

**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**November 29, 2011**  
**1:30 P.M. - 3:30 P.M. (EST)**

**IUB: Franklin Hall Room 106**  
**IUE: Whitewater Hall Room 119**  
**IPFW: Helmke Library Room B37**  
**IUPUI: ICTC Building Room 541**  
**IUK: Main Building Room 111**  
**IUN: Hawthorne Hall Room 318**  
**IUSB: Northside Hall Room 079**  
**IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS:** Jean Abshire, Rachel Applegate, Simon Atkinson, Karl Besel, Hall Bjornstad, Steve Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, Rosanne Cordell, Stanley Davis, Nancy Eckerman, Hal Evans, Tony Fargo, Charles Gallmeier, Steven Gerencser, Don Gjerdingen, Pat Harbison, John Hassell, Pamela Ironside, Hitesh Kathuria, Joan Kowolik, Steve Mannheimer, Michael McRobbie, Geralyn Miller, Mohamed Razi Nalim, Laverne Nishihara, Yusuf Nur, Nasser Paydar, Mary Popp, Christopher Rutkowski, Ellen Szarleta, Herb Terry, Lesley Walker, William Wheeler, L. Jack Windsor,

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Corey Ariss, Randy Arnold, Charles Bantz, Ed Berbari, Zachary Berwick, M. Todd Bradley, David Estell, Clifford Goodwin, Richard Gunderman, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Michael Harris, Jorge José, Justin Kingsolver, William J. Lowe, Marjorie Manifold, Tim Mickleborough, Mary Beth Minick, Lori Montalbano, C. Subah Packer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Una Mae Reck, Jodi Smith, Fran Squires, Michael Wartell, Tony White

**GUESTS:** John Applegate, Craig Dethloff, Faith Hawkins, Elizabeth Whipple

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY12/10.25.11.pdf>

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors L. Jack Windsor and Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council)

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)
4. Question/Comment Period (60 minutes)  
(President McRobbie and Professors Windsor and Calloway-Thomas)
5. Family Leave Policy Update (30 Minutes)  
(Prof. L. Jack Windsor, Senior Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council) [DISCUSSION]
6. Old Business/New Business

### Minutes

**MCROBBIE:** We're still short of a quorum, but maybe there's a few matters we could just discuss if only, I think even with people staying, coming at 2:30, and I'm not certain there's any point in staying around if there's no quorum 'til 2:30 anyway. I don't think that's going to give us a quorum. So I think we have to wait 'til a meeting with a quorum to approve the minutes. There's no point in doing that. Maybe moving to agenda item two, maybe Jack and Carolyn have matters they'd like to raise just for the sake of reporting it to the group who are assembled here. I mean, we can't—there's no action to be taken or anything. Would you like to, Jack—sorry, Carolyn, is Jack up there? Sorry.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, Jack. Sorry, yeah, I see you.

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

**WINDSOR:** Just to give you a brief update on IRB. They're making great strides, really improving the process. I had a colleague call me Wednesday before Thanksgiving. I forwarded the complaint, and it was handled that day. So they're really trying, they're answering the phone, they're solving problems, so I commend the vice president for research. I will meet with him tomorrow. He won't be at the Board of Trustees meeting, but I will convey the excellent job that that group has done to kind of enhance things, and be looking for ways to make sure this kind of situation does not occur again. Carolyn, you'd like to add anything?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** No, just that we're pleased that there's progress being made.

**MCROBBIE:** Jack, what's the latest percentage—I just don't have it in front of me—of the backlog. It was—I think it was at seventy-four about a week ago, but what is it now? Maybe ten days ago. In terms of having handled seventy-four percent of the backlog.

**WINDSOR:** He says seventy-five percent of backlog handled. Twenty percent awaiting PI notification. So, not really sure; I will have him clarify that tomorrow for the Board of Trustees.

**MCRORBIE:** Okay.

**WINDSOR:** Next issue is family leave, which will be presented at the Board of Trustees, there's an administrative group John Applegate put together. They've made some suggestions and overview of the policy is that the faculty formation side of the policy will remain the same to help enhance recruitment as a benefit. Young faculty coming in, family formation will still get the twelve weeks at full compensation. What we've done, as John can explain probably better than I can, on the other situation on the family side, the older parents or chronic illness still maintain the twelve weeks, but the cap on salary will be one hundred and twenty five thousand, and it will be graduated up from there. John, can you add anything to that or... ?

