Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Room 132, University Place and Conference Center
Indianapolis Campus
November 29, 2005
1:30 P.M. – 4:30 P.M.

Attendance


Members Absent with Alternates: Martin Spechler for Jacqueline Blackwell, James Baldwin for Giles Hoyt

Members Absent: Bruce Bergland, Roseanne Cordell, Jennifer Delaney, Brian Fife, Mary Fisher, David Fulton, Ken Gros Louis, Dolores Hoyt, Kevin Hunt, Debomoy Lahiri, Dale McFadden, Michael McRobbie, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Una Mae Reck, C. Michael Renfrow, Nakisha Robertson, Alex Shortle, David Turnipseed, Brian Vargus, Michael Wartell, Maxine Watson, Nanci Yokom, Eric Zeemering

Guests: Maynard Thompson (Office of the President), Nancy Young, Elizabeth Jones (IUPUI, Co-Chair Educational Policies Committee), Henry Karlson (IUPUI, Co-Chair Faculty Governance Committee), Charles Nelms (Vice President for Institutional Development and Student Affairs), John Graves (Faculty Council Office), Rebecca Porter (IUPUI), Michael Sample (Vice President for University Relations)

1. Approval of Minutes
   October 25, 2005
   http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/minutes/10.25.05.htm

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
   (President Adam Herbert)

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

4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
   (President Herbert and Professors Ng and Miller)

5. Conflict of Commitment [ACTION ITEM] (20 minutes)
   (Professors Ted Miller, Marion Wagner, Karen Gable, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee)
6. IU Guidelines for Campus Admissions Policies [FIRST READING] (35 minutes)
(Professors Betty Jones and William Wheeler, UFC Educational Policies Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY05/Circulars/U15-2005.revised.htm

7. Open Discussion on General Education at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (35 minutes)
This open discussion will focus on some broad questions of general education at IU including whether or not IU can or should have one general education program, what the goals of such a program might be, how such a program might be structured, and how such a program might be administered. Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to send comments on this topic directly to the UFC Agenda Committee at ufcoff@indiana.edu.

8. Standing Committee Meetings (60 minutes)
The Council will break at 3:30 p.m. to allow time for the Standing Committees to meet.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HERBERT: We call the Council meeting to order. We have a full agenda with a number of items to discuss this afternoon so let me begin by sharing a few bits of information with you from a presiding officer’s report perspective. First of all, I want all of you to know that we are going to kick off, in a few days a RCM review task force. As you know, it will focus at a macro-policy level. We’re gonna focus on policies and principles as opposed to looking at operational or technical matters. The task force again, we’re still in the process of proposing it, but it will have vice presidents, chancellors, faculty, deans. I’ll have a faculty member that chairs it. I have asked Ted and Bart to each recommend a faculty member from their two campuses. We also will be bringing on board probably two external consultants who are extremely familiar with RCM. We’re gonna ask the task force to take a look at a number of issues. One is, how have the financial and operational conditions changed significantly and if they have from the time that RCM was originally implemented. There were a number of assumptions that were made with regard to state revenue and it’s clear that some of those have changed, but we want to get a very clear handle on that. We want to develop some sense as to what kind of adjustments may be needed to respond to changes in the overall environment in which we’re operating to assure that the benefits of RCM can be fully realized. We also want to develop a sense as to whether or not, as we look at the way it’s currently implemented, does it allow for institutional and campus priorities to be achieved? This is something that is a particular interest to the Board of Trustees. Is there sufficient flexibility to allow for the allocation or reallocation of resources to shifting priorities? We also want to take a look at the current service fee assessment process. It’s clear that that is not generally understood. We want to see if there’s a better way for us to address some of those overhead issues. So again the task force will be looking at those matters in particular. There may be other issues that emerge in the conversation but I think that this is going to be a very significant study. It’s one that I’m especially looking forward to getting started. I can tell you that it’s something, again, that the Board of Trustees is extremely interested in.

We will be making, I can’t say too much about right now other than on Thursday, December 1st, we’re going to be making a very significant announcement. It will be here in Indianapolis. It will relate to our continuing effort to increase the amount of scholarship funding that is available. I
can tell you that this will be one of the most significant announcements that we will make this year. So, that will be on this campus, again on Thursday. There are a number of other things that I could share with you about awards and recognition that our faculty colleagues have received but given the time demands here I’ll pass that up.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Let me, I should have done this first, ask if there are any corrections to the minutes of the October 25th meeting that was posted on the website. If there are no corrections or additions, we’ll assume that those stand approved as presented on the website.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me now turn to Bart for a report from the Agenda Committee.

