Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
November 30, 2010
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 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 075b
IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112

Attendance

MEMBERS: Karl Besel, Elizabeth Boling, Karen Clark, Janice Cox, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, Harold Evans, Tony Fargo, Rick French, Chuck Gallmeier, Stephen Gerencser, Mary Gray, Jennifer Hehman, Joan Kowolik, Steve Mannheimer, Lori Montalbano, Laverne Nishihara, Robert Noel, C. Subah Packer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Debora Shaw, Joey Tartell, Herb Terry, L. Jack Windsor

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Karen Hanson (Sonya Stephens)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Barry Barker, Teri Belecky-Adams, Ed Berbari, M. Todd Bradley, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Stephen Burns, Michael Coleman, Nick D'Amico, Stanley Davis, Nancy Eckerman, Jan Fulton, Clifford Goodwin, Richard Gunderman, Michael Harris, Lesa Hatley Major, Jorge José, Hitesh Kathuria, William J. Lowe, Joyce Mac Kinnon, Eugene McGregor, Michael McRobbie, Mary Beth Minick, Nasser Paydar, Jonathan Plucker, Jamie Prenkert, Una Mae Reck, Simon Rhodes, Courtney Robertson, Alan Schmetzer, Jodi Smith, Fran Squires, Ellen Szarleta, Barrett Tenbarge, Audrey Ushenko, Lesley Walker, Michael Wartell, Michael Wolf

GUESTS: Barb Bichelmeyer, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Rick Ralston

Agenda

1. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Erika Dowell and L. Jack Windsor)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U1-2011.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U2-2011.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U3-2011.pdf

2. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(Co-Secretaries Dowell and Windsor)

3. Resolution on Adoption of AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes as the Framework for General Education Programs on All Campuses of Indiana University (30 minutes)
(Professor Barbara Bichelmeyer, Associate Vice President for University Academic Planning) [DISCUSSION]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U4-2011.pdf

4. Report of the University Faculty Council Reform Group. (30 minutes)
(Professor Herb Terry)[DISCUSSION]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U5-2011.pdf

5. Old Business/New Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: So, introductions, campus by campus. Indianapolis, I was going to start with you; you have some people who are just sitting down, but perhaps you could just tell us who you are.

[Introductions]

Thank you everybody, and thank you for being here. First item on our agenda is Agenda Committee business, which is relatively minimal. There's three circulars that everybody should have if they wanted to print them out or on their computers. Those are basically the sort of beginning of the year circulars that list membership, committees that have been formed and their membership, as well as major actions of last year's Council and what with one thing and another we're just looking at these here on the very last day of November, so welcome to the Council year, everyone! The Agenda Committee has talked a lot on the phone, but we haven't really had a real meeting until this point, so those tell you who we are.

The other item of Agenda Committee business that I know I have, and I'll hand it over to Jack if he has some others, is that everybody should have gotten an email regarding voting on Honorary Degree nominations. I'm told about fourteen people have voted and we need probably twice that many people to vote as soon as possible – I want to say as soon as possible – but these things are supposed to be voted on in time for the Trustees meeting next Thursday and Friday. So Craig will end up sending out another email to folks to prod them but if you can also make a note yourself to make sure that you voted or to nudge other people on your campus who might not have voted, that would be good. It's just two, and there are passwords to look at the PDFs on the Oncourse site

and Craig, again, will send out an email that will refresh memories as far as what those passwords are so you don't have to search your email files if at all possible. Jack, do you have anything you want to talk about as part of the Agenda Committee business?

WINDSOR: No, I'll wait till the Old Business and New Business Section.

DOWELL: Okay, something to look forward to.

WINDSOR: Depends on the time.

AGENDA ITEM 2: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

DOWELL: All right, then. Question and Comment period, I don't think we've received any official questions, and obviously we are meeting here today without President McRobbie, John Applegate will also be joining us by phone as sort of the administrative representative at that level and of course, Barb Bichelmeyer, who works with John, will be here for Agenda Item 3. Are there any comments or questions? Herb?

TERRY: I have a question. As Circular U3-2011 notes, last year at the end of the year the Council, UFC, approved the tenure clock request of flexibility in the School of Medicine. Part of the concern when we did that was that Medicine would have to make sure its faculty approved of all of this and this sort of thing. I'm wondering what's going on in the School of Medicine with regard to the tenure clock.

WINDSOR: I can answer that. They had numerous town hall meetings and asked me to moderate several of those, attendance was very low. Eventually they got the vote out and it did pass, so they are in the process of doing the other requirements accordingly.

TERRY: Okay.

WINDSOR: So it did get passed in a new vote in the School of Medicine.

TERRY: Did a majority of the medical faculty vote, or did it just pass among the numbers of people who voted?

WINDSOR: I don't know if I have those numbers with me. Over of 80% I'm told voted.

TERRY: Okay.

MANNHEIMER: Could you – for those of us who are benighted – could you briefly explain the tenure clock being extended in the School of Medicine to…?

WINDSOR: Up to nine years.

MANNHEIMER: Up to nine years. At the discretion of the faculty member or the department or the dean or a conspiracy of all three?

WINDSOR: I would say all three. You can go up early at any time, at year six if they wish. It depends on the circumstances. The agreement when it was passed is that the standard or requirements would not be increased because of the extension.

HEHMAN: [unintelligible] the candidates would know that and would work harder.

WINDSOR: Right, this is not grandfathered in. It's all new hires would fall under the policy.

MANNHEIMER: Interesting. Thank you. [laughter]

TERRY: To go a little further – it permits other schools to request similar things. To the best of my knowledge no school on the Bloomington campus has requested any such thing or Dentistry, or any of them at IUPUI. Or the new Schools of Public Health. Inquiring –

WINDSOR: No.

TERRY: No, okay.

MANNHEIMER: It will be handled on a school-by-school basis…?

WINDSOR: And there's a process to follow.

DOWELL: Yes, any other questions or comments?

MANNHEIMER: One – excuse me for beating this horse – what about core schools? Were there – ? [laughter]

WINDSOR: We'll burn that bridge when we get to it. [laughter]

DOWELL: Well I believe that the policy as passed said that – the language to be added to the Handbook said that – for core schools to implement such a thing both campuses involved had to have a campus policy that allowed such policy changes and the faculty of this core school would then also have to vote. I believe that was part of the final language.

WINDSOR: So we're following the policies on this campus and after all that process has been followed it goes to the board for final approval.

DOWELL: That's right.

WINDSOR: Any additional questions?

DOWELL: Additional questions on any other campuses? I'm doing my best to look at the screen and you know if you wave vigorously I'm sure that we'll shut up and listen. Anybody else? Herb!

TERRY: Just one. What do you know about what's going on with the president's task force on IUPUI and Bloomington. The new academic initiatives group.

DOWELL: The New Academic Directions Committee that's chaired by Karen and Charles?

TERRY: It doesn't affect the regionals, but it does affect two core campuses.

DOWELL: Right. I do know that they've been, for at least a couple of months, divided into some sub-working groups. Karen's given us some overall updates at the Bloomington Agenda Committee and that they have a meeting today, I think, and one more meeting following that. And so they are getting to the point where they won't be receiving – or they will have a hard time accepting more comment on it as they develop whatever their report is going to be. It's expected to be delivered still, I think, in January. Correct me if I'm wrong, other people who…

TERRY: At a BFC meeting, Karen, some time ago, expressed a hope that there would be some kind of a draft report out in time for BFC to comment upon. And since this is something that affects both IUPUI and Bloomington I'm wondering if it might also be something that the UFC might in some way want to comment upon. And if so, are we going to get that kind of draft from Karen in time to comment?

DOWELL: I don't know. Sonya, you are here as Karen's representative, that doesn't mean that you know everything that Karen knows, but–

STEPHENS: No, I don't know.

DOWELL: I would think – I could see how it might be of interest wider in the university. Jack? Yeah, why don't you weigh in.

WINDSOR: I talked to Chancellor Bantz last week about it and he encouraged me to get the word out that they need more comments, especially related to the questions that they generated. They really haven't gotten a lot of feedback yet.

DOWELL: That's what I heard from Karen, too. But I don't know about when the report is available; exactly how it will be circulated, and so forth. But we can…

TERRY: Well, speaking just as a member of the faculty and the Council, you know, I hope that this ad hoc task force makes all kind of useful recommendations and suggestions, but doesn't take it upon itself to believe it has the power to implement many of the things it's likely to suggest. You know, if it suggests major re-organization of the campuses or programs or whatever, those are things that will have to go through the mechanisms of faculty governance at the campus level and some of them will have to come to the UFC.

DOWELL: Certainly in my conversations and our conversations with Karen down here in Bloomington that is her understanding. I believe that this report would be a starting place for further work of the kind you described. Jack, do you have anything else to…?

WINDSOR: No, that was basically my take on that also when I talked to Chancellor Bantz.

DOWELL: I can follow up certainly, though, and see about if they know exactly how the report will be circulated and so forth. Other questions or comments? All right!

AGENDA ITEM 3: RESOLUTION ON ADOPTION OF AAC&U LEAP ESSENTIAL LEARNING OUTCOMES AS THE FRAMEWORK FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON ALL CAMPUSES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Then, let's go ahead and move on to item 3, which is a discussion item only today: Resolution on Adoption of AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes as a Framework for General Education Programs on All Campuses of Indiana University. This is something that I will let Barb Bichelmeyer introduce. We have had the opportunity – the UFC Agenda Committee – to talk about it with her and with John on the phone, and had a very productive hour long discussion a couple of weeks ago and apologies that we really weren't able to circulate today's documents in advance by very much, but I hope that today can be a productive beginning to a discussion and there are at least – I'm sure Chuck will pipe up later in our conversation – but IU Northwest has actually been delving relatively deep into the LEAP initiative and knows a lot more about it and has been very excited about its possibilities and so I just wanted to make a note of that and I will hand it over to Barb.

BICHELMEYER: Thank you very much Erika and thank you for having me here today. I will try really hard to look that way and look this way, but if I don't catch your attention and you want to stop me at any point, please I'm happy to make this more conversational than just a presentation. Let me start by saying that I am pleased to come to talk to you about this particular idea because I do believe that the proposed resolution here is an opportunity to, as has been said in the past, out of necessity create an innovation that I think, I really truly do believe, it has to potential to be good for all the stakeholders involved, that's all the campuses, students at our campuses and for the state of Indiana as well. But to paint the context for you a little bit about –

DOWELL: Oh, question in Indianapolis?

MANNHEIMER: I apologize but one of the mishaps of virtual meetings is that the lady with the piece of paper held – I can no longer see the presenter. [laughter] [remark indistinct] finish it. Apologies.

