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1. Approval of Minutes
   September 26, 2006
   http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/minutes/09.26.06.htm

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

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

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

5. Labor Studies at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (60 minutes)
   (Professor Bart Ng, Dean Mark Sothmann, Chancellor Charles Bantz)
   DLS Faculty Proposal: http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/dlsfacprop.htm
   DLS Background Materials: http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/DLS.htm
6. Review Procedures for Chancellors [DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM] (20 minutes)  
(Professors Ted Miller and Bart Ng)  
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U6-2007.rtf

7. Policy on Intellectual Property [FIRST READING] (45 minutes)  
(Professors Simon Atkinson and George Alter)  

8. Transferability and General Education at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)  
(Professors Ted Miller and Bart Ng)

9. Standing Committee Reports
10. Old Business
11. New Business

(Tape recording did not pick up beginning of the meeting. The UFC approved the minutes from the September meeting. Chancellor Ruth Person welcomed the UFC to the Kokomo campus and reviewed campus initiatives and upcoming activities. The tape picks up in the middle of President Herbert’s report and he is discussing the Life Sciences Initiative.)

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HERBERT: … context of the presentation I made, but as a separate economic development agenda item. The practical reality is that it’s very important that the state understands that this is not only an academic initiative but also it is one that has a very significant implication for economic development throughout the state. So we will be making yet another presentation as the budget committee deals with issues related to economic development.

The other piece of this is housing. I just want to flag for you that we have presented to the Higher Education Commission and have already engaged in conversations with the budget office. The proposals that have just been submitted for approval by the board, related to both some projects in Bloomington related to the athletics facilities but also housing on the South Bend campus. I believe that that is a very important step forward for our regional campuses. At the next board meeting, so that all of you are aware, Southeast will also be submitting a proposal for housing and the administration is recommending the approval of that plan. What that will mean ultimately is that we would then have housing in addition to Bloomington and IUPUI, also on those two regional campuses. Again, that’s an extremely important development. It comes out of the Mission Differentiation effort. The one piece that we aren’t sure about right now is how the politics of all this plays out but we’ll work on that as we go forward.

That concludes my report and now let me turn to Bart.

NG: Ted.
**HERBERT:** And Ted, give both of you a chance. I’m sorry, I’m just accustomed from last year to saying Bart. I’m sorry Ted.

**NG:** Go for it Ted.

**HERBERT:** Go for it.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**MILLER:** Well, my report today is a fairly brief one from an Agenda Committee point of view. We have a fairly extensive agenda at this meeting and we’ll get to those items. I would just like to pick on the item that the President mentioned earlier in regards to reviewing the system and the multi-campus units. We are in possession of a final report from the committee that made the evaluation, that made an evaluation of this and made some recommendation regarding it. That document is now available for general use. I think it is the intention of the Agenda Committee to have this item on our November UFC agenda and that meeting I believe is in the final week of November. It is after Thanksgiving; it’s very late in November. So it would be appropriate between now and then for the campus councils to take this particular issue up, to review this document, come to conclusions about it with respect to the various campuses. As I said, we will have a discussion of this at the November meeting. This initial review will be a discussion. Whether the changes that are being contemplated or which might be made would require the UFC to take some formal action, I think remains to be seen. It certainly is true that after the core campuses and the multi-campus units were created in 1970, if you look at the history of the UFC, you’ll see that they spent several years actually talking about the implications of all this. There may well be some discussion or some action necessary from this body to retreat from that if indeed we’re going to retreat from it. So that’s something that will be available for use at your home campus. I encourage you to use that in your upcoming meetings. I think right now that is really the only thing I would like to say at this point. But maybe Bart has something else.

**NG:** No, that’s all.

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

**HERBERT:** We are now at the point of the question and comment period.

**SPECHLER:** With respect to Dean Bonser’s report, it was never clear to me even when I talked to him, whether core campus, multi-campus, system schools and so on, what it included and what it did not include. In particular journalism and physical education exist on more than one campus and so does medical sciences. My first question for the President is whether all of these, and perhaps even the law schools, were included in the request to Dean Bonser to examine those as well as the obvious cases like SPEA and Business.

**HERBERT:** All of the obvious ones were definitely included. Just kind of running through, that includes education, it included SPEA, social work, nursing, business, SLIS, journalism, music.
THOMPSON: It did not the medical school.

HERBERT: Informatics. It did not include…

SPECHLER: It did not include the medical school.

HERBERT: It also did not include the law schools because those are separate entities completely. So we didn’t focus on that. But the balance of all those that I mentioned…

SPECHLER: Physical education of course is very peculiar.

BALDWIN: Physical education is actually in two schools. That’s two schools, Martin.

HERBERT: Those are not core schools. I would just note that one of the questions that I did pose, again going back to my initial report, is that is there a continuing rational for maintaining system-wide schools. I guess the bias in the question is that to the extent that our regional campuses have the capacity to offer their degree programs, it’s all with the bias, that we should facilitate that occurring.

SPECHLER: Well that’s really, I guess, a matter of judgment in each particular case. But I’d like to ask about the outsourcing. Now, you have mentioned that outsourcing will also perhaps impact IUPUI and the smaller campuses, perhaps as well as Bloomington. My question, and I hope incidentally that this outsourcing, that we can reassure our staff and workers in these units that they will be held harmless from this procedure. I know there’s a lot of unease among these people who are anyway rather poorly paid as everybody knows. My question is whether you also envision some centralization as well as outsourcing? Is it possible that for example bookstore operations, which is big and very important to our students, whether we might achieve some economies with one vendor, say, who centralizes operations throughout IU?

HERBERT: With regard to the bookstore specifically, that is one of the reasons that we have put forward three alternatives. The assumption being that there might be some significant economy of scale opportunities associated with one vendor having responsibility for two or more of our campuses. The key thing is, I don’t think of it so much as centralization because we still want accountability of each campus but we want to take advantage of the economies of scale that might be associated with running multiple campuses. The key issue here is capacity of companies to provide services on multiple sites. If you take some of the big national companies, they could clearly do it. There are some companies that may be interested in Indianapolis and Bloomington only because of the size. So what we’ll need to see and the key is that to the extent that we can help all of our campuses, we want to be able to do that. We have not put together the proposal yet, but one of the things we’re thinking about is having a statement that particular attention and priority will be given to those bids that cover all the campuses. If it looks like we can get some real benefits accruing to each.

SPECHLER: Great.
HERBERT: Other, Herb?

TERRY: I have a couple of outsourcing related questions. One is very simple and I think the other is my search of a clarification of something. The simple one is that it’s generally easier to outsource something at its beginning than it is to outsource something you’re already doing. So I’m wondering if outsourcing has been considered for these housing options that looking at in South Bend and Southeast, could affect bonding and other things. That’s the simple question.

HERBERT: We have talked about that. In fact, we talked about that from the outset and one of the challenges is that with regard to on-campus housing, it is difficult for an outside vendor to get rates as cheap as we’re able to get them; loans and also construct the housing cheaper and we are concerned about both quality and also price for our students. So if it’s off-campus I think it’s one sort of thing and if it’s on-campus our feeling based upon experience is yet another. So we did talk about that, that there was just no way that an outside vendor could construct housing cheaper than we could. We got incredible rates or we are going get, I think, incredible rates and one of the pieces of good news is that in the case of one campus, there actually is a major contribution to help lower the total costs of this. Again, both campuses have been very creative with regard to how they’re doing this.

I would just make one other observation and that is that the board has directed the administration to do this. We are following up on that direction. We have made very clear that it’s our view in going through this process that we obviously must look at quality of services, we must look at cost and we also must look at the impact on our workers and the potential impact there. So it’s a combination of all of those and I can tell you that one of the things we have been clear on is that if we do contract out, there has to be some concessions with regard to all of our existing employees. Now, what form that takes will be part of the proposal they submit. But we can’t just unilaterally ignore folks who have dedicated their lives or significant portions of their lives to service to our institutions.

TERRY: My second question is, I don’t understand to some extent how the Trustees imagine that savings, at least in the particular programs they are considered for outsourcing right now that really relate to the academic mission of the university. And this is outside of the campus budget. What I don’t quite see is whether, well the trustees are saying we can’t ask the legislature for more money or to raise tuition until we’ve studied these things. I don’t see why studying these things are the right ones to study because these are things that at present neither get legislative appropriations nor tuition directly.

HERBERT: I think that the assumption that some of the trustees are making whether they are right or wrong, remains to be seen and we’ll find out, is that through an outsourcing process there will be additional income coming into the university both in terms of the initial sale of assets and then subsequently in terms of dividends coming back as a result of the outsourcing effort. Now the question is very clear. The issues are very clear to identify and we’ll come back and see how accurate those assumptions are. I think it clearly is the case that there is not as much money as some people think associated with outsourcing the motor pool for example. But I think the numbers will speak for themselves and will demonstrate that. You know where the big bucks can be are in, and big is relative, it’s not as big as I think some people imagine, will be in the
bookstore and second is in food service. And there’s one other area that has been put on the table and it goes back to the question you posed earlier and it’s one that I think would be a very serious mistake and that is privatizing housing and essentially doing what was done with the transportation system for the state on the toll road and selling off our housing stock and taking the cash out. But the real problem with that as you might imagine is that we own most of the housing in Bloomington at least and so we’d end up having to pay back again for stuff that we already own. Anyway, there are a whole host of nuances to all this but we’ll have the numbers and they will speak for themselves and in some cases it makes sense and others, frankly, it does not. I’ve privatized a bookstore and generated very good returns on that but that’s not always the right thing to do and I think that there are some real possibilities, potential possibilities, if we can include all of our campuses as part of a package and the other part of this is to assure that on each of our campuses we’re able to take advantage of our CIC relationship to buy more test tubes and other kinds of things as a total university. So there clearly are opportunities for additional savings there. We also are continuing to look at our healthcare area to determine if there are other things we can do to reduce the annual increases in healthcare costs. This year it’s about 7 percent but if you extrapolate that over the course of the next decade that becomes a very big bottom-line item. And so the question is are there some things we can do there as well. Mary?