NG: Again because this is a shortened meeting, I’m going to make my report brief. In the Agenda Committee meeting today we had actually a fairly extensive discussion on general education and I hope that the discussion will continue in this body. The purpose of it really is we want to take input and we want to give a chance to the faculty as a whole to talk about this issue. We know that the EPC has been working on this issue for several years now, almost and it’s almost unfair that the EPC have not really heard directly from the faculty on our views on general education. So we will continue that discussion that was begun at the Agenda Committee during the meeting later.

I just want to also report, or rather to add one item to our agenda today. An item that is forwarded to you by the Agenda Committee, following item #5, on your agenda Conflict of Commitment. We want to add one item, that is, it’s the first reading of a new policy statement of undergraduate admissions, to replace the current IU admissions policy statement in the Academic Handbook. And that actually should be on a sheet included in your packet of information and it’s in the form of a memo from Ted Miller to the University Faculty Council and that statement will be up for first reading and discussion. So if anyone of you cannot find that, perhaps Kelly knows and she will make sure that you have that. But it should be included in your packet. And with that I think that I’ve finished my business.

AGENDA ITEM: #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Ok thank you very much, Bart. We’ve now come to the question and comment period and I recognize Ted first.

MILLER: Thank you very much. I thought that it might be useful for me to talk a little about what has been happening on the Bloomington campus over the last couple of weeks. Just to clarify some of the procedural aspects of this. There is a good bit of misunderstanding I think about what has happened and who has been involved and so forth and so on. I thought it would be useful for this group for me to clarify some of the structural characteristics.
First the most important point, I think, is that the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty is structured in some fairly important ways like the Constitution of the State of California in that the Constitution in Bloomington recognizes—this may well be true on the other campuses as well. But the Constitution in Bloomington recognizes two distinctive ways in which the faculty can make policy decision, can act on the resolutions and proposals that are put forward.

One of those ways of course is within the context of the Faculty Council. And the Bloomington Faculty Council we know meets regularly and does stuff like this. I am serving this year as the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council. The second way that is recognized in the Bloomington Constitution is essentially akin to a referendum method and we’re all familiar with following the elections in various states, particularly California gets a lot of press over these referendums that are on the ballot there. This is a second way recognized in our Constitution in Bloomington for the faculty to do business. And what happens is that petitions are circulated and signed and when enough signatures are attached to a petition, basically there’s a meeting of the faculty called. This is separate and distinct from the Bloomington Faculty Council. It’s got nothing to do with the Bloomington Faculty Council whatsoever.

I, this was something that I learned in this process, I have a title that I didn’t actually know that I had. I am serving this year as the President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington faculty. This is a title that’s recognized in the Bloomington Constitution and it’s a separate title from the title of President of the Bloomington Faculty Council. And so in these activities over the last couple of weeks, I have been acting as the President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington faculty.

So what we’ve seen in Bloomington is the result of this referendum style of process. There was a meeting of the faculty called, there were resolutions presented and debated at that meeting. There were roughly, as was recorded in the media, 600 faculty members attending that meeting. The resolutions that were approved were forwarded on to the faculty by, sort of an email ballot, it wasn’t quite email but it was sort of like that; an electronic voting mechanism that we used. The votes were cast over the last week or so and there will be an announcement later on today as to the results of the vote. But I thought it would be useful, given that we’re meeting here as a University Faculty Council, I thought it would be useful to clarify that those actions that have occurred in Bloomington really have occurred quite outside the context of the Bloomington Faculty Council. And my action in those emails has not been as President of the Bloomington Faculty Council as was widely reported—both of these points have been widely misreported—my actions in those events have been as President Pro Tempore of the Bloomington Faculty. I just thought it would be useful for me to make a statement like that here today.

HERBERT: Any questions or comments of the co-chair of the meeting? Marty?

SPECHLER: Well Ted of course it’s been widely reported a tremendous number of conversations, especially in Bloomington, about this. I’d like to ask you one thing, you know Indiana University, when there are personnel decisions and discussions we usually take great care and make those personnel discussions confidential and collegial. When my chair hears something that I may have done wrong, I’m called in for a private conversation to verify facts and draw out conclusions and I think that that procedure at Indiana University has been very positive for us in terms of our public image and in terms of collegiality at all levels of the
university. Now what I would like to know, considering that these events of last week or two have caused the university considerable embarrassment and will probably, I believe, make it more difficult to get the kind of person we need as Senior Vice President and Bloomington Chancellor, I’d like to know, why is it that the people who had allegations, complaints or whatever, did not take them to the people involved and the Trustees in a quiet and genuinely way to see whether there was any truth to those allegations at all and if there were, to have a timely correction?