BICHELMEYER: Thank you. So, I want to start by describing a little bit of the state context related to higher education right now and what the necessity is that has brought us to this rather innovative idea, and to do that I need to paint several scenarios. First, if you've read in the newspaper or seen the governor in any forum in the last month or so you have no doubt heard that education reform is the agenda for this coming year. And that reform involves not only K-12 education, and secondary education particularly, but from what we understand from our government relations people that involves higher education as well. And I'll talk a little bit about what that might mean as we move forward here. We also have, in the past couple of years, encountered a General Assembly that has increasingly shown interest in dealing with academic issues, through legislative mandates, and that has everything to do with AP test credit legislation to the Core Transfer Library degree articulation agreements and any number of other issues. And in the summer, as you know – the interesting thing about Indiana is we are very late to the game with the community college system compared to other states, we've had that system for a little over five years now and we are still in the middle of actually determining how we best work with the community college system. That our attempts to figure out how to work in coherent and comprehensive ways has not been fast enough for any number of individuals and groups in the state and in May the provost of Ivy Tech made an update presentation to the Commission for Higher Education about the state of transfer and in that report there was some recognition that we have made progress in that regard but there was quite a bit of focusing on ways that we are not still working as well as we might be as four year institutions and four year campuses with Ivy Tech. And again that was not an IU – when I say four year institutions, that was IU, Purdue, Indiana State, everybody – but we are the largest multi-campus system so that cannot help but influence us. The media picked up on that and there was a very large article over the summer – front page article – in the Indianapolis Star about problems with transfer in the state of Indiana. There are any number of smaller papers that picked that up, but transfer is an issue that's being paid close attention to at the state level and the Commission for Higher Education recently, I think last month or two months ago actually, proposed a five point transfer action plan that they will be working on in this coming year and that five point transfer action plan included moving towards a 10 course, 30 credit hour statewide common core curriculum for every institution in the state of Indiana that the legislature will mandate what those 10 courses and 30 credit hours are and that will become General Education for all institutions. Along with that is a focus on a common course numbering system, wherein we would – to those of us who are on staff our greatest nightmare – convene large numbers of faculty and administrative people and make sure that we all have the same course number for

English composition and for those who have been on the General Education Committee on the Bloomington campus understand the pain, or other campuses as well; along with some other areas such as a single degree articulation agreements for degree programs so that whatever the associate degree for English it transfers into one Bachelor of Arts for English and that degree path looks the same for every institution. So you can gather from this that the commission, in my own words, sometimes confuses standards with standardization, and errs toward standardization. So we are aware from our government relations people that given the General Assembly's recent interest in academic affairs and given the Commission's highlight of five particular areas related to transfer that there's a pretty good likelihood that bills will be passed to address these issues. And this is not just the state of Indiana, there are any number of states who are following this kind of agenda and it comes from the Lumina Foundation, which has a disproportionate voice in educational reform in the nation, as well as some from the Gates Foundation as well as from other educational policy groups and legislative affairs groups who write model legislation and built that onto states like Florida, which if you recognize these things, this is the state of Florida's higher education reform agenda in the past five years. So to just paint that as context that we are aware of some things that might be being proposed this year, one of the questions that comes up generally when we hear presentations like what we heard from Ivy Tech and when we read articles from the news media about transfer is to ask the question, 'Well, really how bad is it?' And we get anecdotal data, generally, about well, how one student whose father happened to be a legislator screamed, or you know, an advisor happened to write a particularly nasty letter to a student about transfer, or whatever those things are, and it's very difficult to know on an anecdotal basis how real the problem is. We had our institutional reporting group do a study about transfer across all of IU campuses and it's on the UIRR website if you are interested in reading it and it does show that we are making significant progress in terms of transfer across all of our campuses. Interestingly, some campuses have different kinds of transfer patterns than others, as you might imagine for the Bloomington campus there isn't as much transfer as there is at the IUPUI campus, which has the most transfer. The regionals tend to be in the middle. Some like East have much more transfer than others such as South Bend, but we have a range of patterns. But everybody has some significant, though not great, proportion of students who are transferring courses in one way or another. But when we looked at transfer related to General Education in particular, there are a couple of issues that came to light. And before I get to those let me talk for a moment about what General Education is, because every single campus at Indiana University has created an interesting and innovative General Education curriculum that is unique to their own campus, that highlights their strengths, and focuses on their faculty's sense of priority and value and they have may unique aspects but they also have many similarities to them and I will come back and talk about those in a little bit. But we do that because General Education really serves two purposes. General Education for native students on a campus serves the purpose of retention, to bring students into the campus, to give them an experience of the breadth of the campus and then to move them into a degree program in a meaningful way. But there's another aspect of General Education, which is

really what people in the Indianapolis – in the legislature and in statehouse – think about, and that is for students who need to be mobile either because they can't afford to start at a campus or they're not sure where they want to go or they move from, you know, in terms of affordability they need to move from Ivy Tech to a four-year campus or whatever reason, General Education also represents mobility. And those are in some ways competing and paradoxical aspects, so to the extent that we have innovative General Education programs that we want to protect for our native students but they might hinder transfer students that is an issue that we need to address. So with that in mind not only did we do a transfer study but we did a study of General Education frameworks across all Indiana University campuses because we wanted to find out just how accurate Ivy Tech's presentation was at the Commission for Higher Education. And there is an eighty-four page report that is available to you if you're interested in reading that I shared that with the Agenda Committee when we talked a couple of weeks ago. But the truth is that what the state has looked at historically through the Core Transfer Library and through other initiatives to promote transfer is to look at transfer on a course-by-course basis. And when you look at our General Education frameworks on a course-by-course basis or if you are, the theoretical activity we engaged in was say that I was an Ivy Tech student and I wanted to transfer on a course-by-course basis to an IU campus at some point in time but I wanted to start at Ivy Tech and I wanted to take the courses that I knew would meet requirements across any IU campus using the framework of the Core Transfer Library, which is a group of about ninety courses that are guaranteed to transfer across institutions in the state, using that collective of ninety courses and looking at what do I want to take to guarantee that it will transfer. The truth is that only three courses, only three courses, are guaranteed to transfer to meet General Education requirements across all IU campuses. And as you might expect it happens to be English Composition, M118, and, I think, college algebra. Introduction to Poetry covers six campuses. That was a close fourth. But at any rate that is a rather shocking statistic to realize what Ivy Tech said in the presentation to the Commission is actually it is harder for an Ivy Tech student to transfer to an IU campus because they have to be more certain of exactly what program they want to take and what campus they want to go to than our own students. And that is a hindrance and our data bear that out. And that's what this report talks about. Well so if a course by course transfer is a problematic approach then we went back up to a higher level and said really what do our General Education curricula have in common? What makes our General Education programs hang together? And when we looked at those and we developed a matrix, what we found out is that there is huge similarity across all of our campuses and IUPUI, I'll come back and talk about your campus in a moment because there is a unique aspect of IUPUI's Principles of Undergraduate Learning, but for all the other campuses you could look at those and you could say basically we all agree that there are two foundational courses that we need or two foundational knowledge bases which happen to be related to English Composition and core mathematical skill. Then we have distribution areas that we agree on. We agree on six to nine hours of arts and humanities, or six to nine hours of social and historical, or six to nine hours of natural and mathematical. We agree on an experience of diversity. We agree on an information

literacy experience. We agree on, you know, those kinds of things. In case you're interested, the distinctions are Bloomington happens to be the only campus that has a foreign language opportunity and South Bend – kudos to South Bend given that our state is 44th in the country in terms of health and wellness – South Bend is the only campus that has a wellness requirement for General Education. IUPUI has the Principles of Undergraduate Learning which do not talk about subject matter in that way. But if we further extract from what's the point of that subject matter what are the point of those distributions areas, and you took them into skills statements or competency statements you could say that the purpose of arts and humanities is to facilitate students' development of the ability to express or interpret expression across modalities. You could interpret from social and historical that what we want is students to be able to understand the place of the individual in society across time and geographic space. You could interpret from English composition that we're interested in critical thinking. You could interpret from mathematical modeling that we're interested in quantitative reasoning. When you raise it to that level then that brings in IUPUI's Principles of Undergraduate Learning. Now, given that as a common framework across all of our campuses, we then were struck by the fact that that framework sounds a lot like the AAC&U LEAP Framework. And for those who aren't familiar with that let me take a moment to talk about that. AAC&U is the Association of American Colleges and Universities and is the oldest and most well respected organization of its kind dedicated to liberal education. About 10 years ago AAC&U, I think very presciently, recognized the writing on the wall that as the cost of higher education goes up and as socioeconomic levels of students who feel the need to pursue high education goes down that there was going to be a point of diminishing returns – or not diminishing returns – there was going to be a point of return where people started asking, 'What do I get, what is the return on my investment and what will it insure me of in terms of spending 25% or 30% of my parents annual income in order to get this bachelors degree?' So what AAC&U did was they commissioned a group called the Hart research and survey company, I think it's Hart somebody like that, H-A-R-T, and they did a study of the a survey of the largest five hundred businesses in the country and they asked the HR managers in those businesses what skill sets and what competencies do you want from students graduating with a bachelors degree to ensure that they will be ready to work for you. So they very astutely tied liberal education with workforce development and what they found is the core set of skills that those, the vast majority of the business people, said they were interested in happened to look a heck of a lot like those skills statements that we articulate from liberal education, which is the third page of this document the Essential Learning Outcomes. So AAC&U as a response to that put together the LEAP Initiative to – basically it stands for Liberal Education and America's Promise – and the whole idea was to create essential learning outcomes that would tie the experience of liberal education with state workforce development and I think that's a very important thing to be aware of because a lot of the conversation that occurs at the state level and nationally about the historic value of liberal education and about places like Ivy Tech, for example, and workforce development is that those are two very different things. And the fact is they're really not very different things anymore. And we see that moving through this

particular group of essential learning outcomes. So that's all to give the background to say that when we started thinking about what might we do in order to say to individuals and the state that the campuses of Indiana University, while having distinct General Education frameworks that represent the unique values of their campuses, really do have a coherent structure underneath them and it looks similar to other General Education frameworks at other institutions in the country and it also looks a lot like a very innovative national model for General Education curriculum and if we focus on the coherent framework as opposed to course-by-course basis what might we do with that as the largest multi-campus institution in the state, that might demonstrate that we are looking for ways to create an innovative approach to General Education in this state, to leapfrog ourselves ahead of other states in the country to say we are all working towards an important skill set for our undergraduate students and how might we invite other institutions, namely Purdue and Ivy Tech, into this conversation and then look for ways that we could work together so that what could happen in the long term is we might minimize the General Assembly's feeling that they need to dictate our curricula to us. Also provide an opportunity to create some transfer pathways if other institutions are willing to endorse a LEAP framework and create General Education as well. Now I should say in this mix what IU has that neither Purdue nor Ivy Tech have at this point – this is the Purdue main campus the Purdue regionals are a little ahead of the main campus – we are the only multi-campus institution in the state that actually has campus-wide General Education on all our campuses. Ivy Tech is just this year defining their institution-wide General Education requirements and Purdue's main campus is just this year defining their campus-wide General Education requirements. So what you see as a result of kind of this interesting kind of phased approach to thinking here, is that what we'd like to encourage is a recognition of what already do and to recognize it in a coherent way and then invite others to potentially create coherent frameworks that also are based on that same model from AAC&U and then start to look for opportunities to accept transfer packages. And I'll talk through that resolution in a moment. But in terms of saying that we want to recognize something we already do and what this particular proposal for resolution says, IUPUI was one of the first AAC&U LEAP campuses. IUPUI has been an AAC&U LEAP campus for some extended period of time. Fort Wayne is already an AAC&U LEAP campus and I think it's been a couple of years or so that they've been that. Chuck will talk about this in a moment, I think, Northwest just recently, their faculty just recently, decided to adopt the LEAP framework for their campus. So almost half of our campuses are already moving in this framework. Sonya could speak more about Bloomington's fit with General Education and the LEAP framework, but I do think there is some similarities there. So the proposal and the idea for you to consider and how far you want to go with this is I think that I've actually in a rather conversational sense talked through most of the bullet points underneath the first part of the resolution about why we are taking this approach. The important bullets in terms of actions are the last three under the "Now, therefore, be it resolved." There are three potential actions that kind of build upon each other from this particular resolution, and the first one is that the University Council actually endorses the essential learning outcomes of the AAC&U LEAP initiative as the guiding framework for General