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah, I'm not sure that the wordsmithing is entirely complete, and I'd have to kind of leave that to Lauren Robel who chaired the committee, but you're—that basic division is the approach to really marry the provisions with the main purpose of the policy—the main recruitment purpose of the policy.

**WINDSOR:** The main reason to bring it up here is just to communicate to faculty the direction the committee was headed in before it's presented to the Board of Trustees.

**GERENCSEK:** Excuse me, Jim. We lost our—we lost communication here just a little bit when you were describing the second half of the policy. I'm sorry, our audio just dropped out. Would you repeat that?

**WINDSOR:** Yes. It will still maintain the twelve weeks, but it will be a cap on salary, a hundred and twenty-five thousand, and it will be graduated there up. The language is not complete yet, but just wanted to give everybody a heads up the direction the committee was moving in.

**GERENCSEK:** Thank you.

**WINDSOR:** Moving on to healthcare, numerous regional campuses have generated resolutions. Bloomington is working on one, so is IUPUI. We meet on December 6<sup>th</sup> at IUPUI Faculty Council to consider a resolution just simply asking for better communication and for a commission composed of faculty and staff to be more engaged in as we look at healthcare issues. Carolyn, can you add anything?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I would just like to say I'm holding in my hand the resolution that was passed by the IU South Bend Academic Senate, and it passed unanimously, and Indiana University Bloomington will be presenting a resolution on December 6<sup>th</sup>, which is next Tuesday, regarding the healthcare cost increase. And as a consequence of all of these resolutions

floating about from campus to campus, it seems to me that a question emerges regarding which one of these resolutions will end up before the UFC. So we probably need to discuss how we're going to reconcile all the competing resolutions that are being passed by various campuses. We can discuss that later, but I just think that is something that we need to be mindful—

**WINDSOR:** We probably need to look how [indistinct comment] to see what is common, what is shared, views, etc... first. This is just to give everybody an overview that people are still concerned. You know an increase in premiums is really a shift in premium cost a little bit more to the employees rather than the university. So it's a shift in cost more than anything.

**ABSHIRE:** Excuse me, this is Jean Abshire from the Southeast campus. I'm not positive if you're aware, but our Faculty Senate passed a resolution on the healthcare issue two weeks ago. I don't know if that has been transmitted via [indistinct comment], but I wasn't sure you were [indistinct comment].

**DAVIS:** IPFW has a meeting coming up, and we're passing a resolution in support of South Bend's resolution

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Will it be—oh so—

**DAVIS:** --because we do have fifty benefited faculty up here.

**WINDSOR:** Alright, thanks.

**NISHIHARA:** And this is Laverne from IU East. The IU East Budgetary Affairs Committee came out in support of the Bloomington resolution. The Faculty Affairs Committee, however, though they dislike the increase in the premiums, thought that it would not finally do much good. I, myself, tend to support the Bloomington resolution because I think it's universally agreed that anything that would foster better communication would be good.

**GERENCSEK:** Steven from South Bend. Just saying that one of the—it will come before our Executive Committee for us to consider the Bloomington Faculty resolution at our next meeting as well. And I think that there's one thing that is shared amongst as it is the sort of call for greater communication and deliberation. There's the substantive issue of the costs themselves, but also the issue of communication and deliberation, that seems to be shared amongst them.

**WINDSOR:** Carolyn, do you know of anything else we should discuss?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** No, it seems to me those are the compelling issues that confront us today.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me ask the two co-secretaries. We have, yet again, an example of what seems to be the fundamental problem with the UFC, Craig, unless I know a few people have drifted in. I don't know if we're at thirty-one yet.

**DETHLOFF:** We are.

**MCROBBIE:** We are. We actually have a quorum?

**DETHLOFF:** Yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, alright. But nevertheless, I wonder if you or Jack want to comment on the reform proposal, where that stands.

**WINDSOR:** Yeah, I apologize. I forgot to mention that. It goes before the IFC on December 6<sup>th</sup> also. So we've asked all the regional campuses; IUB's looking at it also to give us feedback so we can move it forward at UFC, so hopefully in the course of the next year we can start seeing how it impacts the constitution and bylaws. Simon and Mike could add a little something.

**ATKINSON:** Um, yes. Right now, we're just in a holding pattern waiting for feedback from the various campuses, and then based on that, the working group that developed the proposals in the first place will look at the—will do a first draft of changes to the constitution and bylaws, and then that will go to the Agenda Committee, and ultimately to the UFC for action.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** December 5<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for all the campuses to respond to the UFC reform document, and Indiana University Bloomington will be discussing the reform policy next Tuesday. We had it on the agenda for last time we met, but more substantive things crowded out that agenda item, so here we are.