MILLER: I would say that my answer to that question, Marty is I do not know.

WHEELER: I want to return to the discussion of RCM and to say that the greatest harm caused by RCM has been general education and the educational process. That the way that RCM places emphasis on credit hour generation has led to adverse consequences of an educational nature and I hope that the committee that’s going to review RCM will take this into account. That on the Bloomington campus there have been several reviews of RCM and that educational aspect has never been considered in those reviews and I think it’s long overdue to consider that.

HERBERT: I’ll add that I think that it is a critical question.

KRAVCHUK: Mr. President on behalf of Ben Boukai, my Finance and Facilities Committee Co-chair and myself, I want to thank you for spending time with us yesterday afternoon to discuss the ways in which the committee might make itself useful to the university administration and in assisting to move forward in meeting our financial objectives, we had a very productive meeting with myself, with Maynard Thompson and Judy Palmer. You gave us over an hour of your time and that was most generous. We really appreciate that. We look forward to working with you and especially with Vice President Palmer. I think that we’re moving in a very good direction and the spirit of cooperation and support at that meeting was very positive and once again I want to thank you for that. I think the future is looking pretty good for giving our committee a positive role as we go forward, so, thank you.

HERBERT: Thank you, Bob. And it seems to me that there are a number of very critical issues, particularly on the financial side that I think will benefit from getting both faculty input and also sharing information. One of the things that we’ve committed to is that Judy will talk with the two co-chairs individually as they have questions that evolve. She or I or others will meet with the committee as requested or in fact we may even ask one opportunity to meet on to discuss the issues. Also I think it might be helpful, at least once a year, for us to provide a broader overview of the fiscal state of the university to the entire UFC and to be available for questions. So, we’ll work through all of those matters with the co-chairs to assure that we’re being as responsive as possible and also that we can take advantage of some of your experiences on the various campuses. Other…

COFFIN: I’d like to go back to the RCM review for a second. When you were describing the composition of the task force, it was not clear to me to what extent the regional campuses were going to be represented on that.
HERBERT: We will have at least one chancellor from the regional campuses serving on there. At least at this point that’s what the plan is.

COFFIN: No faculty members on the committee?

HERBERT: Right now we have a faculty member but the RCM system is most complex with regard to Bloomington and IUPUI because of the several subunits that are incorporated there. Right now we have a chancellor and we have faculty members from each of the two campuses. We’re trying to keep the committee as small as possible so that we can—we have a couple of consultants coming in again to help us but at this point we have one chancellor who has in depth of understanding of all of the financial aspects of RCM. Other?

BOBAY: Just one follow up, what’s the timetable for that RCM review?

HERBERT: We’re going to officially kick the committee off probably next week. So they’ll have time to have at least one meeting before the holidays in December. We’ve already contacted consultants; one who worked with the university 20 years ago when this process kicked off and we have another who is very familiar with the Big Ten and he also is familiar with what we’re doing. So we have two excellent consultants that will work with us and I think we’ll be able to get all of this done during the spring term and get word back out and get feedback.

AGENDA ITEM #5: CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT [ACTION ITEM]

HERBERT: If there are no other questions or questions let me turn to—Ted do you want to deal with item 5.

MILLER: Yes, thank you. This item pertains to a Policy on Conflict of Commitment. The reason I’m presenting this, I believe anyway, is that last year I was the co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee and it was that committee that was dealing with the development of this policy and it really has not received any discussion this year in Bloomington and so Barbara Hawkins who is currently the co-chair, really has not seen much of this policy and so I’ve agreed to sort of present the thing to you.

Some of you will recall that this policy was on the floor of the University Faculty Council at the end of the year last year and we were poised on the edge of a vote on this particular policy. We’re had discussion, we were going to vote on it and at the very last moment, representatives of one of the campuses requested that they take this policy back for one more review. This was due to the fact that there were some changes in the language of the document rather close to the time that the UFC was considering this. And so the policy was taken back on that particular campus, I don’t believe it has received any consideration at all, or other extra consideration of any of the other campuses. But it has now come back to us for action.

This is a Policy on Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities. The rationale for the policy is fairly straight forward. The statement here says that all academic
appointees are required to meet the professional obligations of their appointment, and to the extent that we’re doing things that interfere with that—outside activities that interfere with that—these are matters that need to be disclosed and need to be managed; the conflicts need to be managed within the academic units.