Education programs across all campuses at IU. And let me talk about why we started this conversation with the UFC instead of going to the campus faculty councils first. We've actually done quite a bit of vetting of this idea already. We've talked to the chancellors and the provosts from all the campuses and they gave a nod to thinking that this was a very good idea. We talked to the vice chancellors of academic affairs and the Academic Leadership Council; they all strongly endorsed this idea. For the regional campuses, several groups in the Blueprint Initiative are endorsing this idea. But when you look at precedent for previous policies related to transfer and multi-campus issues the UFC is the place that has those documents or has set those policies. UFC set the policy for the 64 credit hour cap. UFC set the policy for 100 and 200 level courses or not accepting 300 level courses from two-year institutions. UFC has set the policies related to Master Course Inventory and other aspects. So it seemed like a fitting point to bring this here and then as you discuss this decide how you want to disseminate this back down or bring it back up or what you might want to do with it. But it seemed like the UFC is the faculty policy body that deals with intercampus academic issues. So that was the rationale behind that. We were not in any way trying to usurp campus faculty issues or faculty governance. So the first idea is simply endorsing AAC&U LEAP and it is again, as I mentioned, three of our campuses have already endorsed these at the campus level. The second aspect of a resolution could be to invite other campuses or, I'm sorry, other institutions in the state of Indiana, to similarly endorse the essential learning outcomes. One of the ideas that we would like to pursue, and I have actually been in conversation with Purdue's vice chancellor of academic affairs as well as with Ivy Tech's vice provost for academic affairs as they've been framing their General Education curricula and showing them what the various campuses of IU have as their models and talking about the AAC&U framework for this regard. I think that there is a good possibility of becoming an AAU&C LEAP state, and that means the public institutions in the state of Indiana all come together in agreement that this is what our framework is going to be and we're all working toward this skill set. That does any number of things for the state that the legislature, the General Assembly, the governor, and others are interested in: 1) it's incredibly innovative, there are only four other states in the country right now that are AAC&U LEAP states they happen to be California, Illinois I believe, Wisconsin, - I always get Wisconsin and Minnesota confused and I apologize [laughter] for that but then you know it's just cold up there. But there is that - and I can't remember who the fourth state is – but there are states that are seen as innovators in higher education who have endorsed these frameworks. To be an AAC&U LEAP state invites the kinds of businesses that we would like to come into the state of Indiana for workforce development opportunities for white-collar work, for information technology work, for life sciences work, to say if the student in a public institution or from a public institution in this state gets a baccalaureate degree or completes General Education they have a skill set that you value that you've already told us you value. And the other aspect of this, I think one of the reasons why Indiana is so focused on education reform, is because, again if you've read the newspaper, you understand that Indiana is one of the harder hit states in terms of the current Great Recession and reframing our workforce. We have in the north the rustbelt and we have the automotive industry and those

industries are not coming back. We have to figure out how we invite other large industries or other sectors to come in and at the same time we're inviting those people in we have to educate the families who used to believe that all they need is a high school education and they'll go get a good job at a factory and they'll make a middle level income for the rest of their lives that that is not the way the economy is going to work anymore. So being a LEAP state helps actually frame workforce development. Then finally the last point is that the third potential opportunity here is if other institutions embrace the idea of creating a General Education framework around the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes there would be a possibility to breakdown some of those barriers we've had in terms of transfer and say instead of looking at a course-by-course basis let's make a transfer package that says students who have completed General Education at a campus that is part of the AAC&U Campus Action Network can bring in 30 credit hours toward General Education. Some middle ground again if you focus on Ivy Tech between the full Associates Degree but just bringing in a course-by-course basis that actually gives us a little leverage, I know that sounds scary to faculty and I understand the issues. I really, really understand the issues with Ivy Tech and with people's concerns about Ivy Tech course work. I also know where Ivy Tech is moving in terms of some more quality assurance and that is slow going but the way we have made inroads on that is to start to think of Ivy Tech as less of a competitor and more of a supplier. When we talk to Ivy Tech about 'you are our supplier' and there is a certain standard we need from you we are able to make some movement and that rhetoric is changing. It has to change, and this is one way that might allow us to do more of that. So that is the idea in the long-term and again this circular is for your discussion today for you to look at where you would like to go with that recognizing that some of the things we're trying to achieve are at any number of levels to protect our curricular autonomy, to demonstrate a coherence in our framework, to advance liberal and professional education in the state, to become innovative on a national level and to be seen as innovative so that we invite workforce development, to invite others to align, and then potentially to promote a transfer package. But most importantly to do something that recognizes that we own our curriculum and we recognize that there are problems for those who want to come into our institution, who don't start at our institutions and to do something in a way that's win-win for everybody. This is our best thinking at this point about what that might look like. So with that I will stop and I'll be happy to answer any questions and I leave it to you to determine where you go from there. Thank you very much for listening.

DOWELL: Sonya?

STEPHENS: Thanks, Barbara. Barb's presented some very compelling reasons for doing this and we have talked about the LEAP values.

DOWELL: Wait! Can you hear…?

STEPHENS: Can you hear me?

WINDSOR: I can hear, but we cannot see her.

DOWELL: Oh, here come sit next to me.

STEPHENS: Oh alright, sorry. Can you see me now? So it's true that at various levels we've talked about the LEAP values and endorsed the idea that we would explore being a LEAP university. In Bloomington, we have mapped Gen Ed outcomes against LEAP values and against tuning outcomes. It doesn't really define or describe the Gen Ed curriculum that the committee has put together completely and I would just like to kind of ask Barb to sort of take the other view for a minute and say, 'Yes, we' – and I understand the legislative pressures – but I want to take the other view and say what if we, this is not about – this is about making it possible for students to transfer more easily and all of us want that to happen but we also want to ensure their success when they transfer and if you step back from the course level and you go for the LEAP values which are very generic, then you cannot say anymore that with a transfer package you can ensure students success at the next level because you have no idea. I mean I've been receiving messages since this agenda item was posted, my inbox is full of messages from the Bloomington Gen Ed Committee members saying that the LEAP value in relation to their particular discipline is a very much more watered down version of what they've approved for the curriculum on this campus. So whilst it keeps us in control of our curriculum in relation to legislative pressures, it doesn't really keep us in control of our curriculum as campuses and so there are concerns there. Could you talk about it from the other end?

BICHELMEYER: I appreciate your asking that question because there are two aspects to this, again, and one is when we talk about native students and that is the vast majority of our students on all of our campuses and actually that will always be the vast majority of students on the Bloomington campus. For IUPUI it's not as great a majority of their students because there are more students who transfer at IUPUI and the regionals are somewhere in the middle between those campuses. The question has to do with what data do we have and what control do we have and for our native students there will always be the expectation that they meet our General Education requirements as we've stated those. For those who are non-native students or transfer students, the first thing we have to look at is what data do we have about their potential success or lack of success and we actually, the data that we have from the transfer report that we've already determined, and let's face it, let's talk about Ivy Tech right now because that's who we're talking about. Ivy Tech students who have already transferred to all IU campuses retain and graduate at the same level as our own students, as our native students as well as transfer students from other institutions. So they're graduating at the same rates. What's different is, and this is significant, they are not doing quite as well in our classes as other students are doing but, I mean, that's an interesting double-edged sword. So they are coming in and instead of maybe having a B average they're having a C average but they're retaining and they're graduating. Now we need data to

14

say if it's really different than that, if they're really not adequately prepared, if there's so much more rework that we are doing with those students. We don't have any data yet that indicates that.

TARTELL: Do they take any longer to graduate then our students?

BICHELMEYER: No, well, what this report doesn't indicate that, but now….

TARTELL: Doesn't ask the question or it doesn't say?

BICHELMEYER: We looked at that and it didn't get written into the report. The issue that you have to compare is for Bloomington this is a different story than for IUPUI and for the regionals. Bloomington is a fully residential campus and most students who come to Bloomington are engaged in full-time, you know, four to six year completion. Those students who transfer generally tend to be more like the commuter student or the part-time student that you might find from IUPUI or from other campuses who might take longer to graduate but they're taking longer to graduate because they're taking six hours and working thirty hours a week as opposed to – so we don't have any indication that they're consistently remediating more. So that is an issue at play. Now the other part of that is, and this is really important and I do struggle with this and I really recognize this issue having gone back and forth on any number of perspectives about this, one of the questions we have to deal with is what do we control and what do we not control. And this actually plays out for the regional campuses, I think, as much as for Bloomington or possibly more than for Bloomington and for IUPUI. What I mean by that is when you think about hindering students from progress, we want the vast majority of our students to start and to end at the same institution. That is, all research shows the best approach to completing and to getting a bachelor's degree. We want significant majorities. We want to grow our regional campuses into being comprehensive teaching campuses where the vast majority of students say, you know, 'I want to start at IU Southeast and I want to complete there.' And it's going to be a smaller number who move from Ivy Tech to a campus or it's going to be a smaller number who move from a regional to the Bloomington campus. Bloomington's, I think, full-time student starting and ending at this institution is around, you know better than I do, 80-75% right now. So we're talking about a smaller minority of students than we are our own native students. For that group of students, if the data we have that shows that they're completing at the same rate as native students and they're completing in about the same timeframes for their cohort whether it be part-time or full-time, but they're not doing quite as well. Does that mean that we stop them? Does that mean that we put up a gate and say we're going to make it more challenging for you to move in here? That's the message that the state is getting right now about this. So unless we have data that shows students who come in and who bring in a different set of, you know, 60 credit hours or 30 credit hours or whatever it might be, perhaps they're not doing as well but they're still doing the work, is that a legitimate reason to say we don't want to bring them in? That's the question we are really wrestling with. There are all sorts of opportunities to

make arguments across all sides but the question really does become what's the best way to try to help students in the state of Indiana who don't start here, move through.

STEPHENS: So the student success thing kind of connects back to that which is if you're measuring students who come in under the current regime which has more rigorous requirements than these will be and so we don't know what impact this will have on persistence and graduation or on the student's likely success. It may change it dramatically.

BICHELMEYER: Right.

STEPHENS: So I mean, look, I think the Bloomington campus has said very clearly that it favors the LEAP thing, but I think what I did want to say is one more thing which is that nobody on the campuses, nobody anywhere, has seen this document until an hour ago and so even those people who were consulted previously were consulted more generally about the LEAP values scheme and not about the specifics as are set out in this document. And one of my concerns about this is that it's come to this body and for the reasons that you explained very clearly and I understand that, but that goes counter to what individual faculty councils have already established through their bodies for General Education requirements and that sets up a conflict both kind of system-wide and within the individual campuses which I think we need to be very careful about...

BICHELMEYER: Right. One, in my imagination what would happen here is that this would go back down to the campuses and the campuses would discuss that and weigh in to UFC in terms of what their actions would be. I do want to come back to one point though because I'm not sure that it's accurate to say that it's a less rigorous approach in the future to frame on a AAC&U or a LEAP framework in terms of accepting 30 credit hours as opposed to a course-by-course basis, because right now there is no General Education framework from Ivy Tech or from other institutions so students a bringing in course-by-course but it's not a General Education framework. So to the extent that we are helping to influence what General Education looks like they might be actually a closer fit to what our General Education is right now.