FISHER: Well my question is kind of a follow-up with that general line of discussion and it has to do with concerns about schools getting squeezed financially relative to the flattening and lowering state appropriations and increasing taxes. And most specifically we are seeing a trend of additional schools getting in trouble financially, many times, sometimes through some of their own mismanagement but usually related to the fact that these taxes are wedging the schools to an increasingly underfunded situation. And my question has to do with, what plans does the university have at re-looking at those formulas and also making a stronger effort to try to get the legislature to really fund the university properly.

HERBERT: Well I can tell you that we’re attempting to do the latter. We have asked for this year for an inflationary adjustment and I just got something in the mail yesterday which the higher education commission has asked us to prioritize with differing assumptions in terms of levels of support that we’re going to get from the state so we’re going to go through that process. But what we did in terms of our core university budget is to say that what we wanted was money for inflation and research support consistent with the formulas. So we didn’t ask for anything above formula increases. And the only exceptions were for Columbus and that was tied back to a commitment that the state made to Cummings in order to get the new plant there and so we asked for just under $2 million for that. And the balance was for Life Sciences and again we’re trying to treat that as an economic development issue so we are utilizing our legislative request to address that issue. Now the practical reality is this; the cost of central services do continue to go up. Utilities have gone up. The cost of buying a number of the goods and services that we need will continue to rise and labor costs go up and that applies across the institution. What I did this year was to reduce the size of the growth at the university-level. It’s been about 3 percent a year and I cut that to 1.5 this year. And what I’m also doing now is coming back and looking at ways that we can reduce the size of university administration basically following the same premise that I described earlier. That is that as the campuses become more mature there may be some services that we need not provide at the central level. And so I’m going to complete that analytical process this year so that we’re able to reach whatever conclusions may be necessary. Ironically,
as I’m doing that I’m also being directed by the board to increase staff to deal with other functions so we’ll sort all that out. But at the campus level what I’ve tried to do is basically stay away from micromanaging what occurs at the campus level with regard to the fees or service charges that are imposed. I can tell you that the legislature is focusing more attention on that and that came up particularly during my testimony relative to the Medical School and the service charge that they are paying. But I am sensitive to the issue. We’ll do all we can at the university level to try to hold down those costs and see if there’s a way that we can reduce further some of that overhead. Ok?

SPECHLER: One of our legislators reportedly asked you whether we are buying students at Indiana University. I didn’t quite understand what your answer was but I assume that he means whether we’re increasing the share of so-called merit scholarships for undergraduates and perhaps fellowships for graduate students, but mainly undergraduates. As opposed to financial aid for needy students which the federal government has been neglecting of course. Could you just say a few words about your philosophy on that?

HERBERT: Yes actually I got pretty emotional about that, the question that was posed. The reality is that we’re doing both. The university is very concerned about assuring that students from low income families are not denied an opportunity to study at Indiana University. And we have increased the total amount of money that is available for financial aid. I think that will continue. As for competition what I was concerned about was that the question basically was why should the campuses use any of their dollars to support need based financial aid when the state is funding SSACI. And my view is that SSACI does not provide enough money to provide the support for needy students that has to be provided and this past year was a classic example where they did not fully fund at the level commitments were made and we ended up spending over $900,000 of university resources to assure that those students didn’t have to take out loans. The other universities did not do that. My belief is that that was a clear reflection of our institutional commitment to students from low income families. And the reality is that they pull those dollars out of our budgets and the money is going to go to primarily private institutions. And our students are still going to be there needing help and the question is how are we going to do it and implicit in the question was that if we’re going to do it should come from money that we raise privately. Well we’re already doing that but there still isn’t enough money because there are too many students from low income families in this state for us to turn our backs on them. We will continue to provide merit based aid also and in that context one of the things I said is that I see nothing whatsoever wrong with multiple universities going after the best and brightest students in this state. The reality is that we’re complaining about a brain drain and we’re concerned about students leaving the state and going to a whole host of other institutions and so if we don’t have our best institutions in this state telling students we want you to go to college and we want you here to let them know that this is a state that is encouraging academic excellence and we’re going after the best and brightest, I think it’s a serious mistake and it’s totally counter to the basic concept of building a knowledge-based economy. What we want to do is to get all of our students thinking that they have multiple choices in terms of attending a university in this state and to do anything other than that I think is irresponsible. That was my basic comment.

SPECHLER: Good answer.
AGENDA ITEM #5: LABOR STUDIES AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MILLER: Are we ready to move on to Agenda Item #5? This is an item focused on Labor Studies Program at Indiana University. We have a number of people attending our meeting today for this discussion. Dean Sothmann are you with us at this point?

SOTHMANN: I was able to make it in.

MILLER: Great, thank for joining us. I’m sorry we’re a little behind schedule. Dean Sothmann is with us, I believe Chancellor Bantz is with us; yes I can see him now. He’s been hiding off the screen. Bart Ng is with us. We have representatives from the Labor Studies Program with us, three a number. The purpose of this discussion today is to allow the university faculty to express their views about the Labor Studies Program. This is an Indianapolis campus program and there have been a number of discussions on the IUPUI campus about Labor Studies, the organization of Labor Studies and so forth. It continues to be an Indianapolis issue and my understanding from Bart Ng is that the Indianapolis Faculty Council will take this issue up in December and make some recommendation regarding the issues. This meeting here today is really for the purpose of allowing us as a university faculty to come to understand some of the things that we probably don’t understand very well if we’re not located in Indianapolis, and to make our views known regarding them. Those views in principle will be taken into account by the Indianapolis Faculty Council as it continues it’s consideration of this particular issue. So let me start by asking Bart if he would like to make some brief introductory comments. We can then go on to Sothmann who is joining us from, I believe, Italy and so we don’t want to keep him on the line forever I don’t think. Bart, why don’t you go ahead.

NG: Sure. I just want to actually give you a brief report. I’m sure that some of the issues that are on your mind, there are some questions will be raised during the conversation, but I just want to give you a brief rundown on the chronology of what has taken place so far.

You will recall that this discussion about the Division of Labor Studies really began in earnest back in April of 2005 when the state took away a special appropriation that was made to Labor Studies that I began, I believe, some time in the year of 2000 or 1999. The state took away that appropriation an approximate amount of $365 000, which amounts to some 35-40% of the Labor Studies budget. That money was really for outreach. That precipitated a sequence of events certainly because the money was taken away; there was some real budgetary implications. So there was at one point a great deal of concern raised in Indianapolis about whether the DLS can survive on a sound fiscal basis; budgetary basis. So that really was the beginning of the discussion. Also, ever since the DLS was moved to Indianapolis, I think in 1999, after they left what was the School of Continuing Studies, I was told by the administration that there’s always been an intent to somehow merge the Division of Labor Studies with some academic unit because Labor Studies is the only academic unit that has a system-wide responsibility but it is not a school but actually reports directly to the chancellor of the Indianapolis campus.
That certainly can, as you can imagine, it is a rather relatively small unit, has a direct reporting and clearly can create certain difficulties as far as supervision is concerned. But that was history. So in April 2005, because of the budgetary crisis, the IUPUI administration really wanted to find a home for the Division of Labor Studies.

At the time I was very much involved because I thought that following the policy on our campus, that the faculty council was asked to be involved in and I play a role in talking to the Division of Labor Studies faculty, especially when impressed upon them that we are going to find then an academic home it is very important that they organize themselves as truly a faculty and academic unit as much as possible. When that was done, at the same time, both Dean Bill Plater and I were involved in trying to talk to, or rather trying to explore various possibilities, finding a suitable merger partner. But unfortunately all the effort really did not succeed. So starting from April 2006, also at the same time, the director of the Division of Labor Studies was asked to step down and an interim director was then appointed some time in May, I believe, May or June. That is Dean Sothmann who was given the charge to look at the budget situation on Labor Studies, look at the finances, look at their curriculum and try to work with the Division of Labor Studies faculty to come up with a solution; a plan to organize the division in the future.

So at the same time we put into motion the formal process for restructuring an academic that was spelled out in the Constitution of the Indianapolis Faculty Council. This roughly will require that the administration, represented by Interim Director Dean Sothmann, will put forward a plan. He’s supposed to have worked with the Division of Labor Studies Faculty, put forward a plan to be considered by the IFC. At the same time, in the case of disagreement, which we do have in this case, between the interim director and the Division of Labor Studies faculty, the faculty should put forward their own alternate plan.

We had a meeting at the request of the members of the Indianapolis Faculty Council. We actually had an informal meeting that was held, I think, a week or two ago, with the three representatives which are present here, with the Indianapolis Faculty Council, for the purpose of really for people to understand what the issues are, to give a chance of DLS faculty to express their view, their take on the situation, and also Dean Sothmann was also invited to that meeting and he in turn made his comments.

The process from here on out is for the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, which is equivalent to the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council, to take the two proposals and examine them, and in fact we will again meet with some Division of Labor Studies faculty and we will make a recommendation to the full council, the Indianapolis Faculty Council, which will discuss and deliberate the issues and the full council can either accept or reject or modify the recommendation that the Executive Committee is going to make.

So the Executive Committee of the IFC plans to complete its work in November. We have actually had a discussion at the Agenda Committee this morning. I will in fact, once the IFC has made its recommendation, that recommendation before it’s actually published, I will in fact contact all the presidents on the various campuses to apprise them of what our recommendation would be and we will ask for input and ask for suggestions. After that our recommendation will go forward to the full council at Indianapolis which will, in fact, according to the schedule, will
have until January to really act on it. We will certainly start discussions in December but we will have until January to complete our work.

So, as I have actually told the council members in our meeting with DLS faculty a couple of weeks ago, that I asked the council to put aside or members to put aside any preconceived notion of what DLS is, was, or has been, what their problems are, they may or may not be fully aware of. In other words, they should put aside everything that have heard on an informal basis, and perhaps even based on rumor, and actually try to act as academics looking at colleagues, and try to make a recommendation solely on academic grounds.

I think that the other issues, the other so-called political issues, I think this is where the administration has to, hate to say it, earn their keep, so to speak. They have to make decisions that they are based on what they see from their point of view. I urge the members of the Indianapolis Faculty Council to really look at this as an academic issue. We’re asking the question whether the Division of Labor Studies, or Labor Studies as an area, needs to be preserved and strengthened in Indiana University, and our recommendation will base solely on, I hope they will in any case, base on what is the best way to strengthen if we decide to keep Labor Studies, if we as a faculty think that Labor Studies is important then we will try to make a recommendation or suggest ways to best preserve and strengthen Labor Studies so they can prosper in the future. So that is the current state of affairs that I can share with you but I certainly at this point, I have certain ideas but I can assure you that nobody really have made up their minds yet because the deliberation has not taken place.