The policy itself in Item 2, says that academic appointees may engage in outside professional activities provided that they do not constitute conflicts of commitment. Point D there I think is one of the central points in the policy. It says that full time tenure-track faculty shall be permitted on average one—you’ll like this language I’m sure, it was appreciated at last year’s Council—one non-weekend day each week during the period of appointment. The phrase during the period of appointment is a key phrase in this document. This policy does not govern faculty’s activities outside of the period of appointment. What is meant by the period of appointment? If you are a ten-month faculty appointee in this university the appointment of such a person begins one week prior to the beginning of the fall semester and it ends on the graduation day in the spring. That is the period of appointment. We are called ten-month appointees but that does not mean that we are appointed for a ten-month period. What it means is that our pay for the period of appointment, beginning one week before the beginning of the fall to the spring graduation, our pay is paid out over ten months. So this statement here regarding the period of appointment, is a key phrase in this policy and limits its applicability.

There are some examples, implementation that makes it clear that this is something that would be dealt with at a unit level, school or academic unit level. The disclosure will be made to the dean or the unit head and the management of the conflicts are to be done within that context. If a faculty member fails to disclose these conflicts, fails to comply with the defined management procedures, what this says is that they can get into big trouble. Well, there’s some definitions and so forth. So, that’s the policy that’s presented to you.

We have some other folks here on our agenda, Marion Wagner and Karen Gable, both with the Faculty Affairs Committee in Indianapolis. If you would like to say something about this it would be quite welcomed.

GABLE: On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee at IUPUI, that committee spent extensive time on this policy and the committee as a whole supported it.

HERBERT: Are there any questions? Hearing none are we ready to vote? All those who are in favor of the proposed Policy of Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities, please say aye?

EVERYONE: Aye

HERBERT: Opposed, no. It’s adopted.

NG: I just wanted to let you know, this is actually one of a pair of policies, Conflicts of Interest and Conflict of Commitment. Now they have gone through the UFC and all the campuses and these will receive the first reading, as I understand it, in the upcoming Trustees meeting in December. And I just want to take this opportunity to thank everybody on the various campuses
who have worked so hard on it. The process actually started, I was given a timeline here, the actual revision started sometime in 2003. So it has been long ongoing and now finally it’s done and I just want to thank everybody who has spent time on it. Thank you very much.

HERBERT: I forgot, I should have made one observational response to your question a few moments ago. As we’re developing the membership of the task force, what we’ve done is to deal with or to include people at each level in which decisions are made. That is, where the RCM process stops on the campus. In the case of the regional campuses, the campus itself is the RCM, so that’s the reason that we have the Chancellor on there. In the case of the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, these do go down further into the organization.

AGENDA ITEM #6: IU GUIDELINES FOR CAMPUS ADMISSIONS POLICIES [FIRST READING]

HERBERT: Bart, are you going to deal now with the admissions policy statement?

NG: Yes. Well, actually, yes. The admissions; what you have in front of you is the—actual, sorry, let me back up a little bit. This is the item that I just added to the agenda and this is the—currently there is a statement in the IU faculty handbook about IU Admissions Policy. So, this particular statement is to replace the existing statement in the faculty handbook. Now because this actually came up just today, we are unable to really put in front of you what this statement replaces. But the idea really is, because of the recommendation from the Mission Differentiation Project, Recommendation #1 is that each campus would have its own admissions policy. And so this actually came up just today, we are unable to really put in front of you what this statement replaces. But the idea really is, because of the recommendation from the Mission Differentiation Project, Recommendation #1 is that each campus would have its own admissions policy. And so we want to write an umbrella, kind of an overarching policy for the university and this is the wording that Ted Miller came up with and it was approved by the Agenda Committee today. So this is presented to you for discussion as a first reading and our plan is that in the next UFC meeting, we’ll incorporate any changes that are a result of today’s discussion together with the old policy, or rather the current statement about Indiana University Admissions Policy.

Now, as I said, this is a policy, it’s kind of a general statement and this is to go together with the Admissions Guidelines that was developed by the EPC that you will take up as the next item. So, one of the features that really differentiate this new proposed wording is the explicit inclusion of the CORE 40 diploma requirements. And so this is something that is different, it’s that substantive part that is different from the existing statement. So, Ted would like to move forward with this.