TARTELL: But if we're accepting that blindly, if we say, 'Okay, you meet the framework,' the possibility certainly exists that we're lowering that bar instead of raising it.

BICHELMEYER: Well, yes and no, because there's two ways to look at that. It might be we say you can have that perception if you say it's just a bucket and any course will do. But if those buckets match our buckets so there's an arts and humanities bucket and a social and historical bucket and if there is a natural and mathematical bucket and you look at the range of courses. We have a Master Course Inventory across all of our IU campuses of about 10,000 courses. Ivy Tech has a Master Course Inventory of 2,000 courses. So it's always going to be a range of courses that fit in that bucket from Ivy Tech that's actually smaller then the variation we have across our own campuses. That's

one of the things I think that we might be looking at. Now having said that, this idea is an invitation and I think part of the invitation has to be in terms of framing this. The first thing we want to do is show that we are looking at innovative approaches. The thing that the UFC could do is take this down to campuses and they could get responses and the campuses could say, 'you know, we're willing to invite but we want to collaborate, we want to be in the mix with Purdue and Ivy Tech and we want to frame what those General Education programs might look like and we want to see what those courses are.' Because the reality is there's no way to define, you know, for arts and humanities that it's going to be vocational technical courses. I mean, they sort of have to meet that framework of that rubric in some way. But I do think what we're trying to do is start a conversation across all of our campuses, across other institutions of higher education, and across the state about what does General Education mean from an academic perspective as opposed to having the legislature tell us what we already know that they would propose and it's ten courses that are the ten most common AP courses that meet this framework. And I would much rather irritate faculty a little bit [laughter] but start the discussion from an academic perspective and show that we are engaged in meaningful conversation than say, 'hey, we're hunkering down here and legislature go ahead and give us those ten courses from AP because we're not going to move forward in that regard.'

STEPHENS: I mean, I think that's fine. Go ahead.

EVANS: I just need a very quick clarification here, can you remind us where we can find more details on what this action means. I mean this is so generic about…

BICHELMEYER: Right, there's actually, you can, in terms of AAC&U…

EVANS: What this means in terms of standards.

BICHELMEYER: Right, actually AAC&U, if you go to AAC&U website and go to LEAP actually there's one of the largest pools of statements about skill sets related to the Essential Learning Outcomes or to General Education framed as competencies from their website.

EVANS: So I mean what Sonya –

STEPHENS: I also speak to standards and I think that it speaks to competencies and I think that's not the same thing as standards and I think that's a very well asked question.

EVANS: I want to know if this quantitative literacy means being able to count or does it mean being able to do calculus.

STEPHENS: Right.

BICHELMEYER: And that, back to Sonya's point, is the issue at play here. That what a campus defines as standards may be very different across all our campuses and what we transfer in may be a different standard. But again to me there's something really critical in talking about what we control and what we don't control. Right now, Ivy Tech students come into our campuses and they transfer on a course-by-course basis or they retake everything. That's the real issue in the state of Indiana is that Ivy Tech students will go and they'll take a year or they'll take, you know, two years' worth of credit hours or they'll come in and they will have taken 45 credit hours and they'll be told on no consistent basis what so ever only 12 of the courses that you took, or only 12 of the credit hours you took are going to transfer in. That's hugely problematic in the state because that has to do with SSACI funding, that has to do… They only have so many credit hours that they get funding for, that they are able to take out loans for, to pay back and if what happens is they go to Ivy Tech and they are told, 'Okay, here's the credit hours that you need to take towards an associate degree,' they start down that path and they are told that associate's degree is going to transfer and then on a case-by-case basis what happens is an advisor comes in and says, 'Well, you know what we're not going to take all those.'

EVANS: I think we agree that this is a problem, the point is how do we solve the problem.

BICHELMEYER: Right.

EVANS: Right and that's the issue, the details, not the grand scheme. I mean, we all agree that it's good to know things.

BICHELMEYER: Right. Well, and –

EVANS: We need details to be able to make a judgment.

BICHELMEYER: Right, and I think. Well, let me stop there.

DOWELL: Yeah, are there questions from not the Bloomington campus? Jack?

WINDSOR: Yes, quick question. When you're talking about General Ed you talked about campus specific, IUPUI, IUB, but being from Dentistry I've been pretty naïve and I'm learning that each school has their own General Ed here at IUPUI, particularly specialized programs like Engineering, Nursing, Dental Hygiene that require maybe 16 General Ed course hours which would result in those credit hours their credit hours to complete the degree going up. Do you see that as a problem?

BICHELMEYER: That there are different General Education requirement across programs within the campus or that –?

WINDSOR: Schools.

BICHELMEYER: – there may be more…? I think there's two parts to that. One, is that question on a school-by-school basis General Education requirements and the second, is that students may have to take more credit hours. The second part, the answer to that is, students are already having to take more credit hours than anticipated through course-by-course transfer or through some degree articulation agreements that aren't actually implemented in the way that they were written, so that's actually the problem we're trying to mitigate. So I don't know that this particular approach will actually enhance that. It might mitigate that but there are areas – and it has to do with accreditation or in the case, on the Bloomington campus, with the School of Music – there are programs that are hugely scripted and they tend to be Engineering, Nursing, Education, and the School of Music program on the Bloomington campus and by heavily scripted I mean of 125 or 130 credit hours about 123 [laughter] credit hours are required and that's, you know, worth a little bit of laugh but that's a pretty close statement in terms of that. I think the question is not unlike other General Education programs knowing where those exceptions would be or how those bucket areas, those framework areas, might fit in to those requirements, but to the extent that each IU campus actually does have a campus-wide General Education requirement, in the case of IUPUI it's the Principle of Undergraduate Learning, the question would be where do those map and what would those look like and does a General Education framework that comes from Ivy Tech or comes from Purdue, which is particularly important for IUPUI or IUP Fort Wayne as students move in and out of Purdue programs, does the framework they create work with ours? And again, remembering we were about as forward thinking as we could be in terms of putting this document together to see where we might push and where we might go expecting that there would be some backing away from this to determine what really makes sense. But again we need to start the conversation to demonstrate that. So I think that I've answered both of your questions. One is, I don't think it could be worse than it is right now in terms of actually requiring more credit hours and two, I think for programs that are heavily scripted they would have to look at is there a reason for an exception or is there a way to fit the campus requirement into their school-wide General Education requirement which is already happening, I think. So it would be just a continuation of that. Yeah?

STEPHENS: To follow up my concern would be that if you go for something like a 30 credit – whether it's the legislature or the UFC that determines the 30 credit kind of package for transfer students that what will happen is that there'll be more distribution requirements imposed in the schools in order to backfill the skills and competencies that students need and that will water down the major because that's the only way to go and so that would be a concern.

DOWELL: There's a question in Indianapolis.

MANNHEIMER: Thank you. First of all, I thought that was a stunningly articulate presentation. I'm unaccustomed to (remark indistinct) [laughter] Thank you!

BICHELMEYER: Thank you.

MANNHEIMER: If I understand this correctly, IUPUI is going to come out smelling like a rose because we've got the Principles of Undergraduate Education – or Undergraduate Learning, excuse me – and if we move toward something like this we're going to have less of a distance to travel. I mean that's just sort of a general sense I'm getting but it may grow out of some confusion as to… I mean, the Principles of Undergraduate Learning are sort of like as I would call them sort of meta-tags on top of any course so that you could, I mean, one of those principles being let's say critical thinking conceivably you can have a course in exercise physiology that would be heavy on critical thinking as one might have a course in the French Revolution that could also be strong in critical thinking. So It is kind of a non-generic but meta quality to a course and I'm not sure those are the buckets you're speaking of or whether, as I'm more accustomed to understanding Gen Ed requirements that, you know, they're something like you got to have six credits of the humanities, you got to have six credits of the physical sciences, et cetera, et cetera… And so to some extent we can squeeze or we can sprinkle, if you will, on those Gen Ed requirements. On the other hand it may be so loosey-goosey as to how that is applied that, you know, maybe nobody knows what's going on. My last comment, I'm not sure if it's a comment or a question, but it's sort of to echo what was said earlier by the gentleman who's on my left, the guy back there in the white shirt. It's the devil's in the details or God is in the details as Mies van der Rohe said. Is this an opportunity over a period of time whether it's eighteen months or two years or whatever it is, whatever the political cycle might be for the legislature and the governor, that you know we can say we're moving toward this but we are enacting principles of, or mechanisms I should say, that allow us to perhaps even be entrepreneurial in how a specific school or a specific teacher might say. 'I'm going to develop a course that's already on the books for bucket number three or bucket number four or as a school might sort of seize the bull by the horns as it were and, you know, I'm avoiding the word "bucket" because of limericks [laughter] It's a basically a big bad question, let me put it that way.

BICHELMEYER: Well, so there's several things I could respond to there and let me start by saying I think in my ideal world we want it to be provocative and start the conversation today simply so that we can start the conversation and be able to say at the state level we are engaged in conversation from an academic perspective, so please don't, you know, please don't squelch that by telling us that 10 courses meet everybody's fit, but that we need time to explore this. And I think simply showing that in good faith we are making movement toward that buys us the opportunity of time. And I don't want to put any kind of false deadline or framework on something by saying we got to figure this out in the next month because, you know, if we don't… You know, perhaps we're going to be told, but I think we need to simply be able to go back and say, you know, if you're going to propose this legislation let's tell you what we're doing to

move forward and see if we can't negotiate that. The second part of response that I want to make in terms of your comments, though really have to do with looking at the resolution and I think the reality is item number one in the resolution to encourage UFC to endorse these frameworks and my assumption was always going to be that they were going to discuss this, they were going to pass this back down to the campuses, they were going get campus responses and see. And again for three of the five campuses this is a moot point for. Where are the other campuses on that? Can we say something about that as a collective? That that is giving a structure to a conversation that we need to facilitate, but that for the most part endorsing the LEAP framework works for ourselves and our own campuses is probably relatively non-controversial because they fit so well already. And back to Sonya's point, they fit in more detail because the LEAP framework has to be a relatively general framework so there's movement in it and for any campus there is going to be greater requirements or greater specificity in there, and for some campuses it happens that half our campuses actually have an ethics requirement. Half of our campuses don't have an ethics requirement, interestingly. When you look at that, I think, you know, is there potential for, you know, some misalignment or opportunities for campuses to grow, perhaps that's true. But for the most part on the vast majority of things we agree, so I don't know that it would be incredibly controversial for any campus to say, 'Golly there seems to be a relatively good fit,' knowing that the LEAP framework is more generic. For the second point, I think inviting other institutions to think about it and move forward can we be a LEAP state I don't know that that's so controversial because we're simply saying, 'Hey, do we want to facilitate a conversation or do we want to be involved in a conversation that looks at alignment across various institutions of high ed?' There is no commitment there other than to engage in the conversation. The really controversial one is the last one, and the last one that may be the one that you say, 'Hey, all we can do right now is one and two,' or 'We only want to do one,' or 'We only want to do two, let's just invite the conversation and see where it goes,' but the idea under neither all of this is somehow if we create a coherent framework but we don't find ways to help students move from Ivy Tech into our institutions in order to prepare them better to move into our institutions, if we don't – that's the question about standards verses standardization. I'm all for mitigating standardization in any way we possibly can because we lose the unique value and education really ought to be about customization and sufficiency as much as possible. But if we're not going to standardize and we're going to create some pathway that has some certain level of standards is the starting point a framework and then where do we go from that framework in terms of our conversation with each other. So again, that's the UFC's decision to say how much of this or how little of this will we endorse, will we buy into, will we want to, you know, find out from our campuses what's going on. And I fully expect that, we had versions of this where we didn't have number three on, we took it off, we changed the framework, we changed the wording, we changed the idea but the idea was let's just put it out there and let's be somewhat controversial and let's talk about opportunities to innovate because if we didn't have that conversation then we would never end up at…anyway. But really in the end I do think that if we don't do something as the largest multi-campus institution in the state

to facilitate and to invite more transfer and to prepare students in ways to articulate for them what preparation for transfer would look like we're missing the boat and we're probably going to get that 10 course 30 credit hour framework.