**WINDSOR:** Right. Herb, did you have a question?

**TERRY:** Since we were discussing the healthcare issue a little bit, I had one further comment. It's to repeat something I said at the BFC. I like the idea of creating some kind of a task force to meet with the administration and this sort of thing over healthcare, but I'd urge you to broaden that to make it a task force on compensation. I mean, I think from the standpoint of the Trustees, a major issue is what percent of compensation can be healthcare, and what percent is salary, and other sorts of benefits, and so I would urge you to create a task force so that not only is there a discussion about healthcare, but how healthcare fits into other compensation systems and policies.

**WINDSOR:** Yeah, we talked to Dan Rives. We're going to reform the UFC Benefits Committee to serve for that function.

**TERRY:** I would again suggest it should cover compensation and benefits, so that we begin to have some influence on Trustee salary policy and that sort of thing.

**WINDSOR:** Thanks.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Carolyn, Jack, anything more that you want to comment on?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I cannot think of anything.

**WINDSOR:** No, we did have a few ad hoc committees we need to put together, and some Agenda Committee items, but nothing to bring forward at this time.

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

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. So, let me just—I just want to comment on one item of business, and that really arises out of the last meeting. I was grateful for what I believe was a general support among members of the UFC at the last meeting for the tuition discount over what's being called the summer semester. I think people are aware that that proposal has been extremely well received, not just within the state, but is being commented on nationally as well. And we certainly have heard from many students that this is something that they're very excited about, and I think it'll have an interesting impact on the nature of the summer semester as well. In spite of that, I should let you know that the pressure from various legislators continues for us to revisit our tuition policy, and to look at reversing some of the tuition increases from last year. And that's important to bear that in mind because we are seeing real pressure on tuition.

We've been cut as far as our state appropriation is concerned. We've seen the sheer drop in the amount of externally—significant drop in the amount of externally funded research in the university, in spite of the fact that research expenditures are up it lags behind where we are with externally funded research. And philanthropic giving, although it's been reasonably healthy, is only roughly keeping pace where it has been before, so overall the budgetary situation is pretty bleak. Not only that, I think people have seen the figures about general state of wages or salaries among people in the state of Indiana, not having made much progress. In fact, according to some studies, it's in decline [indistinct comment] being in some kind of a modest decline. So the economic situation is still pretty bleak, and although I think there's been some sort of an improvement in state revenues, certainly what I'm hearing is that it's unlikely the budget will be opened in the short session, which starts very soon, and that it's unlikely that any of the areas in which we were cut that there will be any restoration of any of that funding. So we are still going to be working within those very, very difficult financial constraints in pretty much everything that we—that we do. Nevertheless, I think that, and I really commend the BFC for the action they took about a year ago—over a year ago—that was so helpful in formulating the tuition discount over the summer semester, that that has helped

us sort of regain the initiative in this ongoing discussion and debate within the state about tuition and productivity of the university and so on.

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

Let me just leave it there. And I think we could maybe turn to agenda item four, and I'm not exactly certain how this is going to be handled. I know that it's a question/comment period for all three of us. It's a long time for question and comments.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** It is.

**MCROBBIE:** I'm not certain how productive that is going to be. But I've got a—there's a question I've got from Joe, Joe Wert at Southeast, and about salary compression. Salary compression, Joe, is a matter for the campuses, basically. It's a matter of the salary policy on the campuses, and I—and I think a combination of both salary policies, which, I think are going to be merit based no matter what happens, and the difficult financial situation I just described would suggest that—that it's going to be difficult to address salary compression in any comprehensive way. I just don't see that realistically happening. The only way it can be—it'll probably be addressed is by continuing increases based on merit, at least until things recover economically. That would be, you know, a fairly frank response to that question. But it is—it is something that could be addressed to some degree in maybe different ways on the campuses, but that is to a significant degree a matter for the campuses to determine. Any—I suppose this is just open for questions. Yes, at South Bend? Yes?