MILLER: This is a fairly straight-forward idea. It just seemed to me that it will be useful to the university to have in its Academic Handbook, a statement about admissions. We know that the Mission Differentiation Project has recommended that the campuses be allowed to develop their own admission standards. This basically would be a statement that puts that idea into the policy of the university and it says that part of the qualifications for admission be determined by faculty on a campus. And in the Agenda Committee there was some thought about adding a phrase at the end of that first sentence that would basically make reference to the IU Guidelines for Campus Admissions Policies which is being developed at the EPC. Basically develop these campus policies using these guidelines as a tool.
The second sentence is simply a reflection of the fact that the Indiana legislature passed the law which says that this is going to be the deal for the minimum requirement for admission to a four-year institution is going to be a completion of a CORE 40 diploma if you are an Indiana high school graduate. So it simply codifies a condition that we know we confront.

One of the issues is that we probably should make some reference to a date because we know that this legislation is going to be effective in 2011 or some such date. So we need to figure out a way to make it clear that that’s what we’re talking about. It just seemed to me that it would be useful to have something like this in our most basic policy adopted.

HERBERT: Bill?

WHEELER: So it turns out that this actually is not what Senate Bill 200 says as passed by the State Legislature and it also conflicts with the university’s efforts to shape Senate Bill 200 and I would like to submit the following motion which would bring this statement into compliance both with Senate Bill 200 and with the position of Indiana University on Senate Bill 200, and that is to restate the last sentence to read “qualifications for admission for graduates of Indiana high schools should be completion of CORE 40 program requirements or equivalent.” This has been an important point for the university because of some of the arts areas, in particular on the Bloomington campus, the Indiana School of Music which said that people intending to go to, who hope to gain admission to the School of Music on the Bloomington campus are going to have to invest a significant amount of time in preparation for music courses. And also the admission for the Herron School of Arts, whenever we have a program which is in fine arts that the CORE 40 program requirements certainly not are designed to be compatible with the demands for admissions to school of music, fine arts and so forth. And so it was the case that if you look at JT Forbes’ report on the lobbying efforts of the university last year that the university lobbied the state legislature to insert this language “CORE 40 or equivalent.” One of the reasons for that, as his report indicates, to address, to take care of issues such as the school of music. There are, I think, also other concerns emanating from Vice President Nelms’ office as to whether or not although it as been observed that Senate Bill 200 would require all high schools to offer CORE 40, it does not require them to offer the CORE 40 to all of their students nor does the state legislation provide funding for that purpose.

The co-chair of the Bloomington Faculty EPC has done a detailed statistical study on the data from the state board of education, which includes data on the science courses for all high schools in the state and it was determined that there is a significant number of high schools in the state, large high schools, which are going to have to increase their capacity to offer science courses by 50 percent in some cases, in some cases by a factor of three, in order to provide the science requirements of the CORE 40 to all of their students, and there’s concern that this would adversely impact the university’s minority recruiting efforts because it’s these high schools where there is inadequate—both inadequate physical facilities and also insufficient supply of teachers, that the indications are that in some of those high schools, that there is some tracking of students and some students are tracked into what may lead into CORE 40 but other students definitely are not.
And so it is important at the university level in terms of the schools of fine arts and also in terms of it’s realistic approach to matters of including students in both on the grounds of economic disadvantages and also on other issues of a recruiting nature, that the university have a admissions policy which enables the university to cope with the facts as they are as opposed to the facts as supporters of the CORE 40 would like them to be. So I feel it’s very important that we modify this as the university that the legislature might require in Senate Bill 200, by saying the completion of CORE 40 or equivalent.

**HERBERT**: You’ve heard the discussion, is there a motion?

**MILLER**: That’s a friendly amendment.

**HERBERT**: Ok.

**MILLER**: My point here was to make a statement that would make it clear that Indiana University was complying with the state law and the words “or equivalent” are in the lines and it should be too.

**HERBERT**: So you accept it as a friendly amendment?

**MILLER**: I will accept it as a friendly amendment, yes.

**HERBERT**: Are there any other discussion, comments, and suggestions? Marty?

**SPECHLER**: Well I don’t know why Bill takes Senate Bill 200 so seriously. A lot of bills in the General Assembly never get passed. So, that’s one question and I don’t object to the idea but I’ve been one who believes that a fairly clear and high standard for admission is appropriate for Indiana University and there’s just one thing in this document which otherwise is very good, which, you have to be satisfied, it’s on page 2.

**MILLER**: Marty I think you are looking at the wrong document at this point. We’re talking about the white sheet.

**SPECHLER**: The white…

**HERBERT**: Okay then we’ll come back to it.

**SCHNEIDER**: It was just pointed out to me, and I didn’t think of this earlier, that the way this is phrased and I don’t know how you intended it Ted, but the way it is phrased is aimed at admission to an academic degree program. Lots of students apply and are admitted without being admitted to a degree program. Do you mean it to be more general?