MILLER: Thanks a lot, Bart. Let’s turn then to Dean Sothmann. Thank you very much Dean Sothmann for joining us. We would appreciate whatever comments you would like to make in this context.

SOTHMANN: Sure. I appreciate the opportunity to join you. I’ve been studying this issue now for about five months and I concur with the notion that we need to take the best step we can to strengthen Labor Studies as an academic home. That’s what I’ve been trying to work on.

What I have come to, over these five months then, I have submitted three reports that sort of show the evolution of my thought, is that in order to embed, and I use that term because Labor Studies is still working for a merger partner and if that doesn’t occur then my job is to work on a campus integration program and follow the IUPUI policy with respect to that, which does accent the importance of the academics of it. I’ve come to the conclusion that the best we can do under the present circumstances, and it’s not bad, is to work Labor Studies into the College of Arts and Sciences at IU Northwest and work it into the School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI as a program.

Now, in doing that I have come to realize that all of what Labor Studies is now in its present structure cannot move immediately in that form. And there are three principle reasons for that. First, the academic units I’ve been talking to, IU Northwest and the School of Liberal Arts, really do not, at this point in time, want to take on the total responsibility for the integrative state-wide curricular delivery program of Labor Studies. Much of that is delivered with online curriculum, and they are not opposed to online curriculum, it’s just that this is a rather massive undertaking
and responsibility that really is symbolic of their divisional status and so they are hesitant to take that on.

The second issue is that all of the untenured faculty members in Labor Studies are in fact IUPUI faculty, and there’s four or five of them however you count them. They reside on other campuses other than IUPUI. Under a campus integration plan where Labor Studies is moving from a divisional structure to a campus-based model IUPUI cannot provide tenure for five additional faculty in Labor Studies and IU Northwest in taking on Labor Studies as a department in the College of Arts and Sciences certainly wants to make its own determinations about the nature of the faculty and the number, etc.

The third issue has to do with the budgetary structure of Labor Studies. The structure is such that approximately 60 percent of the income which supports what is now the Division under an expanded model for integration would still represent multiple campuses being engaged—60 percent of the funding for that really comes from the Bloomington campus. And no unit at IUPUI or IU Northwest is going to want to assume that sort of risk and dependency on the Bloomington campus. So what that has led me to do, again I emphasize to try and find an academic home for Labor Studies, knowing its history of being in the School of Continuing Studies, moving out of Continuing Studies and having a very rocky road as a Division over these last years is to embed it in a good strong academic home, I’ve had to restrict the recommendation with respect to the breadth of Labor Studies in terms of its curriculum as well as budget issues and essentially hold these academic units harmless on curriculum. Now that doesn’t mean that in the recommendations we have just cut it off completely the notion that there would be a continuing effort in online instruction and extending out to the other campuses, I have made those recommendations. But I think those need to come after the decision is made what is going to be the academic home for Labor Studies at Indiana University. With that I’ll just throw it out for questions.

MILLER: Well let’s, before we turn to general question and comment period I’d like to ask the faculty from Labor Studies to make whatever statement they would like to give us.

NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. My name is Ruth Needleman. I’m a professor of labor studies. I’ve been on the Northwest campus for 26 years and I want to start by just telling you a little bit about what labor studies is because my experience has been that basically no one knows. We were developed in 1946 in a post-war agreement between the state, Indiana University, and Purdue University whereby we would deliver programs to help strengthen the workforce in the state of Indiana and Purdue would work with supervision. And we did that and we were mainly just on the Bloomington campus at that point but by 1970 we became a full-fledged degree program that was on six campuses throughout the state. And we offer an associate of science degree and a bachelor of science degree in labor studies and we have waiting in the wings, its been ready for three years now, a post-baccalaureate program that has been sitting because we are in limbo.

I want to talk briefly about why we are important and what our academic role is in the university. I think one of the main importance of our program has to do with our uniqueness. We are the only program that really teaches work-based kinds of issues to undergraduates—we teach employment law, discrimination law, we teach family and medical leave—things that are very
important and are basic government policy issues that cover workers. We also do an enormous
amount on comparative labor movements, on globalization and the impact of globalization on
jobs and work in the United States. There really isn’t another place in the university where these
kinds of courses with this kind of orientation is taught. But we also do extension programs. We,
since 1987, we have done an annual leadership school for women, a weeklong training program.
We do special weeklong arbitration schools. What we do is contribute in many ways to put
workers in a position to maintain mature and peaceful labor relations. There is no labor relations
in the state of Indiana, there’s no industrial relations. So it’s labor studies and the Business
School. We are twelve, kind of small, but we actually have done over these years an enormous
amount of outreach work.

I want to also point out something about who we are. When the program was first set up it was
set up with people with master’s degrees with lots of workforce experience or even union
experience. We have all of our hires since 1981 have been PhDs except for a lecturer position
and we were trained in schools such as the University of Chicago, Harvard University, the
University of Massachusetts. We come with very solid academic backgrounds and we approach
our materials with that kind of rigor. We have people on our faculty who have published books.
We have people who have national, and in a few cases, international reputations in the field of
labor studies. When a review was done in 1999 by people around the country of our program
they called us the premier labor studies program in the nation and in many ways that is what we
have been.

We in stride with the university. For example, I am teaching labor history as a service learning.
We are innovative and I think one of the things we have always been is an innovator. We have a
degree program up to a bachelor of science degree that’s now available online. A lot of our
citizens are coming back to school when they are also working full-time and I think it’s, we all
know that the state of Indiana has a very high dropout rate between high school and college, and
so [End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost] in trying to strengthen our workforce to be able
to attract new investment and capital we need to educate our workforce more and we are a bridge
that takes people—maybe a course on health and safety, maybe a class on stress, maybe a class
on grievance handling and we bring them into the university and I know on my campus one-third
of all of our graduates from our program have high or highest honors because older students
work hard. And so we also have developed a special program called Swing Shift College which
helps with this transition.

So for 36 years we’ve been on six campuses; for five years we have been based in Indianapolis.
Let me just say something now about our situation and how we look at it and I’ll try to be brief.
The basis for restructuring in the IUPUI policy has to do with financial exigency. When we lost
the $365,000 which was soft money which was used for outreach we still had our state budget
and what we did—at first they wanted to fire tenure-track people and close offices. We worked
with the vice chancellor of financial affairs at IUPUI and two faculty members, one from the
Business school and one from another department to put together a five-year budget which we
did by October. So we came together in August and by October we had a five-year budget. It was
balanced and it included the elimination of a few positions that had been added with that surplus
money given to us. And so we were at that point viable. We thought that the people, all of our
tenure-track people had been issued letters of termination because of the uncertainty of our
finances—we asked that they been reinstated because we were doing fine but we didn’t realize how fine we were doing. In that fiscal year since the faculty took over we elected our own leadership committee, we set up our own budgetary affairs committee, and within one year we had produced $1.3 million over budget, pure profit, surplus, profit, we all know what that word is. And we had done it by, if you’ll excuse the expression, working our butts off.

So what we have done is put our whole degree online which has helped enormously. I heard the use of the word “massive undertaking” to describe state-wide online program. Well this massive undertaking has been working just fine for about three years. We oversee it. We take care of getting students in and monitoring it and we are on the cutting-edge of developing some better policies for online courses. This is a very problematic area from an academic point of view because there’s a lot of things you can’t know when you don’t see your students and also when somebody calls you up in the real world and says can I come to your class to evaluate they come one day. But if you go online to evaluate you have the whole history of that faculty teaching. You could find the bad semester or the bad day. So there are faculty issues involved in what is going here because we do have and have done this massive undertaking without very many problems.

I want to point out that once the financial exigency was gone, we learned about the merger possibility. That word had never been spoken at a labor studies meeting. So now we’re being told this was always the intent. That’s fine. We would like to merge. We would like to be able to be more integrated academically into the university but what is being done and what is proposed will close most of our regional offices where in many ways we are the most helpful to the local labor force, where we are able to help adult students coming back to school. We have tenure-eligible faculty who have not been able to come up for tenure for three years and now for the second time will be fired. We feel that this is also a violation of the tenure agreement that at least needs to be looked at. If it were financial exigency, but we have money in our budget, to support these faculty and after all these years—in some cases way over five years—they still have been living in limbo. Also, six of our faculty lines are being eliminated in this proposal that Dean Sothmann has made and it will leave us so understaffed that you might as well just come out and say that we don’t want a labor studies program.

In his second proposal, they were divvying up the support money, the resources, fifty-fifty between Northwest and IUPUI. In this final proposal IUPUI has five tenure-track faculty and Northwest has one, me, who is two years from retirement. And when I go there’s no guarantee that anything will be left; and let me point out that state-wide we have over 180 majors and the second largest area of majors is right here in Kokomo. So those majors are going to be left stranded, the ones in South Bend left stranded, Fort Wayne left stranded if we have to close down our program and start over again, which is pretty much what the recommendation is. I don’t believe that after 60 years of working and 36 years with a credit curriculum that we need to start over. We have been a success for many years. We have faculty who have won many teaching awards, research awards, service awards and we think that what we teach could not be more important than it is right now.

The loss of manufacturing jobs in Indiana has dislocated tens of thousands of workers. We have the ability to bring them into the university and give them what they need to find a job—a six
month training program, a vocational training program, will not do it in a job market where change is the main aspect of it. But what we can do is help people get the critical thinking skills and also learn about it. Now one last point and we’ve discovered this in the online program. We have had 3000 enrollments in the last year. We are learning that the students who never heard of us and are taking these courses love them. They say my parents worked and my father was a union member, I never heard of this and this is so interesting. We have gained majors and minors. And the online program is enabling us to reach students who need a class on labor or employment law, who can learn a tremendous amount by studying labor history or by studying comparative labor movements or globalization. So our feeling is that we make an enormous contribution and that we want to continue making that contribution.

