country and the world and then begin
a new sentence with “IU engages in outstanding academic and cultural programs and student
services” all the way up through “development”. And then “IU strives to achieve full diversity,
leadership and…” and so on until the end of the paragraph.

LUDLUM FOOS: Three sentences?

POMPER: Rather than bullets make them into three sentences that begin with mission is to
provide, engages in outstanding and so on and strives to achieve.

GROS LOUIS: Okay so the period after world, right? “Indiana University’s mission is to
provide broad access to undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students from
Indiana and throughout the country and the world”. Right?

POMPER: Correct. The next sentence begins with IU engages in outstanding…

GROS LOUIS: IU engages or IU offers? I’m just questioning whether engages is as precise as
offers. Although in the first clause offers is better and in the second clause engages is better.

LUDLUM FOOS: I have a suggestion for that. If we take the same principle but say the mission
is to provide broad access etc., etc. and outstanding academic and cultural programs and student
services and end the sentence there. And then IU engages in dynamic partnerships.

FISHER: That’s good.

GROS LOUIS: So we add another “and” after world, not semi-colon.

POMPER: I think if we’re not so sure we can make commas.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, so we have “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to
undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students from Indiana and throughout
the country and the world, outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services.”
POMPER: Well the comma and as well as.

GROS LOUIS: After the comma say “as well as”? Ok, so the sentence now reads “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students from Indiana and throughout the country and the world, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services.”

BALDWIN: Shouldn’t it be “as well as to outstanding”, it just reads funny without it.

LUDLUM FOOS: We’re not providing broad access to the programs, we’re providing the programs.

BALDWIN: Ok. Thank you.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, you ready, any further suggestions, or are you ready to vote on this sentence? We have one more time.

HATTAB: I actually have a suggestion, its Eyas Hattab from IUPUI again. It relates to first part of the statement. Do we really need to say from and throughout, I mean, can’t we say for example for students throughout Indiana, the United States and the world. And we are assuming that the only people who are reading this statement are from this country. I think that we’re making IU sound more international if we say the United States rather than assuming that everyone who is reading this mission statement resides in this country.

GROS LOUIS: So your preference would be for it to say “broad access to undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students from Indiana and United States and the world”. Right?

HATTAB: Well actually rather than “from Indiana”, “throughout Indiana, the United States and the world” because I think from and throughout can be, you know we can just simply say throughout these three places instead of the from and throughout.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, those of you amending this, will you take that as a friendly amendment? it will read …

POMPER: Doesn’t it already mean the same as from. To me it means we are offering the services worldwide, whereas from means that’s where the people come from. Not being from here myself, not being a native speaker myself.

HAWKINS: We do have programs though that are in other countries so that it’s throughout, also implies the multi-campus system. It wouldn’t be inaccurate I don’t think to say that.

GROS LOUIS: So you want to go with throughout instead of from? And if we go with throughout, then do you want to still have Indiana and the United States or throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world.
GROS LOUIS: So drop the and. Ok, so this now reads, “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services.” Any further suggestions or discussion? Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Ken I support this change and I will support also changes that haven’t already been suggested to the rest of these semi-colon or now bulleted statements, I don’t know, we’re talking about turning them into sentences mainly because the general thrust of them now is pointing towards something that’s much more prescriptive or actionable in ways that the original draft was not and so I definitely support these changes.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, thanks and if you’re ready for vote, do you want me to read the sentence one more time or you got it? One more time? “Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate and graduate and continuing education for students throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services.” Yes?

DE TIENNE: Did you say undergraduate and graduate? We could drop the “and” before graduate.

GROS LOUIS: “…undergraduate, graduate and continuing education”? Ok are we ready to vote on this sentence? All those in favor indicate by saying aye [aye], opposed? Is everyone out there in support?

[AYE]

We now go to the next clauses and the suggestion was made initially that it begins “Indiana University” or “it” if you think it is clear “engages in”. Should we say Indiana University or it? Yes?

MCCORMICK: I would suggest that we say Indiana University and also indicate a forward-thinking idea in the idea that Indiana University seeks to create or strives to create dynamic partnerships. It’s more mission, at least in my mind, the wording is more mission-oriented and less description-minded.

GROS LOUIS: Are people comfortable with that we begin by “Indiana University strives to create”?

MCCORMICK: That third sentence I had suggested to begin with strive so, how about seeks.

GROS LOUIS: So “Indiana University seeks to create”? And then “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state”, let’s go back to your point over here, state and
local...

**POMPER:** “…and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.”

**GROS LOUIS:** So we now have it reading beginning “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.” A period then?

**DE TIENNE:** Second.

**GROS LOUIS:** Any other suggestions that we have about that sentence if we have that period there?

**HAWKINS:** But I’m not sure that we maintained the parallelism with the sentence prior to it because you say Indiana University’s mission is to…

**MALE SPEAKER:** Can you read that one more time please?

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes, a question was made about parallelism with the preceding sentence. But the way it reads now is “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.” But then Barb has made the point that this loses the parallelism with the preceding sentence which says “Indiana University’s mission is to provide…” Although “seeks to create” seems to be similar to “is to provide”.

**HAWKINS:** It’s still part of the mission if it’s between “is to” and “seeks” “seeks” almost suggests we don’t already do that. So…

**KRAVCHUK:** A mission statement should be prescriptive, it should state some things that we would aspire to become, things we aren’t already.

**GROS LOUIS:** Further suggestions on this sentence? I’ll read it one more time to hear how it sounds. “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.” Should development be plural or singular? It’s ok?

**WATSON:** It seems to me like it should read something like it’s committed to continuing the creation of, so again that dynamic aspect rather than we’re beginning to create partnerships or continues to create.

**GROS LOUIS:** So your suggestion is to change the “seeks” to “Indiana University continues to create”?

**WATSON:** Or supports…

**HUNT:** Or we could say further there.
SPECHLER: If you would say welcomes dynamic partnerships it would resolve this problem.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, but welcome sounds as if we’re waiting for people to come to us as opposed to us going to them. Doesn’t it?

HUNT: If we said “further dynamic partnerships” it would imply that we already have some dynamic partnerships but we seek to…

NG: I think engages is the strongest, the original suggestion. “IU engages in”, it’s the strongest and the most direct way to say. Why beat around the bush?

OGREN: It could say Indiana University builds dynamic partnerships.

NG: That’s fine too.

GROS LOUIS: What’s your preference between engages or builds?

NG: Builds.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, the sentence now reads “Indiana University builds dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.”

KRAVCHUK: I think it’s too status quo. I think we should continue to seek as well as build. I’m trying to think of what it is after digesting the mission statement that I would do different tomorrow on the job that would help me to fulfill further the achievements of the mission.

GROS LOUIS: So what’s your preference here, do you want to…?

KRAVCHUK: I like seeks.

GROS LOUIS: Seeks to create?

KRAVCHUK: Now we’re back to that one, I was very comfortable there, on creating and seeking within the community.

OGREN: The problem is that seeks sounds, again, like we are just beginning the process rather than we are already involved.