**MILLER**: It would be fine. I mean it to cover all students.

**SCHNEIDER**: To cover all students?
MILLER: Yes.

SCHNEIDER: So we need to change that language. Just delete academic degree program and make it admission to a campus of Indiana University. I just wanted to clarify.

MILLER: That’s fine. I’ll take that as a friendly amendment too.

HERBERT: Bill?

WHEELER: I think there’s another thought with this one as well, speaking on behalf of the School of Continuing Studies. This says all graduates of Indiana high schools but as phrased as such it is retroactive to people who graduated from Indiana high schools 10 years ago before CORE 40 came into existence and it has certainly been the case that the EPC in drafting its thing has tried to be sensitive to this. We have received communications from the School of Continuing Studies and that is to say that CORE 40 is not an appropriate requirement for people who graduate before it becomes a state requirement. Even there after there may be questions as to whether it is appropriate for non-traditional students. And so I think that at this time I thought I actually would like to move this even further to the EPC because that’s the committee that’s had the opportunity to talk about these things for quite some time and this appears to be coming forward from the Agenda Committee on the spur of the moment without the benefit of the discussions that the EPC has received from various campuses and various schools. I hesitate to go forward with something which has not been given full consideration. So I would like to move that this be referred to the EPC…

MILLER: This is a first reading. We’re not attempting to approve this today. The EPC would certainly be quite welcome to take this up to talk about, this is a draft and if there’s other language that can be created that serves the purpose of that, that’s fine with me. I was just trying to focus us on the idea of creating something that actually could replace what is currently in the Academic Handbook that would say something useful and which in particular would embody this idea that the campuses, under the official policy of the university, are authorized to deal with their own admission requirements.

HERBERT: Please?

JONES: Betty Jones, co-chair of Educational Policies Committee. Ted is your sense then, I didn’t print out what’s currently in the Handbook, that this statement would replace, totally replace a section of this? And would there need to be…

MILLER: Yes.

JONES: …a motion specifically to get rid of this? From point A to point B.

MILLER: At some point it can be made clear that that’s what we have in mind, yes.

NG: In fact in the next, second reading, we will print out that part which will be deleted and that will be part of the motion.
HERBERT: Any other comments? Please?

JONES: I’d like to say one thing as a faculty member from the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management here on campus I think it’s wonderful but if we accept the wording of the CORE 40 that does include credits in physical education and health and wellness which I think would be a good statement given the state of the nation and the state of Indiana in terms of those topics that we would be in support of that requirement.

HERBERT: Other comments on this item?
[End of Tape 1, Side A]

AGENDA ITEM #7: OPEN DISCUSSION ON GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY [DISCUSSION]

[The tape recording was blank for the beginning of this discussion. The brief introductory comments from Professors Ng and Miller are missing.]

SPECHLER: [Tape 2, Side A begins] …mechanisms for achieving those principles then you have to supervise in some way to make sure that people teaching those courses satisfying Principle A or Principle B actually do so. And I was very happy to see that my colleagues at IUPUI have actually instituted that; that in our new policy there is to be a board, or committee, which will supervise the general education courses which are supposed to satisfy those principles. So I think you can put together the distribution approach and the principle approach but it does take some effort to make sure that courses satisfy, in fact, the principles that you are after.

BOBAY: It occurs to me also I suppose, I haven’t really thought this through, I was just trying to do that but in addition to lining up the authority for creating curriculum there are so many budgetary implications of curricular decisions. And having, at least the person having the authority over the entire curriculum or at least in this chart the whole bubble, aligns with the way RCM works. And to change that, to move the authority for some part of the curriculum to a central guiding body there will, it will have effects on units with tuition dollars and all of that. So it just occurred to me as we start to rethink this it’s not just curriculum and transferability but also some pretty major budgeting and financial impacts of this.

HERBERT: And we’ll again, definitely raise that issue in the context of RCM, I think it is an appropriate question. Other comments? Bob?