DOWELL: Yes.

GALLMEIER: Barb, if I can just jump in here, Chuck Gallmeier from IU Northwest. I like what you just explained because as you know we've endorsed LEAP here at IU Northwest the Executive Committee of the Faculty Organization and Education Committee but we have not seen this resolution yet. And as I look at the resolution it is the third one that probably will cause some consternation. Right now, we have the unanimous support of the campus I'm not really sure that the third part will create that much type or risk either, but I think one of the reasons that we are so onboard and supportive of this and I haven't seen anything like this it's my third year as president of the Faculty Organization and we're never unanimous about anything but we seem to be on this. I think maybe one of the reasons some or all we've heard from is our colleagues from Bloomington or IUPUI but I think the issue of control which I think is what we're hearing and I guess what's making people concerned here. I think the issue of control and who controls our curriculum and the role of legislators is something that has a different meaning for regional campuses than, I think, it has for Bloomington or IUPUI. So I would like to know how people would comment on that. We're often referred to as being in the trenches or something. None of us like those terms but you know regional campuses I think always are looking over their shoulder more than I think the flagship institutions are. So I'd like to hear some comments about that in terms of how other regional campuses see this and how Bloomington and IUPUI see, you know, our reaction to this versus theirs. Have I made any sense at all?

DOWELL: Mary?

GRAY: Chuck, can I just ask you if you would clarify a bit more on what you're just saying about us, that it has a different value at regional campuses because I'm not sure if I see it off the bat. I want to make sure I'm not misunderstanding what value it has for a regional campus versus IUPUI.

GALLMEIER: Regional campuses always feel a little more vulnerable when it comes to something called the legislature. I think Bloomington and IUPUI are seen and perceived differently, I think, by people who wield the power in the state and so when a regional campus learns that somehow there's going to be a control of our curriculum and what we do, we feel it more than Bloomington and IUPUI feel it. I could be wrong, but I certainly got that sense from my colleagues when I shared with them Barb and John's presentation to us is that we're always kind of looking over our shoulder to see what – I mean after all we are IU Northwest as offensive as that makes me often I come down state and people refer to me as, "Oh, you're at the ghetto school," you know? And that always drives me crazy so I think that the view point of regional campus faculty may be

one that's different than what we might hear from Bloomington and IUPUI. Now I could be wrong, but that's my sense of my colleagues and that's why this issue is more germane or really has affected them. We believe that we do a great job and we believe that our General Education program is excellent. We took a look at the information that Barb provided us and John and saw the overlaps between different schools and so we didn't quite see it the same way as perhaps our colleagues in Bloomington. And we see a unification or a uniting in many ways protects us because I think we're the most vulnerable in this whole issue.

BICHELMEYER: And if I…

GALLMEIER: Have I clarified for you?

GRAY: Oh, yeah.

BICHELMEYER: And if I could follow up on that I think there's two points. We have a very interesting model of high education at Indiana University and in the state. And when you look at the way that it plays out, we have very different target audiences, and very different missions. We really have in some ways three distinct divisions underneath one multi-campus institution. So, back to Chuck's point: there are two things that are part of the charter, or the mission and the current admissions criteria for the regionals that are different than Bloomington, particularly, and IUPUI is somewhere in the middle. Bloomington has a statewide mandate, if not national and international, but from the state higher education commission. It's a statewide mandate. The regionals have regional service areas, and they are tied to that service area and they have an expectation that they are going to meet the needs of the students in the state in a very different way than Bloomington, and IUPUI again is somewhere in the middle of that. Not only do they have that different expectation, they also have a different target audience. Bloomington has Core 40 with Honors as their admissions requirement starting in Fall 2011, which is really May 1st, or whatever the date is. And the regionals have a Core 40 – they're moving towards a Core 40 with the requirement. Five years ago they had open admissions, right? Their job was to serve such a range of students that actually they've benefitted in some ways from Ivy Tech taking over the open admissions and they've been able to become more of what we think of as the traditional comprehensive teaching institution in the state. So, a student who comes in with Core 40, versus Core 40 with Honors, there's more of a bridging, right? There's more of a meet-'em-where-they-are-and-bring-them-along where there's actually much less room on the Bloomington campus from where a student comes in and where they end up. So that's one of the things I think, when Bloomington – and again I totally understand – they're more protectionist in terms of standards. There's a different standard that students in Bloomington meet than there is for students who come into the regional campuses, and again, IUPUI is somewhere in the middle, which is, I think, represented by the fact that although they have a campus wide General Education framework and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, their schools really represent the difference in

terms of their student body. So that's the struggle that they deal with as an urban campus. I think that, kind of, is part of what's behind that difference in terms of how this would be framed there. Again, that may be something the University Faculty Council looks at as across these divisions of the university, does something make more sense for one and not for another?

DOWELL: So can we – South Bend do you still have questions? South Bend?

WALKER: No, I was just going to respond to Chuck's query about how the regional campuses were feeling about this issue. And I think that we, by and large, we are actually quite comfortable with the LEAP initiative. About, I don't know, seven or eight years ago we did our General Ed requirements and they're very similar, I mean, they are different but they actually follow the LEAP model as they were being developed, so we feel that it's pretty much in keeping with the spirit behind the LEAP initiative. However, we also share Bloomington's concern, and that is the concern is that we did build in standards and expectations with our General Education requirements that we feel if you didn't have this part of 30 easily transferable, that will probably get watered down, it's hard to imagine how it's not going to. That's our feeling. Anybody else have a feeling?

DOWELL: Laverne, you had your hand up?

NISHIHARA: Yes, I have two questions for Barb. Barb, you're the third person that I'm asking this. There's a concern with the LEAP initiative about how this will affect assessment, and so far I've received the response that endorsing the LEAP initiative will not affect assessment of General Ed, that we will continue with the assessment of General Ed as it is. I'm going to add my second question. I'm in agreement with what South Bend just said that when I compare the essential learning outcomes in this document to IU East's learning objectives, they're quite compatible, except for a couple of the bullet points, I'm not sure that we currently require something like teamwork as part of General Education or specifically require civic engagement, which I think of as resembling service learning. These things are parts of courses, but I'm not sure that our campus actually requires them in courses, and therefore my second question is if we were to adopt the essential learning outcomes, would each campus be required to come up with courses that specifically address these outcomes so as to be in compliance with the learning outcomes?

BICHELMEYER: The good news is that because the AAC&U is not an accrediting body, this is a voluntary initiative or focus area that a campus chooses to join and the commitment to the campus is to build a General Education curriculum that, I guess I would say, closely resembles, but not on a one-to-one compatibility issue, meets each essential learning outcome. But the idea is that the endorsement of the framework of the essential learning outcomes is that your General Education curriculum comes relatively close to that. Now it might mean that endorsing that over time, East would look at that and say, you know, 'We'd like to do something more explicit around,' you

know, any one of those outcomes that you don't feel like you are well-aligned with, for example, civic engagement. Actually, the LEAP framework doesn't necessarily say it needs to be a course-by-course articulation, in fact the LEAP framework says they kind of like to get away from course-by-course, and actually open it up to some things that are more like Shared Goals on the Bloomington campus, or the Principals of Undergraduate Learning, which is why IUPUI is framed that way. IUPUI doesn't actually have a bucket or a series of courses – I'm sorry, the bucket – they don't have that, you know, set thing that says X number of arts and humanities. They have the skill statements or competency statements around critical thinking and they say there's a number of ways that you can get that. That is more attuned or in line with what AAC&U or LEAP endorses, is the idea of experiences, whether they are in a course or whether they're someplace else in the undergraduate education. So because it's not accredited and because it isn't mandatory or required, there is not the expectation of a one-to-one relationship of each essential learning outcome with the course, not is there an expectation that you have to assess on those essential learning outcomes. The idea is that you would want to do some assessment related to those essential learning outcomes and toward that end, again as I mentioned earlier, AAC&U, if you look at their website and actually I forget the name of it, it's not an assessment framework, but there's a resource there that provides more opportunities and guidance and examples of how you might assess on any one of those essential learning outcomes than you will probably find anywhere else related to undergraduate assessment, in terms of actual details, which is available to your campus to look at and determine are there aspects that you would like to assess that you are not assessing. But there is no requirement nor is any of that mandatory.

DOWELL: Thanks, Elizabeth?

NISHIHARA: Thank you.

BOLING: Barbara, who decides that a campus's General Education program matches the LEAP essential learning outcomes?

BICHELMEYER: In some ways, it is more about the idea of review for match and improvement than it is – again like any accreditation aspect – and there are individuals who are from AAC&U or from other campuses who you may invite into a conversation with you, but it's your campus that basically is working with AAC&U folks and any reviewers who you want to invite in, to say, here is our curriculum, how does it hang together in comparison to that?

BOLING: Do you have to invite reviewers or you don't?

BICHELMEYER: All of it is voluntary. It's your choice about how you engage in review.

BOLING: So if there is this package, then it may be a package for which, what I understand is, that another campus has said, 'We believe that this matches.'

BICHELMEYER: Mmhmm.

DOWELL: Herb?

TERRY: I have a kind of structural question. You used the term "we" frequently. That's you and John Applegate's office – is that correct? "When we developed this thing -" where did this come from?

BICHELMEYER: I'm trying to think of how I've used "we". I generally think I've used "we" as a conversation about "we," the campuses of Indiana University. In terms of this document, how this was framed is again – the actual document was written by our office but this was framed through vetting of the Academic Leadership Council, the Blueprint Groups for the regional campuses, conversation with the Chancellors… I think those are the primary groups that we have been in conversation with.

TERRY: And yet Sonya…

STEPHENS: [remark indistinct] have seen this document?

BICHELMEYER: Right. No, this is the –

TERRY: Okay.

BICHELMEYER: – this is the first vetting of this document, and remember, it's for discussion, not decision.

TERRY: Yeah, I mean, where I'm going is I understand the pressures the General Assembly is likely to bring to bear upon us and I think there are all kinds of reasons why we should be able, in good faith, to turn to the General Assembly and say Indiana University hears you and is responding to you concerns and wants transfer to work, but wants each institution to be able to give the best quality education it can to the students who are appropriate for that institution. It seems to me that there are a number of constituencies that would have something to contribute to a discussion about LEAP or anything else that essentially addresses those questions. The primary ones would seem to me to be the faculty bodies that are devoted to educational policies and undergraduate education, this sort of thing, on the various campuses. And since we don't have a system wide equivalent of Sonya, we don't have a system-wide Vice President for Academic Affairs or for Undergraduate Education or something like that; it would be the Sonyas and her equivalents on the various campuses. And if you could bring faculty groups and those folks together and start saying – maybe working with Vice President Applegate's office – saying, here we are well aware of your concerns

about the intersection of General Education requirements to student progress and transfer and we are taking these steps to address it. Maybe you can get them some tentative time-tables by which we would say, we'll get back to you, with something. But that would be something that the UFC or the University could point to and say we're doing it but we're not going to do it so quickly and so improvidently that it doesn't work well, and that it results in a diminution not an increase in the quality of K-16 education.