We are open to various kinds of restructuring but we feel if we’re going to be put on two campuses that we cannot cut off our commitment to people throughout the state who are taking our courses and who are majoring in labor studies. And we also see no reason to rethink what we do because it has worked quite well. We would need to have equal numbers, maybe six and six faculty on each campus, and we would need to coordinate—in order to be able to do an online program you know if you are in sociology everybody gets the same basic training but I was trained in romance literature and art, she was trained in economics, Bill was trained in politics and history. And so I’m not going to be able to teach the economics course on my campus. I need Lynn. She’s not going to be able to teach some of the courses I teach. So what we envision is campus-based budget, we understand the need for that. But what we’d like to be able to do is have those programs be large enough to not only build a program in the area but to maintain some state-wide aspect, some coordinated program that people around the state can take. We have been on the South Bend, Fort Wayne, and Kokomo campus for 36 years; we have majors. And by this current proposal we will abandon all of that and start over. It makes no sense to us.

MILLER: Thank you very much. So we now have a period for comments, discussion, questions.

SPECHLER: Well, first of all let me say that I think the labor studies area is a worthy one for academic work, research as well as teaching, and I admire the ambition and the creativity of the labor studies faculty both in their outreach which many of our units do, my department for example, and also in state-wide delivery of degrees. It does seem to me that it would be possible with adequate budget to solve these problems within the IUPUI campus and merging within, if that’s possible, with the School of Liberal Arts. It would have some advantages. The big advantage is one that Ruth has pointed out to us before, there have been some mistakes and some bureaucratic anomalies in the handling of the Division of Labor Studies and I think that the chances of such mistakes would be reduced if the Division of Labor Studies were part of the regular IUPUI academic framework. It does seem to me that with sufficient budget state-wide delivery at least could be continued on a temporary basis and maybe if the budget continues to justify it on an extended basis. The big issue for people not quite up on this is that much of the current budget that the division gets is from second-eight week courses offered on the Bloomington campus. Those are popular, I know my son took one of them, because sometimes students find that their first choice didn’t work out for them but they still need to be full-time students and labor studies seems like an interesting thing, they don’t know about it and they are reportedly quite satisfied by filling out their program on a second-eight week basis. Provided that the Bloomington campus, and its entirely up to them, if they are willing to continue the
budgetary transfer to IUPUI from these enrollments, it does seem to me that the budget is there for the foreseeable future. I think that’s basically the budgetary issue.

But the academic issue, as Bart rightly emphasizes, that’s the main issue, is that their research, promotion and teaching must be supervised in a peer review like any other department, any other program, any other school at Indiana University. That, I believe, has not been entirely true in the past. So if we, on the one hand, have the academic integrity from integration with a school at IUPUI and on the other hand have the flexibility to continue to offer the outreach and perhaps also state-wide degrees then I think we have an idea that we can be proud of.

SOTHMANN: Can I respond to that?

HERBERT: Please.

SOTHMANN: I would agree with that. I think that the issue that we need to have at the forefront is on a campus integration plan is that this is an academic unit that is integrating into another academic unit that has another kind of culture and it seems to me that there needs to be some time, and this is what I’ve heard, not just from the administrators but also as the administrators have talked to their department chairs who’ve talked to their faculty. We can’t make this leap this that quickly in terms of folding all this in and that’s why in the recommendations that I made, you will see, I don’t have my packet here but you will see in recommendation 10 or 11 or something along that line, that there is or should be as part of the implementation process, and I would envision this to be in the second semester, a coming together of people to look at these issues because the online program, while it’s important and I heard from the legislators and I’ve heard from other, but it’s important that the degree get delivered to other campuses at IU besides Northwest and IUPUI. But that may not be the same structure as it currently is. There may be another culture that needs to be considered with respect to that. So there needs to be a dialog and a planning time and that’s why I put that recommendation forward. So I would just emphasize that I think what you said is consistent with what’s in those recommendations and there certainly is the money to do that; there’s no question about that.

HERBERT: Other questions?

BALDWIN: Have IU Northwest and the School of Liberal Arts answered this proposal in anyway? Are they all interested in this motion?

NEEDLEMAN: I can speak in part. I know that Northwest has been interested for some time because we have the largest program in terms of five students in the classroom. At first they were interested in perhaps providing a home for the whole program but the initial budget that we did showed profitability. The second and third budget that came out from the administration showed us to be a liability by adding fees and other things. So the main thing is the College of Arts and Science is ready to accept a Department of Labor Studies. Right now, with one tenured faculty and the others being associates, they know, as do I, that they will never have a program that way. You have to have a number of tenure tracks, you have to have faculty who have some flexibility.
I have seen in the packet a letter from Bob White, but you met with him and perhaps you can answer that part of the question.

**DUGGAN:** Yes, the School of Liberal Arts is definitely interested and we’re continuing to meet and set up a meeting to become a multi-disciplinary unit within Liberal Arts. But I thought that your question had to do with IUPUI continuing to administer the whole of the Division of Labor Studies. Were you referring to the two hub model with IUN as a program and IUPUI as a program?

**SPECHLER:** Well, my view is that the outreach is obviously something that we want to continue. With respect to the degree, for students on other campuses, I think that depends on budget. My own view, although I haven’t talked to my dean, is that state-wide delivery with adequate budget is not impossible.

**FINKBINE:** Last year, wasn’t there a discussion about Purdue taking this state-wide because it was state-wide set up already? Where there any talks done officially?

**NG:** Not that I’m aware of. But I do actually want Dean Sothmann to actually, if you could, clarify one of the first statements that you made. That you came to the conclusion that this final recommendation you make as three iterations is based on the principle, or rather a consideration that no one wants to take on a state-wide online program. I suppose that means that that’s why you have to kind of, in some sense, disperse the faculty. Could you actually comment a little bit more about what exactly you mean by no one wants to take on the state-wide online program? That seems to be a source of a great deal of revenue. This is something very surprising to me that nobody would want to take that on? I’ve never heard of that. In my whole twenty something years or thirty years in the Indiana University system, people would turn money away, why is that? Can you elaborate on that?

**SOTHMANN:** Well, sure. The current curriculum is delivered from multiple campuses. It’s one curriculum basically. So there are faculty, for example, at Fort Wayne that are teaching Bloomington-based students and IUPUI students in a particular course. As people have considered how they’re going to get their arms around bringing labor studies into their particular department or school, the concern becomes how can I assure the delivery of the curriculum. When you have faculty who are on other campuses, who are primarily IUPUI faculty for example, we would have a program or a department based at IU Northwest then that Northwest department has a very heavy dependency on what’s happening at other campuses, first of all in terms of the faculty, the nature of the faculty and where their appointments are, but secondly, the students, the enrollment of the students on those campuses, etc. So as I begin to have the conversations, and I again I emphasize that what I came out with first was this two hub model that is not that different from what has been proposed from DLS. It’s not quite as broad but it had a hub and we have talked about a north central and a central south region, spheres of influence, etc. The primary concern was that they could not assure the delivery of the curriculum under that kind of situation and they wanted to make sure that they would be successful with that when they did integrate it into their college or to their school.
HERBERT: Bart?

NG: Well you say they cannot assure the successful delivery of these online courses, it seems to me that this is actually a current state of affairs. They are delivering these online courses. Now, whether you consider it successful or not, depending on your point of view, but there is in fact a review of these courses done by some people from Bloomington, Duffy and others, which pointed out to me that these courses, while they have problems, but they certainly does not suffer from any fatal flows. That’s what I tried to really look at in that report. So just like any academic deliveries, especially when it’s new, we’ll have problems but these are not insurmountable problems. So that’s why it strikes me as bring very strange where some dean says they refuse to take it on. Like I said, the problems with these courses are somehow fatally flowed. I just don’t get that impression. Maybe somebody else can help me with this.

NEEDLEMAN: We’ve been doing the online program for about four or five years. It is a new field. I know I was one of the faculty who stomped my feet and said I will never do an online program because for me learning takes place in the classroom with interaction. But I am now doing online teaching. The review that was just done, and I spent a couple of hours with Tom Duffy, the reviewer, just yesterday. There are problems that especially with the compressed class, which is the same length as the summer semester. Now Tom Duffy’s view, which I agree with, is the summer semester is too short too and is not academically sound in terms of covering any complex material and really having people absorb it, apply it, think about it. So the reason to do an evaluation is to give the material to the faculty so that they can review it and improve. I don’t think it’s to punish us and say oh, it’s not perfect, we’re going to have to get rid of you. So from what my discussion with him, we are beginning an initiative to look at best practices and particularly where we don’t totally agree, but I think the compressed class needs to be longer. I don’t want to teach that compressed class anymore, as short as it is. But again, that’s not a fatal flow. We’re in the very beginning of this stage. I have to point out that when I asked Tom for copies of the evaluation so that I as faculty chair could act on them, I was told that I can’t have them because Dean Sothmann requested the evaluation. Now, if evaluations are going to serve the faculty, they have to come back to the faculty. We have to be able to work to improve what we do. So it’s very early on to say that there is that horrible problem. The other thing is that we do deliver it. Semester after semester we offer them on all campuses, even on two of the campuses where we are not based and students get a chance to take a class on globalization or labor history and it helps them and they like the classes and we are improving them. I know I stream videos and music, read my lecture and dance to the music. We’re in a position now to provide the university, I think, with some models for online teaching because we have been doing that.

DUGGAN: One more point. Our compressed courses are not a necessity because actually the income from compressed courses last year was $700,000, while we added $1.1 million to the reserve. That was actually a surplus activity. Our online program is very strong without the compressed courses and it’s been growing by 10 percent.

HERBERT: Other questions or comments?
TERRY: I’d like to make a comment but oddly enough I hope to make it to Bart because he asked for comments to take back to the Indianapolis Faculty Council. To start off let me explain, for those of you who don’t know, I’m Herbert Terry and I’m a faculty member in telecommunications at IU Bloomington. I think that’s relevant because it really is only within the last two or three years that I’ve become very aware of what Labor Studies does even though I’ve been a part of IU for thirty four years. What I can say is that at least for a number of our students in telecommunications are in the individualized major program at IU Bloomington. It’s been useful to have these online courses available. They bring something that we don’t have on the Bloomington campus. I’ve recommended a couple of IMP students to these courses because they couldn’t find a way to balance out their program without access to that.