KRASVUCHUK: It seems to me that this discussion, and the one before it, certainly the admissions guidelines, are both colored by the highly decentralized organizational structure of the university. Now as somebody who studies collective action this is a fascinating problem in how one can consent or compel or in some other way facilitate cooperation where none is required—when in fact the budgetary systems on some campuses provides incentives not to cooperate. There are times when we operate as a university, times when we operate as campuses, and within campuses times when we operate as a campus or as individual schools. And it seems to me there is a opportunity here but there isn’t a carrot or a stick, or perhaps there is. I have a
sense that if we don’t facilitate the transferability of courses across the campuses, within the
schools, both on campuses and across campuses, and between Ivy Tech and the university that
the legislature will compel us to do so and they may do it in a way that will be particularly
painful at the time. And so there just might be the stick that might be necessary. But in any case
the authority issue that Ted brought up earlier is paramount. And I think as we go forward, and
this is a suggestion for both you sir and the Trustees, you need to make your preferences
understood and to repeat that because I think that’s what the faculty are going to have to hear
again and again in order for the process to move forward.

HERBERT: Other comments?

WHEELER: Bart had mentioned transferability issues; this Council has addressed the
transferability of courses issue through the Master Course Inventory when we adopted the
Master Course Inventory Policy several years ago. The unfortunate circumstance has been that
PeopleSoft intervened and delayed it. The UFC EPC did have David Nordloh from the
Bloomington campus come to its meeting of November a year ago to discuss the status of the
Master Course Inventory and what was going to happen with it and he indicated either at that
meeting or later in the year that he was hopeful of making progress on this, that he had gotten
budgetary authority to actually hire some assistants to work on that data. When this Council
adopted the Master Course Inventory had discussions with the PeopleSoft team and it reached a
tentative agreement about how PeopleSoft would be used to implement this Council’s policies on
the Master Course Inventory and we are certainly hopeful that that will come to fruition. It would
be nice to see progress made on this issue and it is the expectation of the committee that we will
have David Nordloh come back and give us a report on that this year and then we will pass that
information on. It certainly is the case that courses that have the same course number that are
taught on different campuses should be following the same syllabus and the legislation adopted
by this Council was that there should be a model framework for each of these courses that would
lay out the syllabus, the topics, the typical readings, the exams, and things of that nature. And it
was especially the intent of the EPC at that time was that the framework would be incorporated
into the PeopleSoft course catalog so that all that information would be readily available, not
only to faculty but to students and advisors and for that matter even to the public at large. So it
was always known that was going to be a difficult undertaking, it would be more difficult under
PeopleSoft. But certainly all the members of the EPC strongly wants to be part of this and the
administrative resources are not there then the Council may want to revisit that issue in order to
pass a motion impressing the administration of the university to move forward on that project.

JONES: I’d like to comment on how well the principle-approach has fit in with those schools
that have external accrediting bodies that have, I think in large scale, gone away from having
course requirements to having principles as requirements. That has certainly been the case in
education and in my field, but I’ve seen it engineering and in nursing and in various other
programs at the IUPUI campus. So these giant matrices with the principles from the state, here
are the ones from the national body, and then here are the courses that are going to fulfill them.
So I think at least in a good number of programs the principle-approach has fit in well looking at
general education as well as the courses in the major.
A second thing that…you introduced this as how we understand general education and what’s the faculty’s role in it…I certainly learned a lot by going to the literature on what’s been happening nationally in general education and getting out of the world of what I thought was meant by general education. So I think one of the things that we can get Kelly’s help with here is to post some of those national readings that could inform us as we go through this discussion.

LUDLUM FOOS: My comment is related to that in that we really need to tackle this question of what do we understand the purpose of general education to be and what is it? I am finding this Ven diagram actually kind of helpful because here they say general education is part of your college experience, your major is part of your college experience, and part of an overall education that you get. It seems that the way we do it general education is a subset of your major, rather than something that you get to supplement or complement your major and so this also gets to the question of what do we think IU really is—I find myself with this vision of the old-fashioned baskets that you put milk bottles in and IU is just sort of the convenient basket to put the milk bottles of the individual programs and what the student does is jump into the milk bottle—I don’t want to take this too far! But is that what we mean by an IU education? So that there really isn’t any IU education, it’s just IU is an administrative structure to hold a program in music or a program in SPEA, or a program in nursing, or a program in English? Or is IU the university and the university provides an education which includes, among other things, that students major in something so that they have not only breadth but depth? And I think until we answer that question we are going to keep spinning our wheels.