**GERENCSEK:** Thanks very much. I would just like to ask a follow-up to the question about salary compression. Understanding the limitations with the state budget and our appropriation, we have a situation where the campus has worked to set aside funds to address some of the salary compression that has developed over the past decade, but we also understand that—and we've developing procedures by which we can address that matter by a means of merit, but we will need from everything I've been told and understand from my meetings with our vice chancellor and chancellor is that we will need permission from Indiana University, likely from, you know, yourself, President McRobbie, Vice President Theobald, and Vice President Applegate. So yes, it is a campus matter, but even when we've been able to find funds that we could use on campus to address it, we find ourselves still in a situation where we need assistance or permission from outside of our campus to do so. Is that your understanding as well?

**MCROBBIE:** Well, ultimately the university's salary policy is determined by the Trustees, and then normally the practice has been for there to be flexibility within that policy for merit based salary increases and other various forms of salary increases. So at the end of the day, it's the Trustees who make—who determine the broad salary policy for the institution.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** President McRobbie, you mentioned the tuition increase and the pressure from the legislators regarding this matter.

**MCROBBIE:** Right.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Have you any concrete plans to remedy the situation?

**MCROBBIE:** Well, I think our plan—what we've done through a twenty-five percent—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Oh, is that the answer, then?

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, I believe that's the answer. I mean, that is a very substantial risk on our part financially. It may not work. Students may not come. In which case, it's going to cost us a lot of money, and—but not only that. I think it more that—more than making incremental changes to our overall tuition across the university—half a percent here or a percent there or something like that—it's an attempt, and as I said, it was sparked really by the thinking of the BFC. It's an attempt to really try to rethink the whole nature of the academic year more generally, and to maybe move away from the more traditional agrarian model to something that is more contemporary and gives students—it gives students more of an incentive to complete their degree earlier if they wish. They don't have to, of course, but if they wish. And I think we have shown a level of creativity in doing this, and an innovation that will have far more important implications and repercussions for us longer term than tinkering with overall tuition levels in the institution.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** But let us work under the rubric of "let us suppose." Let us suppose for the sake of argument that the goal that we've set for ourselves as a consequence of the twenty-five percent reduction in tuition costs does not materialize, then that really will pose a problem in terms of raising funds. So where do we go from there if that were to happen?

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, well that's a matter that, you know, obviously I'll address—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Okay—

**MCROBBIE:** —if it doesn't materialize. I mean it's a—I'm obviously going to be watching the numbers with great interest to hope that that extra roughly, we need—I think we need about just over ten/twelve percent increase in student numbers to cover that cost across all campuses, yeah. Yes, any question or comments from anybody? Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** This doesn't affect the regional campuses, but it affects IUPUI and Bloomington. Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson have been the leaders in figuring out how to proceed on the New Academic Directions Committee Report. Provost Hanson is taking a position elsewhere. I'm wondering what your plans are for moving the New Academic Directions Report

forward once Provost Hanson leaves, and for that matter, how we're coming on getting a Provost—

**MCRORBIE:** — I hope—I hope that work will be uninterrupted, Herb, when I appoint an interim, which I hope to have done very, very soon. And then after that, commence a search. I mean, I think it's—it would be unfortunate if some of the productive momentum, and I've already seen some reports that have been generated that I think are very helpful. Some of the productive momentums were to be lost by a personnel change, I think we don't need to suffer that, and we can continue to make progress.

**TERRY:** And then I would have a question for Carolyn and Jack about the same sort of issue. At the last UFC meeting, we talked about a task force or something to look at the policies that would be necessary for changes in core schools. What progress has there been on that?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We're still in the process of finding members to constitute that committee.

**TERRY:** Okay

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** But we are working on that.

**MCRORBIE:** So forgive me. I'm suffering from a cold. So I'm going to snort and carry on a bit here, but.... Somebody, yeah, somebody—I can't—oh yeah, Jack, yeah?

**WINDSOR:** Can I make a motion to go ahead and approve the minutes while we have a quorum?

**MCRORBIE:** Oh thank you, yeah! [laughter]

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I detected fear in your voice, Jack.

**MCRORBIE:** A fine piece of parliamentarianism!

**BURNS:** Seconded.

**MCRORBIE:** We have a motion seconded to approve the minutes. Any comments or questions about the minutes for anybody? Being none, I'll put the motion. All those in favor? [Aye]. Against? [Silence]. The minutes are approved. Thank you, Jack, for that adroit interruption.