I think just to address a number of issues that have been discussed, I think those are valuable claims and you’re right. I come from telecommunications and nobody’s figured out how to do online education perfectly. You’ve got to allow room for experimentation, for failures, and for success. That argues for all kinds of evaluation which you do and that seems to be going on.

What I wanted to really do was address Bart’s broader question that we started out this meeting with, is this something that Indiana University should do? If you look at the cost of this, in the context of the total system budget, or even in the context of the IUPUI budget it’s a blip, its relatively small component. If we want to we can find a way to fund it. The real question is, do we want this? This is an important conversation.

I’ve read all of the stuff on the Indianapolis Faculty Council webpage about this. So I’ve read Dean Sothmann’s report, I’ve read your report. After reading all of that, one thing that I conclude is that this is important for IU to do. I’m impressed with the analogy that you draw between the function of Labor Studies and functional things like African American Studies or Women’s Studies. You are addressing a marginalized group or population. As an area of study, you can make that academically legitimate. Something I think is important and we talked about earlier, Marty raised it, about the abysmal salaries we pay some of our staff at IU Bloomington. I think the state ought to recognize that it’s possible to do what you said at the beginning of this presentation, elevate the study of employment, both from the standpoint of employers, which we do with the school of business, and from the standpoint of employees, which you tend to do.

You have a strange history. What you do with a program with a strange history, a significant outreach has to be of interest, a multi-campus, multi-disciplinary program that in these documents is described as an anomaly, is of course a major challenge. I think of the two proposals currently, that I’ve read, the one from interim director and the one from the faculty. The one from the faculty is the only one that I see as having a chance of strengthening and improving this area of study. I understand the constraints, particularly given his interpretation of budget that Director Sothmann is addressing. But I don’t think those should constrain the university’s decision as to whether this is something we need. I would hope that the campus faculty council will not feel constrained by these two proposals to feel that it must choose one or the other. Rather I hope the Indianapolis Faculty Council will focus it’s attention on the questions you posed: is this an important thing that we should do. And then it will find ways to recommend perhaps not only to the administration at IUPUI but if the finance is required, to President Herbert, to find a way to continue this program. I believe it’s in the interest of the state
to do so even if some of the folks in Indianapolis may doubt that. That it is in the interest of Indiana University for students to continue to do that. That we have based on its admittedly old, but most recent review, is a premiere program. It would be a shame to adopt a course of action that I would say will leave to failure. I would rather see us develop a course of action that has a reasonable probability of success and I think the faculty proposal comes closer to that then the one from Dean Sothmann.

HERBERT: Ted?

MILLER: Well, that was a very eloquent statement, Herb. You, I think you have demonstrated over the years that you are capable of doing such things and this was a good one. I hope we have it verbatim. I’m frankly not sure that anybody is going to want to follow that necessarily because we really, I think, are at a point where we need to probably press on in terms of our agenda. So thank you all very much. I think this has been a useful discussion and I certainly wish the Indianapolis Faculty Council well in its deliberations. Thank you, Dean Sothmann, for taking your time for joining us.

SOTHMANN: My pleasure.

MILLER: I’m not sure exactly where this is going to go but I think, I turn to Herb that if we approach this focusing on the academic issues, that we will find a way through it.

NG: I just want to say that I quite agree with your analysis and I think that many of the people on our campus are very well aware that the decision must be made on academic grounds.

NEEDLEMAN: Thank you very much.

MILLER: Thank you all for coming.

AGENDA ITEM #6: REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR CHANCELLORS

HERBERT: Ted, Item #6?

MILLER: Yes, the next item on the agenda is the policy for the review of chancellors. The current version of this is Circular U6-2007. This document has a rather complex history and you will note at the top, just underneath the title of the document that the University Faculty Council acted on this proposal, on this policy, on April 12th 2005. Since that time, the policy has been mostly in the hands of the Trustees. They have been thinking about whether this is a suitable policy. At the end of the last academic year, roughly in May of 2006, we got from the Trustees an edited version of this policy incorporating things that they wanted to change. They also indicated that they wanted to act on this document in fairly short order. Therefore the UFC Agenda Committee went through the changes proposed by the Trustees and basically decided on behalf of the council to accept certain changes and not accept other changes that were proposed by the Trustees. If you will look at the notes in the margin of this document as you go through
you will see a number of them refer to the date June of 2006. These comments basically reflect actions that were taken by the UFC Agenda Committee in response to the Trustees ideas.

Many of the things that the Trustees wanted to change in this policy we felt were really not problematic at all. They are just alternative ways in saying the same thing and they didn’t seem to us to be significant. There was one point where the UFC took issue with the Trustees and this is on comment UFC7. This is on page 2 of the document, comment UFC7, and this has to do with the composition of the review committee. You will see the language that is in this particular document is the original language that the UFC approved that the majority of the members of the review committee shall be from the faculty of the campus. The Trustees wanted and perhaps still do want to alter that language. Their language proposal was that approximately half of the members of the review committee shall be of the faculty of the campus, which left open the question of whether the majority would or would not be faculty from the campus. We basically told the Trustees on behalf of the faculty that we felt that if a majority of the committee were not members of the faculty that the creditability of the review would be undermined at least in the eyes of the faculty. And of course, we feel that and have always felt that this policy basically is a policy that structures a review by the faculty of the chancellor. That is where all of this started many years ago, 1993 is the first iteration of this. It was really the faculty’s review of the chancellor and so we basically indicated that we felt that this particular word, majority is a very important word and we pressed them to include it. They were not overly receptive to that the last time that we talked to them. But they haven’t taken action on this yet, so we go then from June of 2006 to the last Trustee meeting.

The Trustees were about to act on a document that did not include this majority language, had the alternate language in it, but at that meeting the University Counsel had some further ideas of how this document needed to be altered. In particularly, they were ideas that pertained to section 7 of the document that is on page 4 right now. The original section 7 is actually on page 5. You will see the struck out section 7 that was the version of it that existed last month. Basically the University Counsel said in that section, there is some discussion about confidentiality issues and basically the University Counsel’s position is that this policy really should not talk about confidentiality in reviews because there is no way that the University can guarantee confidentiality for anything. And so basically the University Counsel had some further amendments to the language which would basically strike the word confidential or confidentiality from anywhere that it existed.

So we had a discussion over that matter at the last meeting of the Trustees. Bart and I had this discussion with the Academic Affairs Committee members and as a result of that discussion, they said that we should go back one more time and work on language that we felt would be useful in this particular section and then bring the document back to them. So we have redrafted Section 7. We have added this Section 8 that is now there on page 4 and we have redone the section on the surveys a bit. Essentially the thrust of this new language in 7, 8, and 9 is to try to focus attention in the review on collecting data in ways that we at least think have a good chance of being held confidential. It is very clear that some things really don’t have much of a chance. If a person being reviewed or if anybody else wants to know what the contents of various letters are that are submitted to the review committee, these things cannot be held confidential. It turns out that if the committee member interviews somebody, personally, and writes notes in a journal or a
diary regarding what they have learned and if that information is then used subsequently to
fashion the results of the review the materials in that diary or journal apparently can be held
confidential. It is not subject to open records disclosure even though the University Counsel is
not willing to say that in print. It appears that that is true. So what we have tried to do here is
emphasis this idea of in these reviews what we really want to do is emphasis methods of
collecting information that are likely to be able to be held confidential and while we know that
there will be other kinds of information coming together in these reviews the main stuff should
be attempted to be structured in a way that we can hold it confidential. So we have the interviews
and we are focused on the surveys because we believe that the survey data can also be
confidential.

That’s really the point of this, is really to focus the committee on those kinds of data collection
methods and we also in here now say that before the committee gets into action that there should
be a meeting between the committee and the University Counsel or a representative from the
Counsel’s office so that the committee can actually get a straight verbal scoop on what the case
is with regards to confidentiality. The Counsel appears to be willing to say things in a meeting
like that, that she will not agree to write down on paper. So that is kind of where we are here.
What I would like to do here today, if it is the will of the Council, I would like to re-approve this
document as amended, including our original language about the majority membership of the
faculty on the committee and we will submit this new version to the Trustees for their
consideration. They apparently are planning to act on this a week and half from now.

HERBERT: Is there a motion in that regard?

TERRY: Moved.

FINKBINE: Second.

HERBERT: Any discussion?

BALDWIN: Has the Board of Trustees spoken on the issue of majority of faculty? What is their
main reason for opposing?

MILLER: The main reason for opposing it as I have at least heard them say is that they feel if
the committee has a majority of faculty on it that this will interfere with the president’s authority
to make decisions about people who report directly to him. In other words, it is expressed as –
they view this as a governance issues.

BALDWIN: Have we tried to tell them that report is only advisory to the President?

MILLER: Yes, well we have tried to explain that to them on numerous occasions but they have
a view of this that having a majority of faculty is going to somehow interfere with the President’s
authority.

FULK: To ask a somewhat dumb question but if the faculty is not going to be a majority than
who is?
MILLER: Well in all likelihood there may not be a majority. There may not be a majority. We know that these committees include a student representative, community representatives, alumni representatives, all kinds of people and all likelihood there would end up not a majority of anything.

SPECHLER: Well a couple of…I would vote for this but I wouldn’t go to mortal combat with the Trustees about the difference between a majority and about a majority or about half that strikes me as knit picking with people who should be on our side. Once more there are many constituents Ted, as you just pointed out, with whom the chancellor has connections. With respect to confidentiality, I think the good policy of Indiana University all these years is that we try to make personnel issues confidential and we have reviews of deans and chancellors all the time, there is a public version and there this is a version that is not circulated. I suppose that we can go to court and get that revealed but I think in practice those have been held confidential. I think we should go on that way. I have an embarrassing question. Your campus doesn’t have a chancellor.

MILLER: Correct.

SPECHLER: It has an Interim Provost. Is the Interim Provost understood as some of us do understand essentially as a chancellor or should you include also, I assume that Provost is something that we are going to continue. I really don’t know, about the Provost or the Interim Provost in connection with these reviews.