KRAVCHUK: Well we are. We are beginning…

OGREN: And I think the mission statement can be a declarative sentence. I mean the classic mission statement…(some comments unclear).
**KRAVCHUK:** Pepsi Cola’s mission statement is beat Coke.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes?

**LUDLUM FOOS:** I’d like to argue against build because building is something you do to something, whereas either seek or engage has more of that partnership aspect of something we do together. Engage more so than seek, I think. But build to me sounds like something we’re doing to the partnerships, rather than with the partners.

**GROS LOUIS:** Okay, the preference seems to either to say “Indiana University engages in” or “Indiana University seeks to create.”

**MCCORMICK:** I would argue that the phrasing when one seeks or strives doesn’t necessarily imply that the present state is not present. As a scholar I seek to contribute to a body of knowledge, that doesn’t mean I’m not doing it right now, but it isn’t what drives what I do.

**GROS LOUIS:** Yes?

**PATTERSON-RANDLES:** Can I suggest that we promote?

**GROS LOUIS:** So “Indiana University promotes dynamic partnerships”? How do you like that?

**COFFIN:** Or you can promote dynamic partnerships without being part of them.

**GROS LOUIS:** What about “shies away from”? [Laughter]

**POMPER:** How about to accommodate both seeks to engage in and maintain?

**GROS LOUIS:** The sentiment seems to be that “seeks to create” captures it best. Are we ok with “seeks to create”? Ok, so Indiana University, here’s what we’re going to vote on. “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development.” Ready to vote on that, all those in favor indicate by saying aye [aye] opposed? Those of you at IUPUI and else where?

[AYE]

**GROS LOUIS:** Okay, now we have three clauses to go. There was a suggestion earlier that I thought captured all three but I’m not sure. So anyway, the floor is open for someone to put it on the table a way of changing the last three clauses.

**POMPER:** The original suggestion was “IU strives to achieve full diversity, leadership and creative solutions for the 21st century problems” and then the semi-colon is replaced with “and friendly, collegial, humane environments at every level of the institution.”

**GROS LOUIS:** Ok, so the suggestion is “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and friendly, collegial, humane
environments at every level of the institution.”

**HAWKINS:** Is the last phrase a mission statement or a description? “Friendly, collegial, humane environments at all levels.”

**KRAVCHUK:** You haven’t seen my unit. [Laughter]

**HAWKINS:** Is it descriptive or is it…?

**KRAVCHUK:** It’s an aspiration.

**HAWKINS:** An aspiration? I like that. Ok.

**BALDWIN:** Is that really, that whole statement more a value statement than a mission statement?

**GROS LOUIS:** It could be although a lot of people who saw this first time round they thought it was one of the unique characteristics of IU as opposed to other Research I institutions. Maybe it’s less true now than it was in the past, I don’t know. Anyway the suggestion is that the last sentence read “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and friendly, collegial, humane environments at every level of the institution.”

**HAWKINS:** That’s good. What if we said “within” friendly, collegial, humane environments? You do those within this kind of environment…

**BALDWIN:** I think it’s a separate thing, it’s not relating back to the previous things. So it’s a third item.

**DOWELL:** I would question if you can achieve leadership or achieve environments and I would suggest “IU aspires to achieve full diversity, provide leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and create friendly, collegial, etc., etc.”

**GROS LOUIS:** But we’ve used create in the previous sentence.

**DOWELL:** That’s true, so we need a substitute.

**GROS LOUIS:** So your change is to change the “strive” to what?

**DOWELL:** No, “strive” stays. “IU strives to achieve full diversity, provide leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and create, or build, or something else friendly, collegial, humane environments at every level of the institution.”

**GROS LOUIS:** Well we’ve used the word “provide” in two sentences before also.
DOWELL: My basic question is I don’t think, I don’t know about achieving leadership or achieving environments.

BALDWIN: It doesn’t refer to that. This change uses another verb. You achieve diversity, what’s the word leadership?

DOWELL: Provide.

BALDWIN: Provide, so achieve ends with diversity.

DOWELL: Striving applies to all.

GROS LOUIS: Any further suggestions?

FINKBINE: Are we going to have four sentences that all start off with Indiana University?

GROS LOUIS: That’s what seems to be happening.

FINKBINE: Don’t most grammarians or English-type folks don’t like four paragraphs that start out with “I” all the time, “I did this” “I did that”?

LUDLUM FOOS: It’s a mission statement though.

FINKBINE: Ok. The secret rule.

LUDLUM FOOS: The whole point is to talk about us, it’s the purpose.

GROS LOUIS: So the issue is whether one can strive to achieve leadership and creative solutions, whether or not the verb is needed. Is there some other verb that might go there? So Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity…then do we need a verb for leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems that can also pick up the other clause?

URTEL: This is Mark Urtel from IUPUI. I like the word “leads”. If we were to start that with “Indiana University leads efforts towards achieving full diversity and in developing creative solutions for 21st century problems.”

GROS LOUIS: What about the last clause?

URTEL: “…in a friendly, collegial, and humane environment.”

GROS LOUIS: How do the rest of you respond to that?

KRAVCHUK: Where are we leading the university to?

GROS LOUIS: Good question. The question was where are we leading efforts to achieve full diversity? Is it state-wide, county-by-county, campus by campus?
URTEL: Yeah, I didn’t think that far through.

COFFIN: This is Don at Northwest. If we feel like we need separate verbs how about “strives to achieve full diversity to provide” and something now I forgot what it was. “Strives to achieve full diversity”…you know I should write these things down. Anyway, whatever I was thinking there and in the end “and to maintain friendly, collegial, and humane environments at every level of the institution.” “To achieve full diversity, to develop” no develop is wrong.

HAWKINS: Provide.

GROS LOUIS: We’ve used provide though two sentences before.

HAWKINS: I think it’s repletion we’re worried about.

GROS LOUIS: How about “offer leadership”?

HATTAB: “Promote”.

GROS LOUIS: “Promote” how about “promote”?

NG: I think the problem with leadership in creative solutions is kind of in between two concepts that kind of go together. Achieving full diversity in a friendly, collegial, and human environment seems to me kind of go together. Leadership and creative solutions in the 21st century actually go with the previous sentence.

HAWKINS: If you just change “achieving” to “achieve” don’t you fix the problem? “Strives to achieve” and “strives to promote” leadership and “strives to create” friendly.

GROS LOUIS: Well, again we use create in the preceding sentence remember. What you could say, based on your suggestion, “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, promote leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and maintain friendly, collegial, and humane environments at every level of the institution.

NG: Sounds good.

GROS LOUIS: “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, promote leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems, and maintain friendly, collegial, and humane environments at every level of the institution.”

HAWKINS: What happened to create?

KISH: You used it in the previous sentence.

SPECHLER: I think Bart is right. I think we should take up his point that leadership and creative solutions goes with the dynamic partnerships and diversity and humane environment go
together. And that would even out the sentences in length. So if we were to say “enter into dynamic partnerships for so and so development” “and offer leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems.” That kind of goes together. And then we talk about diversity and humane environments.