**WINDSOR:** How do you think the revenue will be impacted by having the Superbowl here in Indy?

**MCRORBIE:** You mean the state—?

**WINDSOR:** —Any projections on the state revenue?

**MCROBBIE:** The state revenue? Well, I mean the projections—I mean I think they're all public. They look very rosy. I guess it just depends on, you know, whether they come to fruition or not. A lot is resting on that. Remember, too, that we have the first Big Ten football championship coming up this weekend for which there are also significant sort of revenue generation prospects raised in Indianapolis as well. But I'll just have to wait and see. But that'll help. That will obviously help the economy, but more the local economy. I don't know if it's going to help the state that much. Yeah?

**BURNS:** Going back to the summer session. I appreciate the risk we're taking right now. I'm wondering how much thought you've given if it looks like it's actually working, it will take stepping in and actually some investments actually to accelerate programs as well.

**MCROBBIE:** Right.

**BURNS:** Have you been thinking about the timing for that?

**MCROBBIE:** Right. I think that's an excellent question, excellent point. I think we have to wait and see how that first year goes, if it looks like it's—if it really looks like it is popular and is taking off, then we definitely have to look at how can we invest to build on the success. If that really is demonstrating there's an untapped demand there, this is something students really want, and that faculty—or at least enough faculty are enthusiastic about this for all kinds of reasons, then we obviously we need to have a look at how to invest and we'll definitely do so. Yeah. Yeah, it's a very good point. I mean there's a whole range of different ways in which it could impact us. It may require investments that we haven't really completely thought through at this point. But I think we have enough time to do that, yeah.

**BURNS:** It's just you don't want to get caught saturating it too early.

**MCROBBIE:** Absolutely, absolutely. And any input that people may have in that regard would be, would be—even starting now, but certainly once the semester starts—would be greatly, greatly welcomed from people, too. Other questions?

**DAVIS:** Yeah. Stan Davis, Fort Wayne.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah?

**DAVIS:** Maybe this would be for you or John Applegate, but what's the status now of the articulation agreement between the campuses, IU campuses, and Ivy Tech?

**APPLEGATE:** It's been submitted to the faculty governance organizations, which is the starting point of any sort of agreement like that. So it's been forwarded. It's primarily as between—

primarily intended for the regional campuses, but was provided to IUPUI and IU Bloomington for their information. I think that IUPUI is looking at it pretty carefully and I'm not sure that it really meets IU Bloomington's needs, but it doesn't require that. In other words, it doesn't need to be universal. So, I would hope that the relevant educational policies committees are taking a careful look at the agreement.

**DAVIS:** Yeah, John. One of the first questions that came up when I circulated this around campus is where we say IU Bloomington and IUPUI aren't involved. Well, what about our transfer students who come into our program with this Gen Ed core that transferred to the main campus or to IPU—IUPUI?

**APPLEGATE:** I don't know the technical answer to that, but I assume that something one of those things that you work—one works through in the drafting process. In other words, we try to get it out at an early stage of a draft that people could work with, and if that turns out to be an issue that isn't covered by the existing agreements between the campuses and IUPUI or Bloomington, and we need some different arrangement, then obviously we can work through that.

**NISHIHARA:** This is Laverne from East.

**MCROBBIE:** Laverne, yeah?

**NISHIHARA:** By next week, East's Curriculum Committee should have a list of requested revisions, and also questions about that articulation agreement. There is hesitation just to sign it. Certain schools within East have greater difficulty than others with agreement. A question I have, and you've started to address this is why exactly IUPUI and IU Bloomington are not more involved? And also, if and when the regional campuses sign an articulation agreement, what are the next steps? So after we sign, if we do, what is the future then?

**APPLEGATE:** Well, the second question first. It's like any transfer and articulation agreement of which we have hundreds. It then is managed through the—depending on whether it sends—it requires sign off by departments or whether it's something that can be done administratively. It would operate like any other transfer and articulation agreement. So I don't see a difference there. And in terms of the first one, you know, the idea of sending out is to find out what the issues are, especially and in the first instance from the faculty, as is appropriate, I think. And then we can work to collate what those issues are, and see if we can work around them or accommodate them in some appropriate way.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, South?

**GERENCSEK:** John, this is Steven from South Bend. Can you anticipate what sorts of issues might be raised from various of the campuses that would be particularly problematic at the other end for Ivy Tech, and where might be the, you know, the articulation be some weaker spots, so that we can anticipate those in our own discussions, in case, you know, so that we, that the cart doesn't get upset from our end, or we can anticipate what those might be?