MILLER: Well this, Marty, is a university-level document. The Chancellors are viewed as university-level officials; that’s why we have a university-level policy concerning their review. They serve as chief executive officer of their campus so from that point of view the President is the chief executive officer [End Tape 1, Side B] in Bloomington. The President is reviewed there is a review procedure for the President so the chief executive officers do have review procedures. The Provost is a Bloomington campus official and the Bloomington campus has review procedures for its academic administrators, although it is clear that the Provost is not listed in there right now as a person that would be reviewed that way. But it seems to me that the Provost is not really a person who fits neatly into this particular concept.

NG: Perhaps I can add here, if you look into comment UFC 11, frankly, the Provost in this case falls outside of this document not because he is the Provost but because he has vice presidential duties. So does the chancellor of IUPUI. So, technically both of them fall outside of the purview of this document.

MILLER: I would say that is not my understanding. The chancellor at IUPUI is a university-level vice president. The provost at Bloomington is a Bloomington campus vice president.

NG: Is that correct?

MILLER: That is correct. The organization chart has become more complicated under our recent reorganization.
NG: My apology for not keeping it updated.

SPECHLER: You mean to say that this interim provost has no system-wide responsibility?

HERBERT: He does have some system-wide responsibilities but primarily the Graduate School and SES.

SPECHLER: Well so…

MILLER: At least it’s my understanding that that is not why that person is called Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bloomington. That’s the title, that’s the vice presidential title that Michael McRobbie has in Bloomington; Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bloomington.

HERBERT: Dick McKaig is Vice President for Student Affairs, Bloomington.

SPECHLER: But the problem is that this gentleman in this new position has system-wide responsibilities. Why is he reviewed only on the Bloomington campus?

KISH: Can I clarify that? Just like the Indianapolis policy, for a dean that is a multi-campus dean, you would include representatives from the faculties on the other campuses. So a similar policy exists on each of the campuses has a campus-level administrative policy and that policy applies to deans. The Bloomington policy will include the provost which would then include on the review committee or a search committee for example, representatives from the graduate programs on the other campuses and SES, the responsibilities that fall within his system-level things. So those are handled within your campus policy at present to include representatives when the person’s responsibilities extend beyond the campus.

SPECHLER: Is that your understanding Ted also?

MILLER: Yes, I think that’s the way the system has worked previously.

HERBERT: Bill?

SCHNEIDER: So we are straying a bit from the focus and I’d like to call the question.

HERBERT: The question has been called, all those who are in favor of the motion to approve this new version, this updated version of the review procedures for Chancellors please say aye [AYE], opposed no. Ok, I guess it’s unanimous.

AGENDA ITEM #7: POLICY ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

HERBERT: Next item on the agenda item #7 is a first reading on the Policy on Intellectual Property.
Atkinson: Is George Alter in Bloomington? So this is another policy that’s been here before you can see as other multiple u-numbers on the top. This is a policy that we took up in the spring semester last year. Its history is that the current Intellectual Property policy that’s in force had a clause that required that it be reviewed by the Vice President for Research after 5 years so after 7 years a task force was appointed to make recommendations on revisions to the Intellectual Property Policy. That task force completed its work in the spring of last year and then the policy document that they developed was revised mostly by the research affairs committees on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses with some input from distance education in Indianapolis. That policy came to the UFC in the spring semester and I think we have had two readings on that policy ultimately there was a major objection particularly in the School of Informatics on the Bloomington campus to the treatment of software in last years draft of the policy. So the principle that was used in treating the handling of software as a procedural matter was that software would be procedurally treated as though it were potentially patentable intellectual property, which was not to say that the software would in fact have any of the characteristics of patentable intellectual property, but it would be disclosed the technology transfer office in the same way as patentable intellectual property would be. There was a major objection to this as I said from many of the folks in computer science based on their understanding that software is usually, unless it contains a patentable element, treated as a copyrighted work of intellectual property and in most cases that means that the ownership of that property in a university devolves to the creator as a traditional work of scholarship. So there was a strong objection to the treatment. So the draft of the policy that you have before you now has been revised to essentially reverse that position so now software unless it contains some patentable algorithm is treated as a copyrightable work of intellectual property so unless there is extraordinary university support its treated as a traditional work of scholarship.

I should probably go through the document and just outline what is says for those members who are new on the UFC this year who haven’t lived with this policy for a number of years. The policy first of all sets out a serious of legalistic definitions. The main point of this section is to establish the carve out for Traditional Works of Scholarship. Universities unlike commercial entities have traditionally allowed their faculty to take ownership of intellectual property that falls under the definition of Traditional Works of Scholarship. The broad definition is really those things that you do as a faculty member that are part of the criteria for leading up to one of tenure positions. For example, books, articles, creative works, would fall usually into the Traditional Works of Scholarship exception to the Intellectual Property Policy. So that is really the point of that section.

Section 2 defines how patentable intellectual property is treated. Patentable intellectual property must to be disclosed to the Technology Transfer Office so that they can pursue marketing and establishment of a patent application for that intellectual property. If the Technology Transfer Office chooses not to do that then the rights of that intellectual property revert to the creator. If the Technology Transfer Office does pursue a patent and a potential sale or licensing of that intellectual property, then towards the end of the policy there is a description of how any revenues that derive from that are distributed between the creator and the university and I will get to that later.
The next section deals with the handling of copyrightable intellectual property which in most cases would fall under the Traditional Works exception, however, what are defined as Exceptional University Support is put into the creation of that copyrightable property then the university will claim ownership of that intellectual property and if its marketing and distribution of revenues would be handled in the same way as if it were patentable intellectual property. So Exceptional University Support is defined as support beyond what you would normally expect as a faculty member in your unit. So your office computer, your availability to your office, access to the library is not extraordinary university support. It is what is expected as normal support as your role as a faculty member. Of course that is going to vary somewhat depending on discipline.

The next section, Section G, deals with handling of online instructional materials. This as we have learned from previous discussions is a relatively new and evolving area. The basic principle here is the same if there is extraordinary university support contributed to the creation of these online instructional materials then the university will claim ownership of those and revenues will be distributed in the same way as the other sections of the policy. The basic thesis of this whole section concerning online coursework is that in many cases its probably necessary and advisable for faculty members to enter into an agreement with the university concerning whether the university is putting in extraordinary support in creation of these works and to establish up front at the time of creation whether those online instructional materials will be treated by the university as university owned works and if so how that will actually be handled and those agreements would be entered into between the university and the creator with presumably development of whatever local unit is involved in that creation.

**MILLER:** Simon, could I just ask you a question about that point?

**ATKINSON:** Yes.

**MILLER:** This is on page 10 is that roughly where you are now, down near the bottom where you are talking about these agreements regarding exceptional university support. That language right now is under this section of online instructional materials. Is this not a more general principle regarding exceptional university support? This is not the only area where exceptional university support could be granted. Shouldn’t this idea of an agreement be also described in a more general place here?

**ATKINSON:** Yes, and at one time in some previous version of the policy it was.

**MILLER:** I thought there was something like that but I haven’t seen it

**ATKINSON:** There was at least an advisory clause that was present in the general copyright section. Looking at this draft now it seems to have disappeared so that might be something that we want to make a note. I don’t know if that was something taken out by Ann Gellis. I am not sure how that happened.

**BALDWIN:** There is a section of it under definitions in the beginning.
**ATKINSON:** Yes, but there was previously in the copyright section an advisory clause advising faculty that if there was any question about this issue to establish up front if the university was going to assert exceptional support.

**MILLER:** At one point it was my understanding that the position we were going to try take in this document was that unless there was an upfront agreement then the presumption would be that there has not been exceptional university support.

**ATKINSON:** And it would default to a Traditional Work. I think that’s right. The next section concerns the distribution of revenues and this is a major change in the current policy. The distribution is summarized in this table on page 14 with 35 percent of revenues going to the creator, 15 percent to the creator’s lab or program, if the word lab is not applicable, 20 percent to campus units, 5 percent to central university, and 25 percent of the revenues directly being used to fund the operations of the Technology Transfer Office. This is designed as an incentive the Technology Transfer Office. The revenue stream would essential be tied to the production of revenue producing intellectual property and would also address a perceived problem that the technology transfer office is being currently under funded over a number of years.

**MEISS:** Was there not at one time a sliding scale?

**ATKINSON:** The current policy has a sliding scale and there have been strong objections from a number of creators to that sliding scale.

**FISHER:** Well I have a question about the OTT Expenses. I would think that would be great for them to get up to 25 percent up to a certain point, but at a certain point they are well exceeding their expenditures and then they are maybe getting more than their fair share.

**ATKINSON:** Yes, so this number of 25 percent didn’t really come out of thin air. I’ve got the exact figures but 25 percent of the current intellectual property revenue that the university gets would fund the Technology Transfer Office to a level comparable with our peer institutions. It would support the same number of positions at the Technology Transfer Office. The implementation procedures for this policy, there is a provision for it to be periodically revised and the distribution of revenues, in particular the use of the revenues in the Technology Transfer Office is going to be reviewed by this new Intellectual Property Policy council that is created by this policy. That was a big concern that the revenue stream could get out of line with our activities.

**FISHER:** And we could revisit the policy at that point. My other question has to do with campus units. I assume that means schools?

**ATKINSON:** So the policy leaves the assignment as to what is a campus unit to the campus because things are structured so differently particularly on the Indianapolis campus and the Bloomington campus that’s left for the development of campus specific policies that will define what is the unit for the purposes of this.
FISHER: So that leaves no protections for schools to actually get any of that money in essence if it is left to the campuses.

ATKINSON: It’s left to the campus faculty council so if the campus faculty councils don’t want to protect their schools then that could happen.

FISHER: What happens if there’s not labs involved in?

ATKINSON: Lab is defined as lab or program.

SCHNEIDER: Could that be department?

ATKINSON: It doesn’t…it’s not intended to mean department.

FISHER: Do we need a definition of it?

ATKINSON: There is a definition on the previous page.

TERRY: It does include department.

ATKINSON: It does include the department. This is something that in many cases is going to have to be worked on an individual basis so that will be up to the relevant administration and this is something that could be, how that is defined is I think something that could be appealed to the Intellectual Property Policy Council. That would have to make the move of an ambiguous situation. It is really impossible to define every particular faculty member’s situation across the university. One of the reasons behind this, no one likes to create new committees but in the case of this policy it was necessary because there are a lot of ambiguous situations.