**GROS LOUIS:** Ok, so your suggestion is that in the preceding sentence we say “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social and cultural development and…”

**SPECHLER:** “and offer leadership…”

**GROS LOUIS:** “and offer leadership?”

**NG:** What about “by offering leadership in creative solutions for 21st century problems.”

**GROS LOUIS:** “By offering”

**NG:** No actually that doesn’t sound so good.

**KRAVCHUK:** That almost sounds as though we’re willing to cue up and what we really want to do is take over. [Laughter] We already say we want to be right out in front.

**NG:** “And to offer leadership”

**HAWKINS:** What about “provide leadership”? 

**NG:** “IU seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state blah, blah, blah…and to provide leadership in creative solutions for 21st century problems.”

**GROS LOUIS:** We just had provide in the previous sentence.

**NG:** “To exercise leadership”

[“assert” “promote”]

**DE TIENNE:** We could drop the leadership and say promote creative solutions.

**GROS LOUIS:** And promotes creative solutions? How’s that sound? And promotes creative solutions.

**HATTAB:** Better.

**GROS LOUIS:** And promotes creative solutions, like that, everybody?

**COFFIN:** I think parallelism would require “to promote”. “…to create and to promote…”
GROS LOUIS: Ok. So this sentence would read “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development and to promote creative solutions for 21st century problems.”

HATTAB: Can we say challenges instead of problems?

GROS LOUIS: Everybody comfortable with that?

MCCORMICK: I think problems is more clear than challenges. I would recommend retaining problems.

GROS LOUIS: The comment here is that problems is more precise than challenges. Do we need the sentence one more time? “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development and to promote creative solutions for the 21st century problems.” Are we ready to vote on that?

POMPER: Do we really just promote? Somehow provide those even though we provide already in the previous sentence maybe look for a better word that’s synonymous to provide. Because promoting alone just to say we should use it, whereas providing means we come up with which is a higher aspiration.

KRAVCHUK: Do we want to use the word develop again? We just used development. It could be developing.

GROS LOUIS: Another alternative is to go back to the previous sentence and change the word “provide” there to something else. Such as offer…

LUDLUM FOOS: What if we said, “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships etc., etc., by offering leadership and finding creative solutions for 21st century problems.”

GROS LOUIS: I like that “by offering leadership” but then to say “and finding” you have an awful lot of gerunds floating around in there. A cascade of gerunds. [Laughter] A gaggle of gerunds.

COFFIN: This is Don at Northwest again. I actually like “to offer leadership and creative solutions” the more I look at it.

LUDLUM FOOS: So you’ve got…

COFFIN: We’re putting us in a partnership even in the leadership and solutions part of it that in saying that IU has the answers and we will provide you with them.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, so let me see how that sounds to you? “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development, and to offer leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems.” Are you prepared to vote on that? Bill?
**WHEELER:** Could someone explain how we’re supposed to provide that leadership? Because as I look at this I find myself thinking about you know we’re faculty and our primary mission, I suppose this is part of our mission, part of our service mission or something like that? But I’m wondering you know, it’s phrased here in a way that is a little curious. Are we suggesting that we’re going to have faculty members whose entire responsibility is to serve this mission, to provide this leadership?

**FISHER:** I don’t think it says that.

**LUDLUM FOOS:** One of the things research does is helps provide creative solutions.

**WHEELER:** Oh I quite agree, that’s why I would have like to see it say “creative leadership through research”.

**FISHER:** But that’s not the only way we do it. We have an active engagement, civic engagement.

**WHEELER:** Well that was the next question I was gonna raise is that it isn’t clear to me that this statement subsumes IUPUI’s commitment to civic engagement. I was just looking at all the mission statements and this is suppose to be the lead into the, the context of this is supposed to be as the first mission statement to be followed by all the campus mission statements. I was just looking to see to what extent this actually does incorporate or is consistent with all these mission statements. It wasn’t entirely clear to me that this is mission expansive for IUPUI’s statement about civic engagement.

**LUDLUM FOOS:** You don’t think leadership and creative solutions is expansive?

**FISHER:** That’s kind of civic engagement.

**WHEELER:** Well look at your list of civic engagement on your website. It seems to me that the IUPUI website talks about civic engagement in somewhat broader than what this is saying.

**GROS LOUIS:** Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** It seems to me like the term is broad enough to encompass many things and in many ways in which we could provide leadership. I think in terms of thought leadership and intellectual leadership, active engagement in the community, or in those times when a piece of research will lead to a phone call that will get a member of the faculty out either working with a firm or a government organization to develop sort of a practical feet on the ground application of something that they brought up in their office or in the lab. I mean there are lots of ways that it could imply. Is that different than what you were…I don’t think I understand your comment.

**FISHER:** I think it’s more comprehensive. Just because it’s not explicit doesn’t mean it’s not implicit.
**WHEELER:** And in all of the civic engagement at IUPUI is to always provide leadership or just to engage with the community organizations?

**LUDLUM FOOS:** Dynamic partnerships.

**GROS LOUIS:** Let’s see what the response is if you’re ready to vote on the sentence that will read “Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development, and to offer leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems.” All in favor of that sentence say indicate by saying aye. [AYE]

**GROS LOUIS:** Opposed? Abstain? Other campuses?

[AYE]

**GROS LOUIS:** Okay, thanks. The last sentence may be the easiest. [Laughter] But I hate to make that bold statement. “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity and a friendly, collegial, humane…no and friendly, collegial, humane environments at every level of the institution.” “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity and friendly, collegial, humane environments at every level of the institution.”

**WHEELER:** I would like to see the insertion of “academic freedom” in that sentence. In the Bloomington, the corresponding Bloomington…

**COFFIN:** I would kind of like to see it say “and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments” If we said we’re striving to achieve them that suggests that we believe at some place we don’t have those at the moment. [Laughter]

**GROS LOUIS:** Some folks here are nodding that they don’t.

**COFFIN:** Oh well.

**GROS LOUIS:** But I think “to maintain” is a good point. Then, how are we going to get in academic freedom, Bill?

**HAWKINS:** Isn’t that covered under collegiality? Isn’t academic freedom contained underneath the notion of collegiality?

**SCHNEIDER:** Well but it’s not parallel to the other items.

**WHEELER:** In the Bloomington statement the words “academic freedom” immediately follow “full diversity”. The verb is a little different there but this was an issue at the Bloomington Faculty Council. I think that Bob was the one who spoke to this and I think supported that in this part where we are essentially saying that our aims are to satisfy our values that academic freedom needs to be in here. I would suggest inserting it immediately after the phrase “full diversity”.
LUDLUM FOOS: Do you have specific wording?

IVIE: You can add the phrase to the very end “with a full commitment to academic freedom.”

FISHER: That’s good.

GROS LOUIS: What about “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial and humane environments, while…”

SPECHLER: Something simple like “humane environments and academic freedom.”

GROS LOUIS: So maintain…

SPECHLER: “Maintain humane environments and academic freedom.”

GROS LOUIS: So we drop “at every level of the institution” and you think that’s ok. Bill does that sound ok with you?

SPECHLER: Just insert “and academic freedom” in that sentence.