HAMILTON: I’d like to further that. I thought it was a wonderful opportunity when President Brand invited us to revisit our approach to general education and what’s been going on over the last year and half has reminded me—Charles Bantz spoke at lunch a little bit about the power of anecdote. And I was involved about 17 years ago with the re-conceptualization of W131, our freshman composition program. And a group of us were sitting in a room and every time somebody came up with a wonderful idea somebody said “oh yeah, but…” and then somebody else would come up with an idea “oh yeah, but…” “this structure would get in the way or RCM would get in the way…” or something else would get in the way. And finally one of my colleagues threw her pen in the air and said look, let’s take this as an opportunity to develop the very best 131 course we can think of and then all the other things will fall in place. We will make it work because we will value it. And you know sometimes I fear that we are tempering what could otherwise be a really powerful approach to general education because we think but this, but that, but the other. And I think we have an invitation to look at what is the best thing about being educated at IU and I think what Cathy was saying has so much power. What does it mean to have an IU degree? What does it mean? Does it just mean that you’re a biology major or an English major or does it mean something else, something that makes sense not only to all of us but to the community into which our students will be going, to our local communities so they say we want an IU grad because those IU grads they can communicate effectively or they can think critically or they know how to take what they’ve learned and apply it in new situations or they know how to work with people from diverse cultures and diverse backgrounds and make something work. And I think that we have to think beyond the level of the course, beyond the level of the major, to say what is IU baccalaureate all about? And I think the document that was produced is starting to get there; it really has some powerful language in it and I want to commend the work of the committee because they have actually looked, not only at all of the
eight campuses they’ve also looked around the country and they’ve seen some national models, and I think the one that you gave us Ted is very good because the Ven diagram helps us spell out the relationship, it’s very general, but I think along with Cathy, that we have to say what does general education mean in relation to the major, in relation to the IU graduate?

A lot of times we just think there’s general education here and we march through that and then we get to the real education which is the major. I think that’s really dangerous and that actually is possible the way the document is written right now; it’s possible to look at general education as separate from the major but I think that’s dangerous. I think that we should take this opportunity to say let’s forget for the moment about transferability—not forever, but just for the moment—about transferability and budgeting and so on, remembering that they are there, and move forward on the very best approach that we have on shared agreement. It’s similar to the graduation requirements that we were talking about—we are all very different campuses, we have different missions, we have different cultures, different histories, and are defining our futures differently. And some of us have done a really powerful job at developing an approach to general education that fits our culture and our history and our projected future. Some have developed a really exciting integrated program and Kokomo has its values and goals and IUPUI has its principles and Ivy Tech, from where we get a lot of our students, have their learning outcomes as well. And I think if we were to look at all of these we would see some commonalities that we could build on for IU. For example, whoever wants a graduate that can’t think critically, who wants a graduate who can’t communicate, who is not literate in information technology, not literate period. We all have some shared values that we could spell out without having to spell out course x, y, z, and this course, etc.

So I just want to conclude by saying we have a wonderful opportunity here; we’ve already got a really solid basis of work to move forward. I think we actually can come to some kind of resolution and I think we can make it work and then once we get that then we can resolve these issues of transferability because I think with the best kind of model those issues will be resolvable.

HERBERT: Well stated. Charles?

BANTZ: At the risk of being the administrator speaking at an academic discussion I want to mention three things very quickly. One is I want to thank Ted for bringing up a part of my past from the Arizona State section and I will send a note to Professor David Berstein, when he was president of the faculty council he’s the one who said put a Ven Diagram in, people will understand better. He’s an astronomer, and he was right, and I will provide data of that.

Second, no one has mentioned one thing that is in here that I would encourage you to look at because it is part of the future, President Herbert knows from Florida that it is part of the future, is the Arizona General Education Curriculum, better known by its acronym as the AGEC. This is one of the futures. There will be some point mandatory, x number of credits that will come from community colleges—it’s not happened yet here but something like this will happen and preferably we’ll do it ourselves. But I encourage you to think about that as you look at this issue.
And the last, Sharon said it better than I could, I really do think you need to look to the future. I want you to known what was handed out here, with the exception of the cultural studies/cultural diversity part was established in 1986 at ASU, it was the first university-wide general education. I would not call it innovative in 2005; there’s some important things in here, there’s some good lessons, but I do think we need to think about the future of our students as well as those things that have carried from literally the past, as I look across the table at my rhetoric colleagues, some of those things here go all the way back. But I would encourage you to think forward on this one.

**HERBERT:** I think we have two minutes. Anyone else have any comments on this? Are there any other items that any member of the Council would like to put on the agenda or comment on briefly?

**HAWKINS:** I just happened to wonder what happened to the Mission Statement that we approved. Is that going to the Trustees?

**HERBERT:** Those have been approved by the Board and we are sending them to the Higher Education Commission. Bart?

**NG:** I think we have the break-out sessions for the various committees.

Meeting adjourned into standing committees at 3:35 pm.