

Memorandum

To: Professor Herb Terry,
Chairperson of the Bloomington Faculty Council

From: The Academic Council
Kelley School of Business

Date: February 13, 2009

Subj.: Response to the proposed new BFC resolution concerning General Peter Pace

We are writing in response to the new resolution concerning General Peter Pace which was submitted for consideration by the BFC Committee on Diversity and Affirmative Action. The proposed resolution has emerged as a result of General Pace's publicly stated religion-based personal beliefs on homosexuality.

We understand that inviting General Pace to campus may have offended some members of the University community. We regret that as it was *not the intent* of the Kelley School. The Kelley School *fully embraces diversity in all of its various forms*. Our record will show that the School is highly inclusive and does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, religion or sexual orientation.

Much time and effort has gone into crafting the proposed resolution. Likewise, much discussion and debate has occurred both in private and in the press. We believe that those on both sides of the discussion mean well. That said we believe the proposed resolution accomplishes little in terms of advancing the larger mission of the University. *Therefore, the purpose of this memo, first and foremost, is to propose ways in which we might constructively engage General Pace during his future visits to campus.*

What General Pace has to offer: In inviting General Pace to campus, our intent was to offer students (across all programs on campus) an opportunity to interact with someone with extraordinary credentials and life experiences. As the former Chair of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, he was responsible for a budget of \$700 billion, over 2.4 million people, and the largest fleet of aircraft and ships in the world. Further, General Pace briefed the President of the United States multiple times each week on matters of national and international security. Throughout his career, he was faced with making life and death decisions. He has many rare and valuable life lessons on leadership to offer our students. Finally, General Pace was a participant in important national security discussions of the past few years and has a unique first-hand perspective on key historical decisions that are likely to impact the US and the world for the foreseeable future.

What about his personal beliefs? It was our expectation that students would question him about his perspectives on homosexuals in the military. It was understood at the outset that *all* of General Pace's sessions would allow at least half the time for Q&A and that he would entertain *any* questions on *any* subject. Indeed, such probing questions were asked and he addressed them in depth. On the broader issue, we wanted students to self-reflect on the role

that personal values and beliefs play in leadership. In debriefs with students, to a person, they felt that General Pace's sessions were extremely worthwhile.

What now? What has gotten lost in the debate and discussion is that General Pace will be back on campus three more times over the next 18 months. How can we make the most of his time here? We propose the following:

1. *During General Pace's next visit to Indiana University in April that he meet with members of the BFC Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee in an open dialogue on any topic including his views on homosexuality.* Contrary to what has been widely reported, General Pace had agreed to participate in sessions with the IU Community at large and did meet with leaders from a wide range of student groups. What has gotten lost in the debate is that with his three return visits, there will be plenty of time for him to engage with a wider audience. His only stipulation is that students receive first priority on his time. The students were the focus of his fall semester visit and will be the focus of his spring visit as well. However, we can certainly arrange for a discussion with the BFC Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee, a discussion that will be in **the true spirit of academic dialogue and will allow us to move forward in a more constructive and positive manner.**
2. *Have General Pace meet with student groups from multiple programs on campus.* General Pace's sessions focus on leadership. Due to the large number of students enrolled in the Kelley School, during his first visit we simply could not open his sessions to the wider University audience without compromising opportunities for Q&A. Now that he has met with a large number of Kelley students, we are confident that his future schedules can accommodate students from other programs across campus. Such interactions might include:
 - A session with leaders of IU Student Government
 - A smaller venue session with LAMP students
 - A session with student leaders of IU fraternities and sororities
 - A session with the Council for Advancing Student Leadership (CASL)
 - Additional sessions with leaders of various clubs and student organizations
 - Others? Please recommend.
3. *Engagement beyond students.* Given General Pace's exposure and role in key historical events of the past few years, we feel that some of our faculty colleagues in History and Political Science may also be interested in interactions with General Pace.
4. *Other Engagements.* We are also willing to consider other options for campus engagement with General Pace on topics related to leadership and managing large complex organizations. These could include the Trustees, the Council of Academic Deans, the President's Cabinet, the Provost's team, and advisory boards for various academic units among others.

We ask that the BFC provide us with additional suggestions on how the University community might engagement with General Pace in his future visits.

The Academic Council also respectfully requests that the BFC Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee will consider withdrawing this resolution in light of our proposed engagements between General Pace and IU's Academic Community which are in the true spirit of academic freedom and dialogue.

At a minimum, we ask that the resolution be tabled until the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee has an opportunity to meet with General Pace in person.

If discussion on the resolution continues, we ask that the BFC consider the following:

The first resolution (From the November 18th BFC Meeting) was much more detailed about its objectives and desired courses of action. We responded to the first resolution in a detailed memo dated December 1, 2008. The current resolution has addressed some of our many concerns of the first resolution. However, we are still troubled by the possible implications of this resolution.

An implied policy? It appears that the purpose of the current resolution is to address “the way” General Pace was brought to campus. This presumes that there is a “right way” to make such appointments and by extension may introduce a new criterion for such appointments and a new process to vet candidates for honorary appointments with select groups on campus to make sure that the values of the person being considered do not offend those groups. Any resolution passed by the BFC, which is the representative body of the Bloomington faculty of Indiana University, sets a precedent and, whether it is the intent or not, the resolution establishes a “de-facto” policy/procedure for Indiana University. This could mean that in the future all potential honorees, and by extension all visiting scholars, and new faculty and administrators may be vetted based on their personal beliefs.

An arbitrary reprimand? Some have argued that the purpose of the resolution is not to propose a formal policy. Short of a policy, however, there is no way to assure that a similar situation will not be repeated in the future. If we are not concerned whether such a situation is repeated, then the resolution amounts to an arbitrary reprimand of an academic unit for not applying criteria or a process that were created *ex-post* for the purpose of this resolution and will not be applied in future cases (i.e., no policy). As such, the Academic Council finds it unfair and inappropriate to ***reprimand the Kelley School for not using criteria or following a process that not only (a) did not exist at the time the decision was made to invite General Pace to campus, but (b) will not exist in the future to inform similar decisions (i.e., there will be no policy in place).***

We respectfully request that this memo be shared with all members of the Bloomington Faculty Council prior to the BFC meeting of March 17, 2009.

c: Provost Karen Hanson
Provost, Indiana University-Bloomington Campus