GROS LOUIS: And drop “at every level of the institution” because I’m not sure we need. So it would read “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial and humane environments and academic freedom.”

SPECHLER: “At every level.”

GROS LOUIS: Then we would forget that clause. Are we comfortable with that? Do you want to leave “at every level of the institution” or end with “academic freedom”? Marty? End with “academic freedom” or “academic freedom at every level of the institution”?

FISHER: Just leave it “academic freedom.”

GROS LOUIS: “…and academic freedom.” Or “at every level of the institution.”

SPECHLER: I would leave it but it’s just a matter of style.

HAWKINS: Does academic freedom apply to all levels and constituents of the institution?

FINKBINE: Groundskeepers don’t have it.

GROS LOUIS: Academic freedom is really unique to faculty and not to staff and not others. Alright so what about the sentence “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments and academic freedom.”

HAWKINS: Yes.
GROS LOUIS: Are you ready to vote on that? One more time. “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments and academic freedom.”

HAWKINS: Could you read it the way Bob had suggested which was a little more set off and separate from…you said and a commitment to maintain academic freedom?

IVIE: “…with a full commitment to academic freedom.”

HAWKINS: “full commitment to academic freedom.”

NG: “strong commitment”

GROS LOUIS: So “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments, with a strong commitment to academic freedom.”

IVIE: What stimulated me to say it that way is that if you read the “friendly, collegial, and humane” it really suggests that we just don’t like anybody who speaks up or speaks out.

GROS LOUIS: Ok let me read this one more time. So the last sentence would read “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments, with a strong commitment to academic freedom.”

COFFIN: I think the commitment to academic freedom belongs in the second sentence of this. Something like “the university’s mission is to promote academic freedom and to provide…” Right now it almost feels like a throw away as something that was stuck in at the last second. [Laughter] I know it was. [Laughter]

GROS LOUIS: Do you want to vote on this version and if it’s voted down we’ll come back to Don’s suggestion? Ok what we’re voting on is “Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments, with a strong commitment to academic freedom.” All those in favor of that sentence indicate by saying aye [AYE] opposed? Other campuses? [NO] Is that South Bend? IUPUI? [We have seven for and one against]. Ok, and IPFW? [Both for]. And Northwest? [That’s fine with me]. Ok, then the motion passes. And I’m sure that Kelly has all of these changes.

NG: Should we vote on this in its entirety?

GROS LOUIS: Kelly can you read that? [Laughter] I’m not sure I can read mine. Do you want to vote on the whole thing if I can read it. Ok. “Indiana University is a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical, and technological education. Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education for students throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services. Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and
local communities in economic, social, and cultural development and to offer leadership and creative solutions for 21st century problems. Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, humane environments, with a strong commitment to academic freedom.”

COFFIN: Could you read the first sentence again please? [Laughter]

GROS LOUIS: Sure. “Indiana University is a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical, and technological education.”

HAWKINS: When you read it it sounds really good.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

LUDLUM FOOS: I have a problem with the syntax of the sentence beginning with “Indiana University’s mission is to provide…” “provide broad access to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education for students throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world as well as” it’s really kind of ambiguous, I mean from the context you can tell but Indiana, the United States, the world as well as academic programs…we kind of shifted from talking about where our students are coming from to what we’re offering all in the same punctuation. And maybe I’m the only one who finds that awkward.

GROS LOUIS: It seems to me the clause “mission is to provide” broad access for those we identify, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services.

LUDLUM FOOS: I know what we mean it just sounds funny to me.

HAWKINS: Is it to provide access to outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services? Is that what we’re providing access to?

GROS LOUIS: No just provide. Providing broad access to these students but also providing outstanding academic and cultural programs.

HAWKINS: We’re providing access to those programs for students and that will unclutter it.

LUDLUM FOOS: But also to the public, some of those things.

GROS LOUIS: Are you ready to vote on the whole thing and then we’ll send it to the Style and Rules Committee.

NG: It doesn’t exist anymore.

GROS LOUIS: I was probably on the Council who moved to eliminate it! [Laughter]. All those in favor of the statement as I read it indicate it by saying aye [AYE]. IUPUI? [All for] Thank you. South Bend? [AYE] Thanks, Fort Wayne [AYE]. Thank you. It’s almost time to adjourn.
[Laughter] Now we move on to Item 6 which is the Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and who is going to take the leadership on that?

**SPECHLER:** I would just like to say Ken, we’ll be very fortunate indeed to have your successor with your patience and good humor.

**KISH:** I’d actually just point out that we have to do executive session before they kick us off.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

**MILLER:** Bill is going to come to the podium and speak briefly.

**NG:** Five minutes

**WHEELER:** Thank you. My task is basically just to prepare the floor for your discussion and building on something that...we’re doing admissions at this point in time... for your discussion on this draft on admissions and I think the thing that I should just say actually has to do with something that Ted said earlier at a Bloomington Faculty Council meeting. This is called admissions policies but it’s really more in the way of guidelines and I think that’s the thing that I should address for just a moment here.

This Council typically has adopted policies that are prescriptive to all campuses, as in the Student Code that we adopted last year, as in various faculty policies, as in various and sundry things of that nature. So it’s a policy that we adopt and then actually it applies uniformly across all the campuses. When it come to educational policy, it isn’t clear that this Council has quite that same authority because academic policies are to a large extent invested in the school faculties and to a lesser extent in the campus level. And so both this document and also in the general education document, the documents are...the issue of what constitutes the university policy and the answer is that in these educational areas, that these documents before us are written with the perspective that at the university level, the university level policies are guidelines that may be adopted by individual campuses and individual schools. That is to say, in contrast to the current handbook statement on admission policies, which was really adopted to actually be prescriptive and therefore to actually be followed by all campuses although in point of fact its followed by no campus, this is proposed as a guideline that campuses could use as a standard from which to develop their own. And so all those things that say admissions policies, it at the university level, it’s actually a set of guidelines that campuses could use. I think as you read this you will then see that the document undertakes to empower in anticipation of a discussion by the Trustees of admissions policies. It undertakes to empower the campuses to set up admissions policies which are apropos for their particular situations and so in that sense it is not anticipated that the words themselves would be very literally incorporated into any campus’ specific admission policy but rather that this provides a set of guidelines for campuses to use as a starting point in developing their own policies. In that sense it’s very different from the current handbook policy, this is not a core, this would be, we hope in every policy, but rather a set of guidelines to be used as a point of departure by the campuses for developing their own policies.
At the same time, by putting forth a set of guidelines, it does attempt to preserve some sense of unity for Indiana University. We just, in the mission statement, deleted the historical portion which says that Indiana University was founded in 1820 and is now spread out to be eight campuses across the state. One of the issues before this Council and especially in the context of the mission differentiation, is the issue of in what sense are we one university. And the proposal that is coming to you from the Educational Policies Committee for your discussion is to say that unity exists in the form of guidelines and shared values and not in some sense of prescriptive policy, educational policy for each of the campuses. So that’s the introductory perspective on this that one needs to have; that this is not like the Student Code, it’s not like tenure policies, tenure ranks and things like that. But this then is a statement of values and guidelines that would constitute shared values of the university and give a point of departure for the individual campuses.