BICHELMEYER: Well, and I think that's in some ways, what has happened in reverse because the equivalents of Sonya Stephens are the Academic Leadership Council and to propose this idea, to say what's your response to this? And say they see the idea as something to move forward and to disseminate. Again, there's two ways to do this and you can disseminate it from this body to call down to the campuses to say respond to that and, which I would assume, the faculty council education policy groups would do at the request of the UFC, or we could've gone around to all of the campus faculty bodies and say, 'Send that out and report up.' But because of the UFC's intercampus focus to start here and to say, you know, here's the discussion, will you roll this out and see what people think, collect information from the faculty bodies and roll it back up seemed to be the more appropriate place to start vetting that idea, to see, how far will they go. And again, you know, is it one, two, three? Is it one? Is it two? Is it something different? Is there an entirely different response to this? Does it work for some campuses of the university and not for others? You know, there's different arguments for where you would start in any case but to the extent that what we do want to be able to say to the state in relatively short order is we are paying attention and we're doing something from a university perspective. This seemed to be a pretty good place to go, to go back and say, you know, 'Look, we are engaged in discussion and please do not truncate our discussion based on good academic reasoning by dictating for us something that constitutionally you shouldn't be able to do, but – [laughter] I mean, never the less, but I do appreciate that point, I really do believe what the next steps are, are for the appropriate bodies on campuses to engage in conversation to roll back up information to the UFC about that.

TERRY: For the legislature to actually do some of these things they would be risking AAUP sanctions.

BICHELMEYER: Right.

TERRY: And then it's important they understand that.

BICHELMEYER: Except for – that is true, but again, and I hate – I really, really do hate– putting politics and what I can instructional design together, and I am trained as an instructional designer, and I never in my wildest dreams until I got to this job, realized that it's not about good instruction. [laughter] Having said that, I do think that when you look at the climate of this state, I am on a daily basis amazed at the, I don't know if hubris is the right word, at the reach, you know, from AP test scores to any number of

things that Sonya knows as much and more painfully than I do, but what we do know is we have, in the political climate, we have a governor and a superintendant of public instruction and a commissioner for higher education who last year were already incredibly closely aligned with what they want. which is based on not just what the state of Indiana wants – but it's interesting we have a very Republican state, we have a very Democratic President whose agenda for educational reform fits with theirs and there are policy making bodies all over proposing these kind of statutes, but what we have now that we didn't have last year, that buffered us a little bit, was we had some differentiation in the General Assembly. And as of November 30th, we don't even need a Democratic senator to show up for a quorum in the state of Indiana, so now you have a very Republican executive body and very Republican public school administrators, and a very Republican majority of the General Assembly, or at least the Senate, and well even the House. And I worry sometimes, I really worry – you have no idea how much I worry – about sounding like Chicken Little. And I do not want to be Chicken Little. And I really do not believe that educational decisions should be driven by politics, but I do believe that what politics does is raise the question that because we are a public institution in this state, and we do need to respond to the state needs, it's telling us we need to engage in a conversation we haven't engaged in. And that's why I think we were pretty bold in putting all of those points down there and saying you guys need to discuss them, and we need to come up with some kind of resolution to that, and we need to move that forward. But when I said, I'm simply laying it out for you today and I'm giving it back to the UFC for you guys to do with it what you will, we need to discuss them and we need to be seen as discussing them, and that's where I think we need to go.

DOWELL: Mary?

GALLMEIER: Can I ask Barb, – I'm sorry IU Northwest again – that, you know, we do have a governor who kind of sees the world in terms of education based on the book titled *Real Education* [written by Charles Murray. –Editor's note] and I don't know how many of my colleagues have read it, but if you have it scares the hell out of me. And that's why I think this is a scary time.

DOWELL: Mary?

BOLING: Well, I – oh sorry, Mary? –

BOLING: I was only going to say that I think the ground upon which academics have traditionally stood in these kinds of situations has eroded to the point that I'm not sure it's even there anymore. So to say we need to do this deliberately and with good quality is not – that's not a statement that staves anybody off, that's a statement that actually fans the fire.

TERRY: Yeah.

BOLING: So without action I really don't think that's the way we want to proceed.

GRAY: So my question is this – and this was incredibly persuasive and I was kind of surprised when we first talked about it in the Agenda Committee, that I was finding myself saying sure, you know, that makes a lot of sense, and interestingly for me – I mean I'm relatively new to a faculty position – I come from the UC system in California – sad, but its past, its glorious past was that the idea's that you'd make it really easy for students to move across UC. So when I'm thinking about this, interestingly to Chuck's point, I'm really thinking how do we make it relatively easy for students who maybe find themselves no longer needing to be in, you know, at Southeast or in Fort Wayne, having mobility within the IU system. So I still haven't quite figured out this system and how it relates, you know, how the campuses relate to each other, but that's what I have in my mind. I want to make it easy for our students to move across our IU campuses and in our conversations my bigger concern has been – so my two questions are – how do we bring Ivy Tech into a vigorous conversation that does insure that if they were going to adopt LEAP, that they were also raising the quality of their courses. Because right now we have students who are coming from those campuses that obviously have spent a lot of energy to get here, and I trust their process. I don't Ivy Tech's training – to be completely blunt – because their billboards say two years to a career, and I'm just thinking that's just false advertising. So if they're giving their students a bad bill of goods, I don't want our campuses to pay the price. So that's one question is, what role do we then actually play in making our partners step up? And I'm not thinking about our IU campus colleagues, I'm thinking about Ivy Tech. My second question is, do we have any evidence where a legislature that's fairly rabid about gutting public education has actually heeded to LEAP and has seen it as a robust conversation that satisfies their yen for gutting public education? [laughter] Because my concern would be, that they don't see this as us doing anything other than promoting the liberal arts and do they understand that this is a body that's making a case for the connection between future workforce training and liberal arts because I'm not hearing them that interested in that.

BICHELMEYER: Let me answer that question first and then go back to the second question. Indications from the past have been that the bills that are proposed by the legislature are closely aligned with ideas and initiatives that come from the Commission for Higher Education. So basically the Commission for Higher Education is the educational policy group that says 'Here legislator, here's legislature, here's what you ought to be proposing.' We know that the Commission for Higher Education is very interested in the idea of becoming a LEAP state, for any number of reasons that I've said. And we know that one of the other aspects that's really kind of a beauty about LEAP, is that LEAP – to become a LEAP state – you actually have to move away from standardization because the idea behind LEAP is to allow for the richness and diversity that liberal education is –

GRAY: So why is this commission behind it? Because that's what I'm not getting, why would you ever back –?

BICHELMEYER: – because it's innovative and because it ties to workforce development in the skill set. You can make a pitch to potential employers in the state and when you look at our state numbers we really, really are – we're in big trouble in a lot of ways. I already alluded to our healthcare – but we are 44th – no, that's the healthcare – we are 41st in the country in terms of baccalaureate degree completion per adult population. I mean, we're right down there with the southeast of the country.

GRAY: No, I know it's the thank-goodness-for-Mississippi syndrome.

BICHELMEYER: Yeah, exactly. So they know that that number needs to improve, they know that we need to have something to be able to invite the kinds of employers that we want for the 21st century in here and this is a nationally recognized model for doing that. And it does tie, and makes some sense about how do we do workforce development in a way that recognizes that Ivy Tech and IU and Purdue actually have something in common. So the idea I can get is they would bow to the pressure for less standardization in order for those other gains. Where right now the only thing they can hold onto is standardization. So that's the aspect of that. So our thinking is, if the commission's back there saying, 'Hey, this is a good idea,' it takes some pressure off legislators or they take pressure off of legislators to propose these bills because AAC&U would not endorse those kind of bills. The second question about how do we work with – I'll take that as how do we work with Ivy Tech a little better – comes back to that idea of the invitation here, and that if what we do is say, we would like to be in dialogue with you and we need to be in dialogue with you because you are our supplier. I mean I really appreciate that you have the Cal perspective, because in our state that's – for lack of any other coherent strategy – they've looked at California, they've looked at Illinois and they looked at Florida. They continue to look at California, Illinois, and Florida, but sorry, California a little less now.

GRAY: MmmHmm.

BICHELMEYER: And it's interesting because we don't have that model of the tiered structure. We don't directly, but inherently we kind of do. Well so, that was a little digression I apologize for that, but what comes out of that is that the Cal system worked because they knew that there was a supply chain. And again, the whole point about Ivy Tech only being five years old, the creation of Ivy Tech was so political. Ivy Tech has 47 employees in the state legislature. Ivy Tech's previous president would tell you that Ivy Tech was a political institution. Ivy Tech is just now shifting from being a political institution to an educational institution and I think they had to be a political institution to get money, to get resources, to build what they needed to build, and now they're facing, for any number of reasons, a question about quality, and it has to do not only with, you know, that they need to work with us, but they're changing the funding formula in the state to a completion funding formula. All of a sudden it doesn't matter how many people you enroll, it matters how many people you get through. But in order

for us to have a leverage point with them, we have to work with them enough to say 'You are not our competitor. You are our supplier and as our supplier we have expectations of you.' We have just in the last six months moved to that kind of dialogue with them, to say, 'We're not threatened by you. Our regional campuses are not threatened by you,' because we're comprehensive four-year teaching institutions and we make the argument that we bring in students with Core 40 and we expect the vast majority of students to start and to finish with us, but to the extent that some of your students move over here, they have to be prepared to move over here, what does that look like? They've had a shift in a president, and a vice provost, and a provost in the last three years, and some of that, they are understanding the expectations of them now. They're maturing in their developmental cycle. So all of those things come into play, but part of it is inviting them to the conversation. And I do not envy them the challenges that they have in that regard, so, long-winded answer.

DOWELL: Okay, let's just take a couple more questions, and then move on in our agenda. Does that sound okay? Let's go with Herb. You had your hand up first. Then Laverne, then South Bend, okay?

TERRY: I just have a question for the members of the Council who are here. If we want to provoke a discussion on these issues, we don't have a quorum now to adopt your resolution, but we could certainly advise the Agenda Committee that we think this circular and the minutes of this meeting should be quickly sent to the other campuses and to their governing bodies, and urge them to start picking up these issues. I'm wondering if there's any reaction to the notion that we should urge the Agenda Committee to do that.

GRAY: There are only two campuses that actually haven't had this conversation?

BOLING: You said three of the five are already…

DOWELL: Are you talking about on non-IU campuses?

TERRY: What?

DOWELL: You're talking about campuses outside of IU?

TERRY: I was talking about IU campuses.

DOWELL: You were talking about IU?

TERRY: We could send it to our colleagues at other universities if we wish. We could just say here, this is what Bloomington has not yet adopted, or not Bloomington – IU has not yet adopted –

DOWELL: Yes, that's my confusion here –

TERRY: – not yet adopted, but it has implications for your campuses and this sort of thing. Discuss it.

DOWELL: Well, I think that we can talk about that at the Agenda Committee, but I don't think there's – I would feel a little weird about sending it off to Purdue right now, saying that we're – you know…

TERRY: If that's true, we could at least send it to our other IU campuses.