SCHNEIDER: Would the lab be different from a center?

ATKINSON: A lab most likely could come from center. I have a lab that is part of a center so in my case a lab.

SCHNEIDER: That’s ok then in the policy?

ATKINSON: Then there are various bits of legal items about the implementation that I don’t think will make any particular significance to anybody the University Counsel’s office.

HERBERT: Could I ask one question on the top of page 14, the second line? It says “devoted to intellectual property creation and protection”. Do we need to add the words “and commercialization”? I ask that because ultimately it’s from the commercialization that that you derive, or is there a reason that you decided not to do that?

ATKINSON: It was intentionally drawn more narrowly in that route. We really wanted those revenues to be directly used by the Technology Transfer Office for the protection of intellectual property which, as you know, is a very expensive enterprise. We think that the resources for
commercialization in the more global sense should really come from elsewhere. The economic development mission of the university shouldn’t be necessarily diverted out of these intellectual property revenues. The real intention is to direct those revenues specifically to allow the university to protect intellectual property on behalf of the creators of the university.

HERBERT: I ask in part because I wonder if we are trying to generate the kind of ROI that is called for here, ultimately commercialization of some of that may become an important piece of this. That is gross revenues may be tied back in some respects.

ATKINSON: There’s definitely a commercialization aspect to what a Technology Transfer Office does because basically they won’t seek prosecution of a patent application unless they have already identified a commercial prospect for that intellectual property because it is so expensive to prosecute a patent.

TERRY: I wonder if you could point me specifically at the language in this version addressing the concerns of computer science about software becoming presumptively copyrightable rather than patentable.

ATKINSON: Certainly, I can point you to the main change which in the original definitions section. I believe definition D, Traditional Works of Scholarship, use to be defined as works of scholarship other than patentable intellectual property and software.

KISH: Excluding software.

ATKINSON: So pretty much what’s missing here.

TERRY: So the answer to this has not been to specifically say that software is presumptively copyrightable rather than patentable but to be vague?

ATKINSON: Right.

KISH: In the preamble Herb in the last sentence of the third paragraph, the last two sentences that is revised from the previous one and this is sort of the advice area the preamble. Third paragraph last two sentences.

TERRY: I’m raising the question because people in my department remain concerned about patentable or copyrightable of two things: digital art and video games and similar programs. For the sake of some kind of record are those things regarded as software and therefore usually copyrightable, although they may be patentable in some instances.

ATKINSON: I would think that both those areas would be regarded as usually copyrighted but I think at some point we get into ….

TERRY: But this policy could state that our current understanding of the law and if it gets overturned later then it gets overturned. We publish lots of policies that eventually have to be modified.
POMPER: I think it does on page 3 item I, second paragraph at the bottom, “Copyrightable Intellectual Property” and software is specifically listed there.

ATKINSON: Then it doesn’t, you get into various areas like video games and it gets to be more complicated.

MILLER: Thank you very much, Simon. Bill you have a question?

SCHNEIDER: A quick question. This is a very elaborate policy primarily (some words unclear) traditional works is meant to save us from multiple pages. However there is one thing that is possibly of concern some of us are able to get some external funding. And the way I read this externally funded works makes these universities works. University works then looks like it kicks in this whole policy. If I get a $2500 grant to go to Paris to do some research on a project I’ve been working ten years on am I going to have to…

ATKINSON: No the reason that clause is in there is because many sponsor agreements with the university specify the disposition of intellectual property that results from those agreements so the university needs to be able, if necessary, to treat those sponsored works as university works.

SCHNEIDER: If those external sources are produce traditional works. Maybe we need to qualify that.

HERBERT: Other questions or comments?

MILLER: This is a first reading, it’s hard to call this a first reading but it is a first reading of this version of the policy. It is our intention to try to act on this policy at our November meeting so I encourage all of you on your various campuses if you are interested in reviewing this one last time to please do so this coming month. The UFC meeting in November is at the very end of the month after Thanksgiving so hopefully all the Faculty Councils will meet between now and then and have a chance to do this.

TERRY: To faculty who remain concerned about some part of this to whom specifically should they address their comments or questions?

MILLER: Well.

KISH: I have been collecting them unfortunately.

HERBERT: Did everyone hear Kelly volunteer?

MILLER: Kelly knows who the right people are to any question that comes up.

AGENDA ITEM #8: TRANSFERABILITY AND GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY
HERBERT: Okay we now go to item 8.

MILLER: Yes Bill the meeting actually goes until 4:30, but hopefully we will not have to spend that amount of time on this last item. This is a general education update. We are, Bart and I are planning in a week and half at the next Trustees meeting to present the Trustees with an update on general education and so this is to keep you up to date on where we are in our thinking and so forth. As many of you know, general education has been a topic of interest amongst the faculty of this university for a very long time. Some of our campuses have implemented general education programs. They are in operation. Others have tried to implement general education programs and have failed, although at least one of us, even after a long history of failure has now taken the first step to implement a general education program. This is the Bloomington campus that I talk about. There has been a lot of interest in this topic in the faculty and of course we know that when President Herbert came to IU, one of the first things that came out of his month was his interest in general education. And the Trustees in the last year or so have indicated their interest in general education.

We are coming in February to a point where the university, through the President, will give its response to a Trustee resolution that was approved several months ago regarding general education. One of the things that we know about general education is that the faculty on each campus has their own ideas about general education. This is perhaps the most fundamental thing that we know is that the faculty on each campus have their own ideas about general education. And over a full year of discussion in the Educational Policies Committee, two years ago it was very, very clear that there was no interest in developing a common set of general education requirements that would be offered to every student in Indiana University. The faculty did not want to go there. Now, it is clear that some other people may want to go there and basically what we are trying to do at this point is to indicate that what might be viewed as the outcome of having a common general education curriculum everywhere can be accomplished in another way—particularly having a focus on the so-called Course Transfer Library that is basically being created by the Commission on Higher Education under a legislative mandate that we have all heard about regarding a bill that was passed by the legislature last spring.

So what we are trying to tell the Trustees is that there is a lot of interest in general education on the various campuses, we are developing general education programs on our various campuses. We feel that having common general education everywhere the same would basically undercut many of the strengths that individual campuses can bring to this issue. We all have our individual strengths. We have our capacities. We have our uniqueness and I think it the faculty’s view that those things should be manifested in the campus general education program. If we squish them all down from our point of view this is not going to be a positive thing. So we are trying to say to the Trustees that by using this course transfer library, we can in fact bring into existence an awful lot of things that would follow from having a common general education program. In particular, we would be able to give people advice about a course that they might take that is in this library, we would be able to tell them how these courses would be used across the IU campuses and hopefully its going to end up that many of these courses in the course transfer library will have similar uses on all of the campuses. Now whether that is going to be the result yet I do not know because we are really just kind of getting into this. We have the document that you have in front.
of you today, this white document is kind of a preliminary set of information that is meant to sort of point out some of the possibilities that exist here and some of the issues that faculty on various campuses need to confront as they get into this. Now note please that this is a white document, it is not a blue document. It does not have any sort of official label on it. It is not an official University Faculty Council document it is just some information that we have brought along here today to talk about, to help us kind of talk about this particular subject. Let me just give you a couple good examples of that we have here. The information on this document comes from the Bloomington campus and the Southeast campus. Those two campuses have to this point, we are at least in possession of the information that has been provided from these campuses regarding the assessment of these course transfer library courses. So if you look at this document in the first column you will see these bold titles, these are titles of courses in the course transfer library and what the Commission on Higher Education is up to now through some of its subcommittees is trying to identify on each campus a specific course that sort of matches up with this generic title. So if you look at the second course on the list American Government, in Bloomington the course that they identified is political science Y103, Introduction to American Politics that’s the same course at the Southeast campus and it may well be the same course on every campus, every IU campus because we have common course numbering system. These courses are being identified not only on the IU campuses but on all the state system campuses so there would be a course at Ivy Tech, course at Ball State, course at Purdue, etc. And the idea of the course transfer library, and the idea of the legislation was that these courses once they agreed to by the Commission and the committees of the Commission that they equivalence is agreed to that those courses would transfer seamlessly across various campuses and one of the provisions is that to the extent that Political Science Y103 meets certain requirements in Bloomington a transferred equivalent course coming from Ball State, Kokomo, wherever. The transferred equivalent course would satisfy those same requirements in Bloomington; that’s what the law says has to happen. So what we are now up to is we are now taking this list of courses and the courses that have been identified in my case in Bloomington that match up with this and we are trying to evaluate the use of those courses in a general education context so American Government Political Science Y103, if you run out to the end of this list what this says is that that course is going to count—there is a yes there in the third column from the right- that means it is going to have a use in our gen ed program specifically its going to be course that can be used in the Social and Historical Studies component of the gen ed program. So if somebody is at Ball State and they take the course that matches up with this one in Bloomington, they will know for sure that if they transfer to Bloomington, they will have a course that will count in the gen ed program. If they are at Ivy Tech and they take the course that matches up with this one, they transfer to Bloomington they will have a course that satisfies gen ed requirement. Now in this particular case with regard to the Southeast campus that basically the course is going to satisfy a very similar requirement on the Southeast campus. Its going to count in what is called Social and Behavioral Sciences on the Southeast campus. So this is the kind of thing that we are hoping to see a lot of as the various campuses evaluate these courses and of course these are all very basic courses and I think that there is a likelihood or a chance at least that we will end up with a lot of these courses satisfying a very similar requirement on each of the IU campuses.

This is an empirical question right so we are not sure exactly how this is going to turn out. Maybe it’s not going to turn out so well, I don’t know. I am hoping that is going to given the nature of these courses, I think that there is a reason to expect that it might turn out well. Well
the American Government category is really pretty straightforward one. Not all of them are as straightforward so let’s just consider the Abnormal Psychology course up above here. You will see that in that second column that course has been evaluated by Bloomington and by Southeast as a course that is not taught. And you will notice after the column the reason for this is given as level. What this means is that the IU course in Abnormal Psychology is a 300-level course and the course that is offered at Ivy Tech and at a number of other places this course is offered at a 200-number and so we have a policy as many of you know. This is a policy that is now under review but it is our policy right now that we will not transfer a class from a 2-year institution and equate it to a 300- or 400-level course within Indiana University. So that is why this Abnormal Psychology is listed this way on this sheet because the Ivy Tech Abnormal Psychology is a 200-level course, well whatever it is, our course is a 300-level course and we have by policy that we will not equate those courses. So there are a number of instances like this as we go through here please note what has happened to this course in the evaluation from Bloomington and Southeast. The Southeast has concluded at this point that this course—lets suppose somebody takes a Abnormal Psychology at Ivy Tech and they transfer to the Southeast campus, what the Southeast campus has said initially is that that course will not count in the general education program, now you will note that in Bloomington – you know we are the good guys in this whole – Now please note that this is a tentative judgment, we have a new committee that we are forming that is going to make the basic decisions about this but…. 