NG: Thank you. I think we open up the floor for discussion. Marty?

SHECHLER: Well, Bill, you present it very clearly as two alternatives: one, prescription, one guidance. But I wonder whether these two polar alternatives solve the problem that students in the state of Indiana often don’t pursue an academically rigorous program in their high school and therefore when they come to Indiana University have a number of deficits. I would like to suggest though, that within this, that we have a clear message to the high schools in the state of Indiana, that the CORE 40 program, high school education is required to be admitted to Indiana University. If we just have guidelines and flexibility, I’m for flexibility beyond this. But flexibility means a diverse and a very muddy message to our high schools. And that’s what we want to do. If we want to tell them that if you want to prepare for Indiana University on any of its campuses the CORE 40 would be the minimum requirement. Now I’d like to suggest that in this respect we shouldn’t back off from the prescription element.

WHEELER: Well…

NG: Bill, could you actually quickly repeat the question for the benefit of the people who are not in this room?

WHEELER: The question was whether or not to be prescriptive on the issue of the CORE 40 and so if I can respond quickly on that. The CORE, what is not widely recognized is that the CORE 40 is actually weaker than our current admissions policy. The CORE can be satisfied with 15, I think, academic credits. Whereas our current policy calls for 18 academic credits. This is because both in its present form and its future form, it has issues of electives that can be satisfied by either college prep courses such as foreign languages or by non-college preparatory courses such as vocational business education. And so the sense of the Educational Policies Committee is that we wanted to not weaken our requirements. It’s also the case though that there is some doubt as to whether some high school in the state will actually be able to offer the CORE 40 or will be able to offer it to all of their students. And so therefore if we were to put, to enshrine, CORE 40 in a prescriptive way then we actually might work against our access, our mission of access, and so for that reason and because also—although for many of the campuses, for South Bend, for Northwest, for East, for South East and also for Bloomington, a very important part of our
constituency are the students from out of state. Then we should cast our academic, referring here to Section Two, our academic preparation in terms of what we think are the course work that people should really take. A careful reading of the academic coursework, you’ll find out that it’s actually stronger than CORE 40, if one were to actually sit down and compare.

We are carefully walking around a couple of issues here. On the one hand Senate Bill 200 says that CORE 40 should be a requirement, CORE 40 or the equivalent should be a requirement for regular admission to all universities. That is to say that it should a necessary condition. The Regional Campus Agreement says that the CORE 40 with a minimum grade of C in each subject should be a sufficient condition for that. And there are objections from various corners within the university from both sides of that argument. The Music School for example has indicated that it accepts students who don’t satisfy the CORE 40. J.T. Forbes’ description of the university’s lobbying efforts on Senate Bill 200 indicated that the university was making the case for CORE 40 or equivalent bearing in mind especially the needs of the School of Music because some of the students there will focus very intently on things relevant to music in terms of preparation—its very difficult to get into the Bloomington School of Music and they have to devote a lot of time to that. There’s also a sense that the CORE 40 is designed more with an eye to the needs of the industry than to the needs of preparing for a liberal arts education. Commissioner Jones was on the Bloomington campus several weeks ago, Marty you were at that meeting perhaps when Stan Jones was here I forget. But at any rate, one of the issues that I raised with commissioner is that on the one hand the Higher Education Commission wants us to increase the amount of effort that we’re making in the remediation. On the Bloomington campus and I think its true on all the campuses, the greatest single error in remediation happens to be mathematics. And on the Bloomington campus, a person who has CORE 40, and just has CORE 40 is going to have to start in remedial math courses. We currently have over 1700 students taking remedial math courses on the Bloomington campus and this is because they satisfy only the CORE 40 requirements in mathematics.

On the other hand, CORE 40 division is taking three years of sciences and there’s certainly parts of physics that are difficult to understand if you don’t have trigonometry, if you don’t have much knowledge of exponential functions. So that there’s a case to be made that from a pedagogical point of view, it should be the case that one should spend a bit more time in mathematics and then take their sciences at the university level. I’ve put this to Stan Jones as whether there was a pedagogical justification for the mathematics and science portions of CORE 40 and he was unable to provide any pedagogical rationale for why we do not, why CORE 40 does not require enough mathematics to go on to college but requires enough science, so it requires more science than mathematics. So there’s this, I’m wrapping up here.

NG: Actually, I want to… the question I’m asking, sorry for interruption, I think all the people are not clear in their minds on the academic preparation, some of those items if I read them correctly, exceed the CORE 40 requirements and some of them the CORE 40 requirement is actually stronger, is that correct?

WHEELER: The CORE 40 is more specific, in terms of total credits, this is stronger than the CORE 40 in terms of college preparatory courses that are required, its stronger. It is less specific in that the CORE 40 specifies six credits of science whereas in this one it specifies four credits of
science but then in Item #5 it’s says you have to have seven other credits and if you spend those seven credits in the physical sciences then you will satisfy the CORE 40 thing. So, it is consistent with CORE 40 but it’s stronger than CORE 40. It is consistent with CORE 40, it’s not as specific.

NG: But that requirement #2 exceeds, in terms of specificity, you’re requiring six credits of mathematics versus four that CORE 40 explicitly requires, is that correct?

WHEELER: CORE 40 requires six.

NG: Six?

WHEELER: # 2 is exactly the same as CORE 40.

NG: Okay, so when you referred to trigonometry maybe I misunderstood you. Alright, go ahead.

WHEELER: So anyway, there are issues. There are a variety of issues concerning the CORE 40 and so that’s why in this particular proposal we have opted to provide a list of what we believe are the courses that students should take. If someone carefully compares this list of courses to the CORE 40, one will find that the total number of credits is stronger but at the same time it does provide a little bit more flexibility in terms of the course work and that flexibility is consistent with the university’s posture on Senate Bill 200 where the university supported the language that said the students should have a CORE 40 or an equivalent degree. And now, at the end after listing # 1 through #6, it does say students who attend high school in Indiana should equate a CORE 40 high school diploma or equivalent or a CORE 40 academic honors high school diploma or equivalent.

NG: Bill?

SCHNEIDER: Bart could you remind us again where this draft policy is coming from and why are we considering it, where it’s going and when?

NG: The policy or as you’ll recall Mission Differentiation, one of the recommendations is that each campus will determine its own admissions policy. That recommendation itself has not been voted on by the Trustees. In the mean time, I think this particular policy, we asked the Educational Policies Committee to see whether we can in fact come up with a kind of a set of guideline for the campuses, for the campuses as they proceed to discuss their admissions policies so that we will not start off in any and all directions. So this is, as Bill pointed out, is meant to be a set of guidelines for discussion and…

SCHNEIDER: If and when the Trustees decide that…

NG: That’s correct, if and when the Trustees decide that we’re going to move ahead with different admissions policies, then we have a leg up on the process. Bob?
IVIE: Question for clarification, these guidelines are for admission to the university not to a specific school, is that correct?