DOWELL: Well, we're doing that now. All of the IU campuses are here represented, and they're getting it now and hearing this discussion and then we will ask everybody to if – I mean, some people are already a LEAP campus so maybe they don't really need to discuss a lot of it, but they need to discuss opinions on the transferability issue – and we will absolutely ask all campuses to send it to their appropriate committees for discussion and to bring their comment back and we'll have to discuss a sort of timeline on that.

BOLING: Not being a member of the committee at all, my sense would have been that you might table it, ask representatives to go back to the campuses and get a sense of where they are.

TARTELL: Right, all campuses, absolutely, that's what I thought we were doing.

DOWELL: That's, I believe, what we are doing. We tend to not stand too close to like following parliamentary kind of rules, so we tend to just say, yeah let's all come back and talk about it later, but we could officially take a vote on tabling the measure if we like. Can we do the two comments I promised to put forward? Laverne first, then South Bend?

NISHIHARA: Right, you partly answered this question just now but at East, the equivalent of one and maybe by now, two committees, have started to discuss this initiative, which isn't enough for me to come back to you yet, of course, but I did want a timeline. I also wanted to know who could answer questions that came from East. There are a few people here who might be able to answer questions, but I think I'd like a central person in the state that I could go to if there are questions.

DOWELL: Barb, would you be willing to be that person?

BICHELMEYER: Yes, I will be that person.

DOWELL: Barb will be that person.

NISHIHARA: Thank you.

DOWELL: South Bend?

GERENCSER: This is sort of a timeline question as well. If we share it with our General Education committee, which has been the plan of the Executive Committee of our Senate, I can't imagine they would get back in time to make a report to our full Senate, so that even if our full Senate were to choose to approve it, that's late January. I don't know if that's useful to the timeline that Barb has been talking about or not. But, you know, we don't actually meet as a full Senate 'til the end of January.

DOWELL: I'm sure that's the case for a lot –

CLARK: Now what is the urgency? Right now, what is the urgency, Barb, in all of this? How quickly, do you imagine, in your imagined world, how quickly would you have these [unintelligible]

BICHELMEYER: Actually, this is back to the idealist and instructional designer in me, right now, since we don't know what legislation is pending or how we are going to be able to respond to that, I think simply being able to say we are in discussion of these issues – I'm fully comfortable saying that. And I think that whatever time you need in order to have those conversations, you have those conversations. And I don't know what the UFC's agenda is for the spring but sometime to come back in the spring and that might be one meeting, that might be two meetings, but I am fully cognizant of the fact that there needs to be time on campuses to have these conversations and right now we don't have – there's not a bill on the table, and there's not anything that says, 'You better tell us what you're doing or we'll pass this bill.' So I might come back to you, you know, in January and say, 'Oh, the bill's on the table, what do you want to say in response to that?' But right now I don't know that. So right now I say, my thought would be to take the time that you need and use the appropriate vehicles and then if we have to, say, come back in January and say, 'Hey you better have a quicker conversation you might need to convene some kind of group,' – I don't know – but right now, I'd say take the time that you would take.

DOWELL: Okay, and I'm sorry is there someone in Indianapolis? Yeah?

MANNHEIMER: The time-table, I'm uncertain if there is a time table, I guess you just said, Barb, that there isn't. There is no technical motion on the floor. It's nothing [unintelligible] and I'm not sure we table these things or not if there is no motion if this is an informational item I'm not parliamentarian but my sense is you're taking our temperature so that you can go back and report to your boss, and he in turn reports to his boss, that we're not unreceptive to this idea. The aroma wafting over the backyard fence is not unpalatable, although we have some questions on whether the steak's cooked medium well or rare, and is that – am I reading you correctly?

BICHELMEYER: Yes, I think you are –

GRAY: – Are there buckets involved? Are there buckets of steak?

BICHELMEYER: Yeah, are there buckets? Are there buckets of beer with the steak? [laughter] In terms of the intention, I think the intention was to frame the context of the state for you to understand. Two, to put ideas on the table so that there is some discussion, so that we can actually engage in the discussion for the value of the discussion, but also to be able to say to the state we are looking at pathways for transfer that make sense. And we are looking at doing innovative things that the state needs to have done, in terms of looking at how our undergraduate programs tie into developing skills that would be good for workforce development and all the many things I've talked about. So the goal was to start the conversation, to be somewhat provocative, to give the UFC an opportunity to send this information out to campuses to consider it. And back to your last point, yes, to gauge, to get a sense, of the temperature of things. And I would say that I'm not at all surprised that the temperature seems to vary from Bloomington across IUPUI and the regionals, and again I am not at all surprised, and as I mentioned the idea of being provocative was I fully expected that that last point was going to be the real issue here. But that said, for some campuses, the first point's already a done deal, for other campuses, to look at do we even want to embrace the LEAP framework? I can look at the General Education frameworks across all campuses and see it tie to those, but that's the campus faculty to decide for themselves, so that could be more controversial than I realized for some campuses but those were the multiple agendas for the conversation today.

DOWELL: Alright, great! Thank you, Barb.

BICHELMEYER: Thank you very much.

DOWELL: And yeah, all campuses should consider themselves charged to look at this resolution and to look at the issues as Barb spelled them out and to kick start discussions on this so that when people tell the commission of higher education that IU's delving into this and really thinking about it deeply it will be true.

BICHELMEYER: Thank you. And thank you again for the conversation today, and I look forward to seeing where it goes. Thanks!

GRAY: I don't think I realized that we do not have a quorum so we can't really pass a motion for the UFC, is that my – is that your understanding?

DETHLOFF: That's correct.

GRAY: Okay, it's Craig, so I know it must be true.

DOWELL: Yes, I was going to say you have to ask the people who count heads, but yes. Alright, last agenda item. Oh, sorry.

WINDSOR: I'm going to have to apologize I have another pressing engagement but I'm sorry and I will catch up with you later.

DOWELL: I understand, I frankly didn't think we would last this long and we still have an agenda item to go. My apologies to everybody that we're actually using up all of our time, it hasn't happened in recent memory.

GRAY: That's what meetings are for.

DOWELL: What's that?

GRAY: That's what meetings are for.

AGENDA ITEM 4: REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL REFORM GROUP

DOWELL: That's true, even if they are three hour meetings. All right, for what energy you have left we now have before us a report from the UFC Reform Task Force, Herb would you like to say a few remarks in introduction?

TERRY: Sure I will. First of all like Barb's presentation this is a report rather than a request for any action at the moment. Last year, the UFC decided they would create a group to take a look at the UFC, and answer basically two questions. The first question was did we need the UFC anymore? And the second question was assuming that we needed it or something like it, how might the body be made more effective, more attractive to faculty to participate in, and whether changes were needed in the body given changes in the university and its structure and that sort of thing since the last time the UFC took any kind of a comprehensive look at itself? Three of us were appointed to this Reform Task Force, and most of you know the people on this group, but let me explain how we got there. Simon Atkinson was for two years the head of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, and for second of those years was the senior co-secretary of the UFC, last year. I was the president of the BFC for one year, and two years ago – two and a half years ago – was the senior co-secretary of the UFC. Both of us have long involvement in UFC and campus governance and so does Markus Pomper from IU East. And we were asked over the summer and this sort of thing to take a look at the questions that the UFC charged us with and to bring back by December recommendations for where we might go next. And circular U5-2011, which some of you may have – I apologize for not being able to get that out until today but it's only a starting point for discussion – is the result of our committee's deliberations. Working with Craig, we reviewed faculty governance at other Big Ten institutions, at selective other institutions that had some similarities with IU, and we applied the years of experience with the UFC that we had to the problems that were presented to us. Our

answer to the first question is that there still is a need for a system-wide faculty governance body, and the reasons for that are outlined in the paragraph on the bottom of the first page. But it is basically that we are one university with more than eight front doors, if you count the various campuses of the Medical School, but we are viewed by many of our constituencies as a single university. We have a single board of trustees. We have a single president. To some degree, forces such as the ones Barb was talking about run counter to some extent to the general de-centralization of this system. The issue that she presents is partly one of centralization and standardization across campuses. So although the UFC hasn't been optimally functional in recent years, we decided that we needed some body that could speak for all of the faculty at Indiana University and we do not recommend just giving up and abolishing the UFC. That gets us to the question of what to do about it, how to reform it. And we begin our discussions with a very open mind, anything was possible. We could have proposed very radical reforms, but the result of our deliberations was to propose less radical reforms, modest changes, in the UFC because we thought it could, with those modest changes, be a more effective body. And on the rest of the memo there are several points that we addressed and then the answers we came up with. One criticism of the UFC was that it was excessively large, and that maybe a much smaller body could be both representative and nimble. We ran various scenarios where the numbers of faculty who were required to earn representation in the body would be changed from the current approximately 200 faculty for each member in the body. None of those worked very well. As we did that, the regional campuses partly due to rounding, ended up with more representatives and both Bloomington and IUPUI ended up with less. And we had a general sense that this place has three major components of roughly equal importance. The two core campuses, IUPUI and Bloomington, and the regional campuses as a unit although they are very heterogeneous. So we in the end recommended no substantial change in the representation of faculty and the numbers of faculty in the UFC. We looked at student representation. They have student members, they're often not here, but they have six members in the current structure and decided that that seemed to be justifiable. But we did recommend that the student members should not all be undergraduates, the students largely get to the UFC through the All University Students Association and we would recommend that this body require the All University Students Association to select members including at least some graduate and professional students as well as undergraduate students, but we leave the specifics of how they do that to them. We did look at the number of ex officio administrative members. And we decided that we would recommend a reduction in that number. All of the chancellors are automatically members of the UFC so are some other vice presidents, so we are recommending that there be only five ex-officio members, voting members. One would be the university president, and the others would be the provost of the Bloomington campus, the chancellor of IUPUI and then two regional campuses' chancellors who would be chosen by the campus chancellors, be chosen by their peers. We would hope that that result in those two officers, those two regional chancellors, being expected by their colleagues to participate in the UFC's business. As it is, I think, we have one Chancellor today, and she can always volunteer every time she wishes to represent the regional campuses, but we

were proposing two campus chancellors from the regionals be ex officio members rather than all of them. We discussed what to do about NTT faculty and their representation on the faculty had proved to be a very difficult problem. So what we're recommending is that four non-tenure-track faculty, one from Bloomington, one from IUPUI, and two from the regional campuses, join the UFC membership, but for a trial period of three years. With a mandate that the Agenda Committee look at that in the second year and try and figure out if that's the right answer to the representation of NTT faculty or not. We don't have a quorum at the moment. This is a not uncommon problem for the UFC. The rules of Robert's Rules of Order is that we need a simple majority of voting members to conduct business. We propose not to change that. We couldn't come up with anything rational to change it. We would hope that we could, through the other changes we propose, get a quorum when we needed one. We did recommend a reduction in the scheduled frequency of UFC meetings to four per year, two in the fall, two in the spring. We recommend that the last meeting in the spring be one that would include all the members of the existing UFC plus any incoming new members. After two years of experimentation with this format, electronic meetings, which I guess I would add Simon was much in favor of when he was senior co-secretary of the UFC, we unanimously, all three of us, recommend that the four UFC meetings be physical, that they be held somewhere. And we recommend that they be held at IUPUI. The reason for recommending that they be held at IUPUI is geographic. We don't want to impose the burden on our colleagues from northern Indiana to drive all the way to Bloomington and back in a single day, and Indianapolis is marginally closer, an hour or so closer. We would hope that we could stimulate effective participation from all of IU's campuses if we more or less located the meetings of the UFC in the geographic center of the state. Our reason for recommending against continued electronic meetings is that while the meetings can work to conduct the Council's business, they mean that there's no sidebar conversation among faculty from different campuses. They can't talk about other issues for many from regional campuses and this sort of thing when the President presides the UFC meetings give them an opportunity both during the meeting and outside of the meeting for face time with the president and sometimes other officers who attend and we think we have lost that through the electronic meeting format. As far as leadership of the UFC, we continue to think that there should be kind of a shared responsibility for leadership that two co-secretaries, as they're currently called, is a good number. It does share the burden of leadership if you stagger the terms and make them two year terms then you have sort of one co-secretary studying the process and ready to take it over the next year so we recommended that that we continued. At Bloomington, we are about to, probably, adopt a system where the president of the Bloomington faculty and the Bloomington Faculty Council will be elected through an at-large election of the campus faculty. We talked about the prospect that all Indiana University faculty might vote for the head of the University Faculty Council and decided that it would probably not be a very informed vote. So we recommend that the co-chairs be selected by the Agenda Committee of the UFC. We do not endorse the current system, which is not actually what the constitution requires. The current system has been that the two secretaries, co-secretaries, are the head of the IFC and the head of