NG: That will consist of good guys too.

MILLER: Yes they will be good guys too. That’s right. So what we have done is we have said alright look so somebody has taken Abnormal Psychology at Ivy Tech. They are transferring the course to Bloomington, its going to be transferred under our normal practice as an undistributed 3 credit hour course, Psychology undistributed from our point of view we don’t see any reason why that course could not satisfy a general education requirement in Bloomington. It is not going to be equated to the 300-level psychology course but it is still a course, it is about social and historical studies and from our point of view there really is no reason why we couldn’t give recognition to that course in the gen ed program so that the decision that we have made here. So the fact that we don’t have an exactly equivalent course to match up with I really don’t think should be a reason why we can’t find a home for these courses in our gen ed structures. We are dealing here with a fairly limited number of courses; now of course what the future might bring in terms of the length of this is another matter I suppose but right now at least we are dealing with a number of courses that are about 80 in number. And my hope is that by the end of the day that we can find a place for these courses, for as many of these courses as possible, at the general education level. We don’t have to count them in our majors, but in the general education level I think it would be very useful if we could find a home for them. To the extent that we can demonstrate that a substantial number of these courses satisfy similar requirements on all of our campuses it seems to me that we are really going quite a ways in the direction of the kind of commonalty that I think the Trustees conceive of when they think about general education, common kind of general education program. This would basically solve a number of problems that they think can be solved by having a common general education program. [End Tape 2 Side A] Well okay maybe I will stop there and we can, if there are questions about this I would happy to try to clarify.
KINTZELE: Last UFC meeting, we talked about matrix of all of the campuses and you stated that this was a little premature but you thought it would be as minimal as 20 credit hours that would be common for all the campuses in mind. Is your thinking now since you are going through this…

MILLER: Well I don’t recall saying that exactly, Marilyn. I really don’t recall saying that. My feeling all along here has been that I have been hoping that as many of these courses as possible could find a home in our gen ed curricular and in as similar place as possible given the structures that we have in place on the various campuses.

SPECHLER: Well I want to be on clear on two points here. Ted as I understand you are going to construct, or a committee, will construct a list of course titles because they are not the course itself but just the title which will match up with a specific campus that is to say the IUPUI campus will decide that so and so course offered at Kokomo will count towards our gen ed course, now that is what I am saying.

MILLER: Now that is not quite right. What’s happening is there is a sub-committee of the Higher Education Commission that is sitting down and they are taking these general course titles that are in bold on this sheet and they are equating courses from each of the campuses to that course title.

SPECHLER: So on the first point then if a course is on this list then it will be acceptable at every campus at Indiana University.

MILLER: Under the law it will transfer and it must satisfy the same requirements that the local equivalent course now satisfies, that is what the state law now says.

SPECHLER: Okay, so but it is still open to each campus to decide what courses are equivalent.

NG: I think that it is correct. If your question is take a generic title at IUPUI, take Art History. Art History 1, it is satisfied by H101 now that is our decision it is not H100, H099, but H101.

MILLER: It’s not specifically the campus decision. IU has some representatives to the committee that is making those equivalences.

SPECHLER: On the basis of looking at what the course really is or just...

NG: Well presumably there is some negotiation of detail that I do not know but they do sit down and actually look and compare syllabus and then they say yes this is...the rule that I have heard is that something like 80 percent or 75 percent equivalent.

FRANTZ: This is just…I have seen one of these course transfer lists at our institution. This is not just within Indiana University. It is all the state institutions so you get a sheet at the end that says Intro to Computers, you got 7 to 8 different courses from all of these universities all of which legislature is going to say that you can go anywhere you have taken this course it is going count for whatever course is listed at Indiana University.
SPECHLER: Ok, I understand that but suppose that Introduction to Economics that’s my field is on this list. Does IUPUI have the right to say that these one semester course is not equivalent to anything on our campus?

FISHER: No, it’s being negotiated in that committee. In the state-wide committee, it is being negotiated there.

SPECHLER: Ok, so they are going to say no it is equivalent to E201.

MILLER: Well, Marty, if you will go to page 3 of this document about 2/3 the way down at the bottom. And you will see in Bloomington and Southeast and I presume the other campuses would maybe say the same thing that this is a course that is not taught because our structure is that we have an Intro to Micro and Intro to Macro. We do not teach a one semester course in Introductory Economics so that is a course that is not taught. If a student takes that at Ivy Tech and say transfers to IUPUI, they would probably bring their three credit hours with them and they would get some kind of economics undistributed.

KISH: No, these are courses have already been determined so the Indianapolis equivalent for that is ECON E101. It is equivalent to a Ball State course, Indiana State course, Fort Wayne course etc.

MILLER: Wait a minute according to this sheet it is not done.

KISH: No that is Bloomington and Southeast but in Indianapolis there is a course.

SPECHLER: Kelly is correct.

KISH: Yes I know I am correct. But Marty I would be happy to send you this entire excel spreadsheet so that you can see all the statewide courses. What we have done here is just taken Bloomington and Southeast.

MILLER: Ultimately we are trying to develop this information for each campus.

SPECHLER: So in the past ex-post we have examined the courses and determined yes it is equivalent or not equivalent. Now it’s going to be known that a student looking to take at Ivy Tech will know if I pass this course at Ivy Tech I am going to get this credit for E101 at IUPUI.

MILLER: Correct.

SPECHLER: Well I hope that you have a committee of…

MILLER: Well, let’s hope so. But beyond that Marty then question is going to be let’s take the Bloomington case again. This is not a course that is not taught in Bloomington. So in Bloomington if somebody transfers with that credit we are going to give them undistributed credit, and what we are saying here is that they have taken a 3-credit hour course in economics
and from our point of view that is something that would satisfy a social and historical studies course in the gen ed program.

SPECHLER: Absolutely you are right. Is the committee going to tell you that is what you must do?

MILLER: No, we are making that decision.

SPECHLER: I see.

MILLER: Now you can see that the Southeast campus has not made that decision.

SPECHLER: So the student who takes this course at Ivy Tech and passes, now he comes to either IUPUI or Bloomington because we do the same things, Right. And we tell him that it satisfies E101 but does not satisfy general education, but Kokomo might decide otherwise is that right.

MILLER: That’s right. The final three columns on this chart right now are under the control of each campus. The stuff to the left are basically being developed by the Higher Education Commission Committee so we are trying to build off of their decisions and we are trying to say on our campuses what are these courses going to be used for.

SPECHLER: But you are going to tell them in advance that if you take this course at Ivy Tech, it may count as E101 but it will not count as general education at Bloomington but it might at Kokomo, but you will tell them in advance.

MILLER: We are hoping that we are going to be able to tell them it is going to count everywhere for more or less the same thing that would be the best possible outcome.

HERBERT: We have four minutes.

TERRY: I want to turn to the reason why I think you brought this to us is to make a case to the Trustees that we are doing what they have asked though we are not doing exactly what they have asked.

HERBERT: Don’t say that.

TERRY: I would think that the table will make the case. The more lines of this that can be clear to the Trustees the more you will be able to demonstrate the diversity of Indiana University. We can’t establish a very large system-wide general education program. I like your argument that diversity also reflects the richness of the campus. The risk of a system-wide general ed program is that it would be a lowest common denominator requirement, determined by whatever the resources are of the smallest unit that can offer those courses. The other thing that I would stress is that this ought to be very useful to students when they plan that a student who comes in truly exploratory and discovers that they are interested in something that they never thought of before, if they want to pursue that they are probably not going to graduate in four years they have
changed their plans. But this will provide the information for a student that comes and says I am anticipating transferring to IU Bloomington after two years at Kokomo. This will tell that student what to do at Kokomo and I don’t think the end development of general ed plan for the students without the plans to transfer.

MILLER: I think all of that is true, Herb. But from my point of view the thing that I think recommends this approach over an approach that would focus on only the IU campuses and have some kind of commonality that this approach extends across all the state institutions and basically kind of talks to the students wherever they might be who have a plan and articulates classes that will meet requirements at our various campuses.

SPECHLER: But the complication here is that each campus here has to look at hundreds of courses and say whether this particular course fits somewhere into our general education scheme. They are general yes but not always yes.

MILLER: There are 88 courses at currently, so far.

SPECHLER: So far.

NG: Ted, could I answer that actually this is also pc information that you should be aware of. Since IUPUI does not appear on this list, we are actually working in the same direction as Bloomington and I have in front of me a list similar to this one but it only apply to IUPUI, of the courses which we have identified to be equivalent to the IUPUI courses I counted 70. Okay this has been determined by the committee on our campus and of these 70 courses the usage of 54 of them are identical to that of Bloomington. I have just done this while you were talking about something else. The difference really comes in your treatment of certain language courses for example you would not take the first two language courses to be worth anything in Bloomington. In our case we actually take that towards general education so my, I think the lesson to take away from this very brief calculation is that there are tremendous overlap and commonality and I think aligned with what Herb said this will in fact demonstrate to the Trustees even though you say this is an empirical exercise, don’t know what the outcome is. My bet, if I had to bet on it, the outcome will in fact be what we had hoped for so I think you know it is encouraging.

MILLER: Let me just say that the first two language courses in Bloomington do count for something—they count as an admission requirement in Bloomington. In our new admission standards, a student will have to have what is felt to be equivalent to first-year of foreign language so those courses would count. If the student transfers would count somewhere.

HERBERT: It is now 4:30 pm.

MILLER: It is mandatory that we adjourn at this time.

HERBERT: Since there is no further business the council stands adjourn.
Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.