WHEELER: There are guidelines for admission to the university rather than to a particular school. That’s an unusual question. Admission is typically to a campus and it is true that various campuses [schools] have direct admission programs and they may set somewhat higher standards for direct admission to it. But as the School of Music in the local Educational Policies Committee meeting this morning that they would want to admit students who are subsequently flagged when the applications go to the admissions office because there may be some questions as to whether they satisfy the campus or university criterion at this point in time. So the answer there is that admission policies are primarily the providence of campuses. Schools may have somewhat stronger requirements for direct admission, but everyone has to be admitted to the campus.

IVIE: That’s what I was getting at; when I said school I was thinking of your example of the Music School. Really these would be guidelines for whether a student would be admitted to a particular campus or not. Not whether they would be able to get into a school in that campus.

NG: Bill it was also just pointed out to me as we talked about guidelines, the heading of the document says “University Faculty Council Educational Policies Committee, Admissions Policies” perhaps it can be changed to Guidelines?

WHEELER: Well, that’s why I was saying that in educational matters, the university level policy is a set of guidelines for the campuses. What constitutes a university level policy and I think university level policy is a set of guidelines.

NG: As long as it’s understood.

SCHNEIDER: You gave examples when it’s not the case.

NG: I beg your pardon?

SCHNEIDER: You gave examples when it’s not the case.

WHEELER: No, I just said with the educational matters as opposed to faculty matters and personnel matters and the Student Code or something.

NG: Cathy?

LUDLUM FOOS: I still think that if we want to be clear that these are guidelines that it’s probably better not to use the word policy because generally speaking policy means something we’re all bound to go along with and so if you mean for it to be guidelines why not call it guidelines. Then everybody knows.

WHEELER: That’s fine with me. The section in the Handbook is called admissions policy and that’s the origin of the term.
NG: Marilyn?

KINTZELE: Who approves the various campus admissions policies? Is that the Trustees or does it come under some other purview or is it not… it should be somehow looked at by the whole university what each campus has it as its policy?

WHEELER: The question had to do with whether or not… can you repeat the question again?

KINTZELE: Who approves individual campus policies other than just the approval that takes place on that campus? Is there some overall approval, you know, like Trustees approve all admissions polices or is it somebody at the central administration in Indiana University that looks at it?

MILLER: Marilyn I would say at this point that that actually isn’t quite clear to me. But my understanding is that in March or April, the Trustees are expecting to have presented to them a set of admissions policies: one for the university, maybe it will be guidelines and one for each campus. I guess my expectation is that they are going to approve those. It isn’t clear to me that this Council is going to be in the approval business for the admissions for each campus. I could imagine that this can be an unusual situation really. But normally the Trustees don’t deal with policies that are sort of individual campus policies. But this seems to be, given the Mission Differentiation Project, given this recommendation coming out of the project; I think they are expecting to see the individual campus policies.

KINTZELE: Ok, thank you.

NG: Whether they are going to approve it or not, we frankly don’t know. But I think the development of the policy, the responsibility to come up with the policies, rests with the faculty on the campuses.

JONES: This is Betty Jones at IUPUI. We’re getting a lot of mic feedback, if somebody has something…Thank you.

NG: Betty did you want to say something? Do you want to add something?

JONES: Well, I’d like the group to know that the Educational Policies Committee has been working on this this fall and received sort of a hustle up message from our fearless leaders to get a draft together for this body to review starting today. I think we’ve tried to put something together that gives us something to talk about but is certainly not in a final phase at all. A concern I have is that in the Handbook now, we have something that is, as Bill said, is identified as an admissions policy for the university, yet we’re now going about devising guidelines so perhaps we’re going to have to, in our actions, propose that we would rescind the current policies and replace them with guidelines or… those sorts of steps, I think we need to look to in our work. One of the things that we tried to identify I think a bit more specifically in this document is external transfers and then inter-campus transfer. So I think since we only have quite a bit on
interest in students moving from one of our campuses to another that we have tried to address that. Those will be comments for the moment.

NG: Okay, thank you Betty. Yes?

MCCORMICK: Just in terms of looking at this particular document though, and I don’t know if this helps in clarification, but this document appears to me to be in fact the admissions policies guidelines or guidelines for admissions policies, in a sense that it provides a guide for the development of admissions policies and so titling it such might make it clear.

NG: Thank you. I actually have one more question that was raised with me by somebody. You made a distinction between the inter-campus transfer requiring that the person have at least or rather instate, I believe. That’s right, for residents, we only require 2.0, for out-of-state you require 2.5 and somebody said well, you know, the out-of-state people actually pay more, why should we discriminate against them? So perhaps you can address that question.

WHEELER: This is the current policy. So this is the exactly what’s in the current Handbook. So, we just carried that over. This is under External Transfer Students, item # 2, transfer student accumulate a grade point average of at least a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale for Indiana residents and it’s a 2.5 on a 4.0 scale for Non-Indiana residents. So then this is the existing policy. It goes back a long time, somebody else might want to comment on the rationale. My speculation has always been that this is part of a recognition as a state institution, a state public institution that we have a commitment to serve the needs of the students from Indiana and we have an access mission there that we do not have, although we provide access to students from Indiana, the United States and the world or whatever words we just adopted, in terms of a mission there is a qualitative and quantitative difference in the nature of our access mission to students from the state of Indiana in comparison to others.

NG: Markus and then Cathy?

POMPER: I would like to add that this appears to be relic from the 1960s and maybe it is time to do away with it. Particularly because some of our regional campuses have reciprocity agreements with neighboring states. For example, at IU East we have such an agreement with Ohio which allows students to enroll at IU East at in-state rates. So to discriminate against those students I think is uncalled for and I think now is the time to do away with treating out-of-state students different than in-state students for example.

LUDLUM FOOS: My comment is related in the sense that it seems that if you are a campus that has competitive admissions it makes sense to make the standards for out-of-state students higher because you want the in-state students to have a competitive advantage. But for the regional campuses where admission is typically not competitive simply to penalize the out-of-state students is hurting us more than anybody else because it’s cutting down our pool of enrollees. So that seems to me to be one of the things that maybe an individual campus might have but that doesn’t seem to fit in the university guidelines that apply to all of us.

GROS LOUIS: Marty?
SPECHLER: Bill you gave us, as usual, a very cogent reply to my original comment but I’d like to say that I think we differ. I think if Indiana University does not have a unified policy to hold out to Indiana high schools we will be missing an opportunity to strengthen academic preparation at the secondary level and if we have just guidelines and therefore policies at eight different campuses it won’t have the same effect in mobilizing the state to improve academic preparation. And I think Indiana needs stronger academic preparation and I think you do too.

[He needs stronger academic preparation??? Laughter]

WHEELER: One of the difficult issues here is that the university’s agreements with the state provide different flexibilities for Bloomington on the one hand versus IUPUI and the other campuses on the other hand. The Regional Agreement very carefully does say that CORE 40 with a minimum grade of C is supposed to be sufficient for admission unless you are in a competitive admissions situation. So at that point in time it says that you know that removes your ability to firmly say you need more than CORE 40 because if it says that CORE 40 with a grade of C in all of the requirements is sufficient then you know…

SPECHLER: I think that CORE 40 and these requirements should be a necessary condition but not necessarily sufficient for admission. And the important thing is to hold out a very clear message to the state and to high schools that this is the desirable level for university work.