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah, that's a good question. The main thing—well, as you know, part of this is to get out ahead of the idea of a state mandated General Education requirement of ten courses that are required to be taught and accepted by all public universities and transferable among them. There's a whole spectrum of versions of a common core Gen Ed curriculum. That's one that's out there, and if you've been involved with things like the core transfer library, you'll know that Indiana has been sort of taking little steps along to sort of prepare the way for that—Indiana, the state, not the university—for a long time, and that's something that obviously we think is a terrible idea for any number of reasons that'll be obvious to people in this room. So, there are other versions of that, and one is to be able to come up with a fairly easy—easily transferable—collection of courses or learning outcomes, depending on what the form of the General Education agreement is, to come up with something that is transferable as a package.

Now, what Ivy Tech is concerned about, and has been very, very vocal about, is that it has hundreds and hundreds of individual agreements between individual Ivy Tech campuses and individual IU campuses, and they've very dramatically brought, you know, boxes and boxes of notebooks of these agreements. So what they are looking for is the simplest possible version. Things that are as system-wide as possible. Now, obviously the one-size-fits-all is not really where we want to go, but that's going to be the balancing process. From our point of view, I think it's very important regardless of who it's with, is to have the flexibility that honors the General Education requirements of—adopted by specific campuses, and tries to build it into a larger framework that's transferable. That's a fairly common model in a lot of other states where you have an understanding that—or a requirement that there is, wherever you complete your General Education requirement, at whatever institution it is, you kind of check that off, and the check off of that works at all other institutions in that state, Minnesota, Florida, would be, I think—Arizona, I think, would be an example of that. California might be, I'm not sure. But that's another version of it. What our goal here is to see if we can get ahead of that with an agreement, especially among the campuses that are going to be most frequently working with Ivy Tech transfer students, and I think that's clearly the regional campuses—the Ivy Tech transfer is a very important part of those student bodies. But it's also, I think it's—I know it's important at IUPUI as well, which I think is why IUPUI is interested in looking at it also.

**NISHIHARA:** It's Laverne from East. My understanding is that the LEAP Initiative is not dead. It may be revised somehow. Can you address how this articulation agreement intersects, or it does not, with a possible LEAP Initiative?

**APPLEGATE:** Well, I think—I think that the LEAP idea is really kind of the foundation of it. In other words, it provided a common set of learning outcomes that the—that we were able to identify for Ivy Tech, for the community college, and which then they were able to use to structure their own General Education requirement. And so it provided a mechanism for kind of a common language between the IU ones and the Ivy Tech ones. So, they're not connected in some—in a technical way. In other words, it doesn't make a difference to the articulation agreement as such, but it meant that Ivy Tech, which, as you may know, just developed its Gen Ed curriculum last year. It gave them a way to interact with the IU one, again using kind of a common language. But that's the way that they're connected.

**GERENCSEK:** May I ask any of my colleagues at some of the other regionals if they have any knowledge of this situation. One of the things that's come up for us is that in our General Education program, we have at least one upper division course required of all students, so that would be compromised in some way that I don't know, since we're a four-year institution, that's where some of the rub might be in terms of working with a full package that comes in. Is that the case? Does anyone know at the other regional campuses, institutions, that they have three hundred or four hundred level courses as part of their Gen Ed requirements?

**DAVIS:** We do at IPFW, but the—we thought that, just looking over this, I don't know how much this'll apply to us, but just looking over this, there's that extra ten credits that's in there that, not to exceed ten credits, which would sort of cover a couple, three, upper level courses that you wanted to add, as I read the agreement.

**APPLEGATE:** Stan took the words out of my mouth. That—exactly. The idea was to provide that level of flexibility so that you're not in the situation again that we're trying to avoid where Gen Ed is, you know, is treated like something to get away from or get over with and have no connection with the campus that ultimately grants the degree.

**MCROBBIE:** I don't know, I mean as this is getting in to a level of detail that I'm not certain everybody is fascinated by, but—

**APPLEGATE:** —I am, sir! [Laughter]

**MCROBBIE:** Important, though, it is. But I'm wondering, obviously there is a lot of stuff to sort through here, John. Is it worth, you know, convening a meeting of maybe the faculty leadership from the various regional campuses in particular, under the auspices of your office, to specifically focus on all this and share information and concerns and so on?

**APPLEGATE:** Yes, and indeed we're working with the vice chancellors for academic affairs, as well. So, sure. That would be helpful. That would be excellent.