WHEELER: I agree fully but you know I have reservations about saying that CORE is sufficient but it’s unfortunately the case that our former President and the Board of Trustees signed a contract with the Higher Education Commission saying that at IUPUI and the regional campuses if a student has a CORE 40 diploma with a grade of C in all the requirements then the campuses are required to admit them and it’s sufficient. This is the Regional Campus Agreement and you know the status of that agreement according to the President’s Office is that we have not yet reached that point but you know we have to, we are being, on the one hand the CORE 40 and the Regional Campus Agreement is saying that for all the campuses except for Bloomington it’s supposed to be a sufficient condition. And for the Senate Bill 200 it says it should be a necessary condition. And so for all the campuses except for Bloomington it’s the case that those campuses are obligated to have as an admission requirement is a CORE 40 with a grade of C.

GROS LOUIS: Some observations I made at BFC that I might mention here that Charlie Nelms and I have looked at the students with a CORE 40 who applied to all IU campuses in the fall of 2004. Twenty-two percent of them were not admitted to any campus. Why? Because CORE 40 has no GPA requirement. So although they completed CORE 40 they may have had a GPA of 1.0. I think it was 22 percent, almost a quarter, of those with CORE 40 were not admitted to any IU campus.

Further, Charlie through his contacts and working with people at IU East we found that at some schools and some inner-city schools in the northern part of the state, that CORE 40 is not available because the laboratories are not there. What Larry Richards has found is that some high schools in the IU East region, CORE 40 is available but only to a limited number of students. So what is disturbing about CORE 40, in addition to it not having a GPA requirement, is the fact
there are some schools—and maybe they’ll have it by 2010 but they don’t now—or if they have it, in some rural areas of the state, they can only offer it to a certain number of students. Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Ken I want to endorse what Marty Spechler has said about sending a clear signal about what is required but you know we are in a little bit of a pickle here. It seems to me that our ability to improve the quality of the overall undergraduate population is limited by the under-resourced secondary education system that we have in the state. And I, but I still think that we need to be very, very clear with the various school corporations in the state that they are simply not producing the products that are going to succeed, at least not at Indiana University. One hopes that sometime in the next decade, sooner if possible, that the community college system will be able to take these kids and mold them into something that we will be able to work with in their second, third, or perhaps their fourth year. But up to that point it seems that our efforts here are going to be severely limited by what we have to work with.

WHEELER: Marty I fully agree with your desire to send the strongest possible message on the need for adequate preparation and the question is how do we do that given the constraints that we’re under and given that this is a public document. Again let me point out that if you add up the number of credits that are listed in items #1-#6 that it adds up to 28 college credits; CORE 40 only requires 26 college credits. So this is already a stronger message than the CORE 40. The CORE 40, there is the issue of the electives, you can have for your academic electives you can have courses in the foreign languages, you can have courses in arts and you can have courses in business/technical/vocational. And if the student undertakes to put his/her electives in non-college prep courses than a student can get a CORE 40 degree with only 26 college prep credits so the list that we have here is in fact stronger than CORE 40 and this was a policy position that the Educational Policies Committee wanted to take. Twenty-six is not enough, we really need you to take 28. So this document is in terms of the number of college prep courses required saying something stronger than CORE 40. Now again, that’s contrary to what the Regional Campus Agreement says.

GROS LOUIS: This is clearly just a preliminary discussion. Let me give an opportunity for the individuals on the other campuses to comment. Any questions at IUPUI? South Bend? Fort Wayne? Northwest?

AGENDA ITEM #7 GENERAL EDUCATION

GROS LOUIS: What Bart has suggested is that we go to the next item so at least there’s an introduction to the general education as well as the introduction to admissions. We have to break at 4:15 so those not on the Council will leave so that we can have the Executive Session at that time. So we’ll move to the next item on the agenda which is a discussion of general education and Bill are you going to take the lead on that also? Bill?

WHEELER: Again, I want to emphasize that the committee’s view of this is as a set of guidelines that schools in particular and campuses can adopt. In particular is that under the University Faculty Constitution that the schools are the decision-making and policy-making authority on requirements for degrees. There is some ambiguity as to the authority of the UFC
and of campus faculty councils vis-à-vis the schools. And there are different views of this. On the IUPUI campus it’s very much a campus-level policy that is imposed on all the schools. On the Bloomington campus it’s actually the other way around where the schools have the final say over their own general education policies and that is an issue that the College of Arts & Sciences in Bloomington feels very strongly about.

I don’t want to, I’m not going to spend time to go through all these materials because there are so many things here. I hope that you have time to look at it; in particular the cover letter from April 10th in which we describe the origin and context of the proposal and then we lay out some issues, particularly school degree requirements, campus degree requirements, and general education competencies, the issue of transferability of general education curricula versus principles, so on and so forth. I think I would like for just one moment though to say a word or two about the origins of this.

The origins of this are in the President’s Inaugural Address and in his statements to this Council in the spring two years ago. What he actually said there was that if every campus of the university is going to offer a degree that says Indiana University then there should be a shared general education curriculum. The President isn’t here but I did check with Roland before I came. That isn’t quite right. What should be said there is that every campus doesn’t offer a degree that says Indiana University we offer diplomas that say Indiana University. And if you look at the back of the packet there you will actually see samples from all the campuses. However, one thing that has been brought to my attention is that in point of fact that all the campuses offer diplomas that say Indiana University is not quite right because since 1971 the Indianapolis campus has offered one that says Indiana University-Purdue University. So in some sense the President’s rationale was not accurate. And I think that is perhaps relevant to our discussions here.

You know the Indianapolis campus has a very different history than do the other campuses and there is a recent document that was discussed in August on the Indianapolis campus; it’s a wonderful document to read. It’s called “A Brief History and Overview of IUPUI General Education Principles of Undergraduate Learning: August 2005.” [End of Tape 2, Side A, some comments lost]

…urban university formed in 1969 through the merger of a number of graduate and professional programs with brand new schools in the arts and sciences. And I think if one contrasts that opening sentence and the flavor of the rest of the document with the sentence that was struck from the mission statement one is struck by the contrast there because the general education on all of the other campuses of Indiana University does actually trace itself back to the history of Indiana University from its original founding in 1820 and the general education policies on other campuses maintain a historical continuity with the development of Indiana University. On the other hand the Indianapolis campus views itself as a new creation as of 1969/1970 that stands apart from Indiana University; its history begins in 1969, not in 1820 when the history of all the other campuses begins. And I think this is very relevant then because if we attend to the issue of the degrees, the diplomas that are actually offered, there are some real differences there. The Indianapolis campus has done some tremendous things with the Principles for Undergraduate Education; at the same time it’s not something that grew out of the liberal arts because the
Principles of Undergraduate Learning evolved from discussions with the professional schools and it tries to meet their needs and then it works backwards to things that are shared. Whereas on all the other campuses the general education requirement grows out of the tradition of the liberal arts education.