**GERENCSE:** John, just one more thing. Do you have a time frame that you are looking at right now?

**APPLEGATE:** Well, I'd like to have some sense of where we're going with this or its prospects in the next month or so. We, as the President said, we have the short session of the legislature will be starting work right after the first of the year. Every year, for the past several years, there has been a common core curriculum piece of legislation either drafted or introduced. So, we would certainly want to be able to present some progress if we're to make some headway against, you know, against that, but that gives you some sense of it. So at least some indication of where we are by the end of the calendar year would be most helpful.

**MCROBBIE:** Chuck has the call. Chuck?

**WINDSOR:** Can't hear you, Chuck.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** He is mouthing, but nothing is...He's miming.

**TERRY:** He was there for a moment.

**MCROBBIE:** Hit it again, Chuck. Alright, let's—Chuck, we will see if—

**EGYHAZI:** This is Steve at the Video Help Desk. I am going to try to unmute his—Chuck's microphone for him. So, Chuck, you can put the remote down, and I'll do it for you, okay? Thank you. [laughter]

**MCROBBIE:** You're a danger with technology, Chuck. Why don't we see if we can resolve this problem, Northwest. Is there someone else that would like to ask a question? Chuck, you're on.

**GALLMEIER:** I forgot my question. [Laughter]. John, you can hear me now, right?

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah.

**GALLMEIER:** Okay. John, could you address the issue, perhaps, to the Blueprint's role to the articulation agreement with Ivy Tech, and that process? That might be [indistinct comment].

**APPLEGATE:** Again, I think they're congruent, in other words, one of the recommendations was that to develop more seamless transfer between the regional campuses and Ivy Tech, and obviously transfer and articulation is, and such agreements are, part of that.

**GALLMEIER:** Okay, now I can't shut myself off, so...

**CORDELL:** Rosanne from South Bend. Even if the courses, you know, the course agreements, seem okay, one of the issues that we have is that the instructors for Ivy Tech are often not—they often do not have master's degrees in the subject area in which they teach, and this seems to be a very problematic force. Is there some way that IU can encourage Ivy Tech to move along in this area, so that we do have truly qualified teachers?

**APPLEGATE:** Well, I can say that in a variety of other areas, where the state or Lumina Foundation is looking at issues of learning outcomes, of tuning to determine common or understood standard for things like associates degrees and baccalaureate degrees, that we're working very hard to try to develop those kinds of understandings for precisely that kind of reason. In establishing, several years ago, things like the core transfer library, of course the state made it impossible for us to simply, in a blanket way, say, you know, no courses, we don't like your instructors. And so, being able to engage with the community college to talk about learning outcomes, talk about standards, and so on, is, I think, the most effective thing that we can do, and we're pursuing that actively.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Any other questions on any matter from anybody? Anybody who hasn't asked a question? Herb?

**TERRY:** I have a comment.

**MCROBBIE:** You haven't asked one for a while.

**TERRY:** I'll ask a question. Much of this discussion is related to your State of the University Address, you know, what does it really mean to be a public institution, a public university in the twenty-first century? How are we moving forward to have that discussion in a comprehensive way, rather than focusing on state intervention and tuition, state funding, state transfer credit, all this sort of thing. I thought that was a very important speech; how are we moving forward on it?

**MCROBBIE:** Oh well, that's a, you know, huge question. I'm glad Craig provided sixty minutes for it— [Laughter]. I mean, there's so many different components to it, Herb. In terms of, I think in terms of the general, general issues I raised, that any of you who have read the IBJ or other newspapers realize that I did attract some criticism for taking those positions from various people in the state. I think some of the debate has gone pretty well. I think that the fundamental issue that I raised, which was really how does one—how does one change our relationship with the state so that we remain a public university, but in an era of declining state revenues, as I pointed out in that speech, ten percent by the end of the decade approximately for the whole university, but, nevertheless, legislative administrative regulatory oversight at least as great as it is now, if not more. How can we change—how can we change the direction so that we are actually reducing the amount of legislative and regulatory administrative

oversight to give ourselves more flexibility. And although I think that idea is in principle accepted in some quarters of the state, I just don't think there's been much willingness among those who've got the ability to possibly make some of these changes to go on with those ideas at this stage.

It's sort of funny that you really—that people are a little ambivalent about state universities, on the one hand they want to push us to do a lot more, but then we don't always have the flexibility that we need to do that. So, I do think that continuing to show that we are capable of changing in a thoughtful and deliberative way is an extremely important part. I think that really undercuts this claim that we're not willing to change, that we're basically stuck in our ways, etc... , and if we can do that, I think that at least provides us with one key part of a way of moving forward by demonstrating that, yes, you know, we're actually capable of changing, which is why I think the summer semester initiative has been so important, and that has proved that we are capable of taking a bold initiative. And then, I'm hoping that if we can do more things like that in the future, maybe some of the things coming out of New Academic Directions that that will let—help us try to make those kinds of arrangements in the future with the state going forward. But I don't think it's going to happen quickly or easily, and I don't think that's going to be an easy matter. It hasn't—I mean, you look around the country, it has not proved easy anywhere else. I mean, look at what's happened in Wisconsin, look at what happened in Oregon, for example.

**TERRY:** I would just hope that faculty, faculty governance, faculty institutions, could join you in advancing that conversation.

**MCROBBIE:** I greatly would welcome that. And they already have, but I think we need to be doing more of it.

**TERRY:** Yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Because the matters are getting very serious. I mean the rate at which funding is being cut without the competence—the compensatory ways of being able to respond to that are making it harder and harder for us all the time. I mean, just the pressure around the room that people are feeling in healthcare issues, obviously, is just one manifestation of that. Other questions?

**TERRY:** I have an invitation to Simon. Were you going to say something about the honorary degrees, Simon?

**ATKINSON:** Yes. I was just [indistinct comment].

**MCROBBIE:** Is that on the agenda? I don't think it's a problem, but is that—does that come up in this meeting?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Oh.

**ATKINSON:** No, it was really a point of information so that everybody on UFC should have received an email with the dossiers for three candidates for honorary degrees that are up for approval by the UFC, and to vote on these you just need to send an email back to the UFC office, back to Craig. Since we're not in Executive Session, I don't want to discuss this, this mix of any of the candidates, but this is really just a point of information to encourage people to vote on these.

**WINDSOR:** So please vote.

**R. APPLGATE:** I couldn't get in to—. I got into the first one, and couldn't get in to the second two.

**WINDSOR:** Did you use the different password?

**R. APPLGATE:** I used the different password. Well, it just was blank. I sent an email back, too.

**WINDSOR:** We will follow up on that.

**MCROBBIE:** Herb, you've [indistinct comment].

**TERRY:** I'm a member of the Honorary Degrees Committee, and I wanted to add something to what Simon said. We sent, along with that email, a summary of the deliberations of the committee and how it voted. That's a middle ground that may be necessary, if we go down the path we're talking about in UFC reform, because in UFC reform, the UFC will only meet once each semester. So, I think we would welcome, on the Honorary Degrees Committee, your reaction to that process of sending, not just here the dossiers to look for them, but here is a very quick summary of how each candidate was discussed by the—

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, I think that's an excellent idea.

**TERRY:** Yeah, and, you know, let us know out there in the UFC if you think this works.

**MCROBBIE:** From my experience in these things, Herb, I think there are some candidates who may not be well known that the committee actually does quite a bit of work on—

**TERRY:** —that's right—

**MCRORBIE:** —there may be one or two people on the committee who know a lot about that person, etc..., and that informs the discussion, and those discussions can be very productive, and then it's in as much as it's possible to capture that in a reasonably brief way, I think that's very good information to share with the UFC, because it gives people a sense of the deliberations and the reasoning.

**TERRY:** So if the members will let us know that you agree with the president that would be helpful. We'll continue to do that.

**MCRORBIE:** I think that's a very good idea. Any other questions from anybody who hasn't asked much say for example? For the sake of [comment indistinct] Alright, why don't we move on. Jack, do you want to say anything more on the Family Leave Policy?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: FAMILY LEAVE POLICY UPDATE**

**WINDSOR:** Not really. I was hoping that we could have the draft by now, but as John mentioned, we're still wordsmithing it. So we don't have that ready yet. So, other than my comments earlier, that's where it stands.

**MCRORBIE:** Okay. Alright. Yeah, Steve? Yes?

**GERENCSEK:** What would be the process for getting that final language out? Will that come through the UFC or individual campus leaderships? When and how might we see that on the Family Leave Policy?

**WINDSOR:** It's being presented to the Board of Trustees on December 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup>, and hopefully as soon as I get a draft, I will check with John and make sure it's alright to send it out to regionals just as communication.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS**

**MCRORBIE:** Yeah, I don't see a problem there. Alright, nothing else on that, but that's close to fruition. Well we really have just old business/new business. Is there any old business? Any old business? Any new business? That being done, we are adjourned. Thank you.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 2:28PM**