It seems to me entirely plausible, in fact the document was written in such a way as to permit campuses and schools independence on these types of things, and it may well be that in terms of general education if you look at the general education proposal you have before you it is based on a careful examination of the general education policies at the South Bend campus, the Southeast campus, the Fort Wayne campus, on the Kokomo campus, on the East campus, and on the Bloomington campus, as well as on the Indianapolis campus. And if you look at the policies on all of them, especially the recent developments on the Fort Wayne campus, the South Bend campus, and the Southeast campus, they have done some wonderful things in their more traditional liberal arts oriented general education. And the proposal really stems and really draws strongly on the work that’s been done on those three campuses in terms of its framing. And it seems to me that one possible outcome of this, given the fact that it’s not the case that all the campuses offer a diploma that says Indiana University that it may be the case that we end up having liberal arts directed general education proposal for many campuses but at the same time we want to provide the flexibility for the Indianapolis campus to continue its unique experiment and development as a new university in terms of its Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

GROS LOUIS: You’ve had a chance to look at the document. Observations or questions? Mary?

FISHER: I had two observations. My first question is to what extent did the committee poll schools that grant degrees to see to what extent this proposal is in alignment with either current realities or capabilities of the schools within their degree frameworks?

WHEELER: So the answer is yes we have looked at those issues and the remaining issues there I believe are the issues of the minimum grade point requirement and the issue of requiring a laboratory science as opposed to just a science—that those are the two main, when you look at, that’s the only place where this is in any sense really stronger than any of the degrees in any of the colleges of liberal arts and sciences on the campuses. We very carefully looked at the degree requirements of all the schools of arts and sciences, schools of liberal arts, and schools of sciences and in terms of their degree requirements, that is it is the case it is consistent with those except for the issue of, in terms of the course requirements, for the bachelor’s degree…

FISHER: I’m asking about the other schools, not liberal arts, like professional schools or any of the other schools that are not liberal arts oriented that wouldn’t maybe have the same investiture in a liberal arts component. Did you poll all those schools as well?

JONES: This is Betty Jones at IUPUI, co-chairing with Bill, and I would just like to, in terms of a little bit of background, we developed this last year and froze the version in late March-April for people to look at and its still under consideration by schools. So the idea is that probably at the January meeting we would have information from each of the campuses where we hope they are taking a closer look at this to then bring feedback back so the loop isn’t closed at all. This is a
draft for discussion so we’re appreciative of those comments and we’ll certainly take them into consideration.

**GROS LOUIS:** Mary’s question, I think, is were schools such as nursing and business and SPEA, education, also given this draft?

**WHEELER:** Well it was up to the individual campuses to take it to the schools to do that. On the Bloomington campus it has been discussed on the Educational Policies Committee and gone back to the individual schools through that route. So it was certainly the UFC Educational Policies Committee’s expectation that with Nursing and the schools on the Indianapolis campus would be done by the Indianapolis Faculty Council.

**GROS LOUIS:** And has that been done?

**NG:** Well…

**SCHNEIDER:** It’s under process. There are two maybe corrections or different versions of the history of IUPUI and it’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning. I think it’s wrong to say that this was done not from the liberal arts but rather from the professional schools. My recollection was that indeed liberal arts and the school of science were probably central, the professional schools participated in it, but one of the driving forces for doing the Principles of Undergraduate Learning was that we had students in liberal arts and science—you have arts and sciences together in one school and here we don’t—and we needed to have common principles and common requirements so that they were very much part of it. So I think the arts and sciences were definitely central to the development of the IUPUI policy.

The second point is that I also think it’s misleading to say that this was a campus policy that was then centralized and dictated to the schools. In fact the model of IUPUI is something of what you are trying to do here for the whole university. The Principles are set up so then the schools can then use the Principles to adopt their specific general education requirements in their school. And in that sense it’s very parallel to what we’re trying to talk about here today; something done at the university but then the campuses, and then the campuses can develop down to the schools, to come up with the actual requirements.

**WHEELER:** What I said is based entirely on Dean Plater’s foreword; everything I said came from the IUPUI documents on these things and that was the way this current, this was described in the materials that were presented in August 2005 at this conference. The papers there are from Dean Plater and Vice Chancellor Trudy Banta and from Director of the Writing Program Sharon Hamilton. And last year we had communications with all of them; we heard several different presentations by Trudy and by Sharon and Sharon was an active participant in these things. So you know what I say is simply from what these documents—I was not there so I don’t know. What I said is exactly what IUPUI said and they certainly in here say that once the Council on liberal arts and sciences were formed to look at the issue of merging the two schools that that then played a very strong role after in the development of these things. But that in terms if you look back at the original, the first steps toward it, that it predated the…and they described it as the professional schools already existed in Indianapolis and then liberal arts and sciences were
then created and the professional schools were the origin for the campus. The campus began by saying what is the general education that’s needed by the professional schools and that was the origin of this given the fact that we have these professional schools what should our general education be? Whereas the history at most of the other places is that the professional schools grew out of the college of arts and sciences. So in Bloomington for example since the schools did grow out of the College of Arts & Sciences, they carried with them, as they grew out of College of Arts & Sciences, their general education requirements. So there’s a lot of continuity in the general education policies for all the schools on the Bloomington campus because of that shared history. And I suspect that also accounts for much of the commonality in the policies that we see on the Southeast campus, the Fort Wayne campus, you’ll find that they are similar to the Bloomington campus.

MILLER: We’re kind of running out of time here I believe. To me one of the really basic issues here—let’s take Bill, what Bill has told us is that this document is supposed to be essentially similar to admissions document that we were just talking about. It’s supposed to be a set of guidelines. Now some people read the document and don’t think that that really is the way it reads but let’s just suppose that we could kind of work on this document and make it really clear that it is a set of guidelines meant to be directed to the schools as they go forward with their curriculum development, giving them things to think about in terms of general education. To me there is a question of whether that is in fact what we want to do. Is that really what we want to do? Or do we in fact want to work toward a general education curriculum? It seems to me that that’s a fairly fundamental—it’s equivalent to the admissions thing. Do we want a policy at the university level or do we want guidelines that campuses and units can work with? How do we want to operate? It seems to me that’s really a very fundamental kind of question in both of these areas and I think that as we go forward with this we really should kind of come to some kind of consensus if we can about that in both of these areas.

GROS LOUIS: One more comment and then we’ll have to move into Executive Session.

JONES: This is Betty Jones from IUPUI. One of the things that our committee has labored under is what I think Bill has aptly characterized as the ambiguity of whether schools, the faculties in schools set policies such as this or whether it is something that UFC or the Trustees or campuses set. So that’s certainly a dynamic that we’ve had to try to work with and it would be wonderful to have some clarity instead of ambiguity. Can you solve that for us?

GROS LOUIS: I’m sorry but I think we need to go into Executive Session now. So those of you who are not members of the Council will need to wait outside and we will adjourn at the conclusion of the Executive Session.

AGENDA ITEM #8: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES

The Council met in Executive Session for 15 minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 pm.