the BFC. That's really not what it's supposed to be and hasn't been for many years. Rather we would recommend that the co-chairs be selected by the Agenda Committee from any member of the UFC. If not already on the Agenda Committee the co-chairs would be automatically added to it and we recommend that one of the co-chairs always represent-come from–not represent, come from–one of the core campuses. It could be either IUB or IUPUI and that the other comes from one of the regional campuses. This represents the core, and it represents the regions, and frankly it avoids the conflict that sometimes arises or seems to arise when the head of faculty governance at IUPUI or the head of faculty governance at Bloomington is suddenly is expected to become the non-biased head of faculty governance throughout the whole system. So that is why we recommended that. We recommended a simplification of the standing committees of the campus – of the system to four, whose chairs would automatically be members of the Agenda Committee and one more committee which is entirely a UFC committee that would continue to exist but would where the chair would not automatically join the Agenda Committee. The four we recommend, which bear some relationship to the current committee structure, are: Finance & Facilities, Fringe Benefits & Compensation, Educational Policies & Student Affairs, and Research Affairs. We thought about issues that might come up. We thought about current ones and we thought, you know, if you think about current issues confronting the system, this would work. Clearly, we're worried about the General Assembly and appropriations. That would fall under Finance & Facilities. Clearly, there's a dispute now about Fringe Benefits in terms of healthcare and compensation in terms of possible salary freezes or lifting salary freezes or whatever. That fit under Fringe Benefits & Compensation. We've just had an example from Barb of something that would be suitable for Educational Policies & Student Affairs, and Research Affairs we've had recent examples largely in this campus and others focused on deficiencies in human subjects research that prove we need a university-wide system for dealing with research affairs issues. It would eliminate such things as Affirmative Action Committee and some other committees that we have. Those could be on an ad hoc basis addressed, we would think, in other ways by the Agenda Committee if it was creative. The idea was to get four committees, constitute them from the beginning of the academic year for the BFC, not create them just as we believe they were necessary but actually create them as standing committees and build a bridge between the Agenda Committee and the standing committees by making these four chairs automatic members of the Agenda Committee. There's a paragraph in here in which we say that we would want these committees to "establish effective collaboration with relevant University administrators," and to be proactive as well as reactive. Again, if you look at these, you can imagine that Finance & Facilities would have a good active relationship with Neil Theobald, the CFO. You'd imagine the Fringe Benefits & Compensation Committee would have an active relationship with him and with some people from Human Resources. Educational Policies and Student Affairs will, based on our presentation, probably be John's office and Research Affairs would be the Vice President for Research. And we would hope those would be proactive relationships that those committees would reach out to those university officers and get involved in university planning at that level; in that sense have business to do even if there was no

specific matter calling for the committees to adopt a resolution or to propose policy. The Agenda Committee, the main change that we propose there is that, as has been proposed and probably will be adopted at Bloomington, that the Agenda Committee have the authority to act on behalf of the entire University Faculty Council when required. The committee would get slightly larger through the addition of the chairs of the standing committees. We presume it would exercise that authority judiciously, but part of the criticism of the UFC has been that it can't respond too quickly in those instances where quick feedback from the faculty is required and so we're proposing to give the Agenda Committee the authority to act on behalf of the UFC on any matter subject to the UFC's authority. In order to do such a thing, the majority of Agenda Committee members would have to be present and any such action would require approval by a supermajority, two thirds of those members who were present. If the Agenda Committee chose to do this, it would be required to communicate what it had done promptly to all UFC members for a brief, we don't have a specific time to identify but it would have to be brief, remonstrance period and if after being notified of something the Agenda Committee had done, one fifth of UFC members objected to the Agenda Committee's action then the action would be tabled until the next regularly schedule UFC meeting or if required brought up at a specially called meeting of the UFC. We were asked to consider who should be the presiding officer and we decided we would like the University President to come to the meetings and be its presiding officer. And finally, we recognized that part of the UFC's problem, is true perhaps of faculty governance at many of our campuses, is communication with faculty and with the administration, so we recommend that the Agenda Committee and the co-secretaries or co-presidents or co-chairs establish a mechanism for providing succinct information about the actions and the deliberations of the UFC and faculty governance across the system to IU faculty which might take the form of some kind of a very brief electronic newsletter. But the idea, the more we thought about it was not only that it should report on what the UFC and its committees were doing, but that it should be a forum in which the faculty governance of one IU campus could share what it was doing and what it was thinking about with other IU campuses so that the newsletter would include some way or another information about what is happening in campus faculty governance as well as what is happen at the university level faculty governance. What I would propose is that – I think I can speak for Simon and for Markus – we're interested and willing to continue to refine these suggestions. What I think we could say is that it would be useful if this group today and certainly upon further reflection everybody through an email or elsewhere wants to send us comments they can send them through Craig we'll take them under advisement, and we'll come back very promptly. When's our next meeting?

DETHLOFF: January.

TERRY: Okay. We can come back in January with a perhaps a revised document including new suggestions if you have any. Dropping some of these if they prove to be unacceptable. Modifying them, but anxious to hear suggestions that people have. That's our report.

DOWELL: Thank you, Herb. Mary you want to kick us off?

GRAY: Sorry, I've been working on this for the Bloomington Campus for the Constitution and Rules Committee. So I just love this kind of conversation. [laughter] And I'll start with saying I appreciate a lot of the recommendations because they synch with what we've deliberated in our group in terms of what makes the most sense for a nimble structure that still keeps governance intact. So I just have a couple of clarifying questions. So would the standing committee chairs also be potentially co-chairs of the UFC and did you discuss overload or how to manage a workload?

TERRY: I think we discussed that. I think our sense was that it was likely that if one of the standing committee chairs was selected as the head of the UFC we'd find another head for the committee.

GRAY: Okay, but it wasn't something you thought needed to be included into the…

TERRY: It could be, and we can add it.

GRAY: Okay. Can I…?

DOWELL: Go ahead, yeah.

GRAY: …rattle 'em off. So why choose from the Agenda Committee versus the UFC at large for the co-chair – I like the co-chair language by the way – or did I misunderstand?

TERRY: No, I think you…

GRAY: Or – I'm sorry – why have the Agenda Committee…?

TERRY: A co-chair could be any member of the UFC. Why have the Agenda Committee do it?

DOWELL: Right, why have the Agenda Committee select the presidents or the co-chairs as such. Yeah.

GRAY: UFC selecting the co-chairs?

TERRY: That wasn't my idea, I'm not so sure I exactly remember how it came about. Craig do you?

DOWELL: Wasn't Craig's idea either. Okay!

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Sort of slipped it in there.

TERRY: We will review that and consider having it chosen with your recommendation by the UFC at large.

GRAY: I think by the UFC at large. I mean, I definitely see your point I wouldn't want to throw it out to the entire faculty because I don't know how they would….

DOWELL: Yeah.

GRAY: …deal with that but and I can send you other little suggestions that came out of our conversation.

TERRY: We can review that and I will get back to you with an answer as to where that came from.

GRAY: Did you have a sense of remonstrance for how long? If there's an executive decision that needs to be made?

TERRY: We certainly believed it should be brief. I think we had a sense, too, that the season mattered. That, you know, if this [laughter] group might actually have to act in the summer –

GRAY: Right.

TERRY: – but whether people, you know, would attend to that, I think that is an open issue for discussion, but the main thing I think we would say is it needs to be brief. Otherwise the Agenda Committee loses the ability to make any decisions quickly. And so, you know, I would throw out two weeks but, you know, that's off the top of my head.

DOWELL: Okay, should we move on to some other people for now?

GRAY: Sure.

DOWELL: How about Indianapolis first, then South Bend?

MANNHEIMER: Thank you, first of all…wonderful and gracious! Let's all come to Indianapolis and we have good restaurants. That's perfect, thank you. Perhaps I misunderstood but it dovetails on the last question about the remonstrance period. Do I misunderstand to say that the super Agenda Committee the Central Committee, whatever we might want to call it –

GRAY: Politburo!

MANNHEIMER: – will take action and then wait for two weeks or a week or ten days or thirty-seven hours for remonstrance? Or was it the intention that the Agenda Committee will recommend a possible action and not actually officially take that action until the remonstrance period is over? You know, let's say you've got five days to respond, please let us know. Here's what we recommend unless we hear otherwise that's how we're going to do it. That's one question. Second question is perhaps a little more farfetched non-technical. The fact that we have a Research Committee and Educational Policy Committee in your recommendation makes perfect sense of course, because we have this tripod of academic duties to teaching, research, and service, whether you call it service or civic engagement or what-have-you, tends to be a little more important at the regional campuses and traditionally has been a little more important as civic engagement at IUPUI. I wonder if there was ever any discussion about there ought to be some committee that somehow added its mission words like that. Those are my questions.

TERRY: Let me respond to the second one first. No, I don't think there was that kind of a discussion because I think we understood that we don't really have at the moment very system-wide policies about service or civic engagement as we do about research and teaching. And we recognize that that is an area where there are huge differences from campus to campus. The regionals, as Barb mentioned, were created with service to their region in mind in ways that Bloomington and to some extend IUPUI were not. But we can discuss it. We can talk about that. Our overall goal was to find ways to create the smaller number of committees so we wouldn't have to staff so many and ones to which you might assign multiple tasks. I would almost look at these things and ask if you would want to create and Educational Policies… I don't know, make sure that service goes to one of these four committees or look for changes. But we didn't want to just really recreate the committee structure that we have now and the large numbers of committees that we currently do. We wanted to keep it small. I will go back to Simon and Markus as they have the suggestion that we should consider how service fits into the four committees we propose and we'll see what they think. But the overall goal was to keep it small, keep the number of committees small.

MANNHEIMER: And the first question about the remonstrance period?

TERRY: Ah! I think we imagined that people depending on us would have to understand that this remonstrance period existed and that nothing would really become final until it had passed. But that there are occasions, I can imagine, where the university administration dealing with the General Assembly or something like that might wish from the BFC, or UFC, a firm action or decision. I guess what I would think about would be some of the things that came up with regard to budget last summer. Where they thought they needed a quick action. I suppose we would continue to remind them that anything the Agenda Committee has decided on its own is subject to this remonstrance and we've got to wait for it to run and you can't quite rely upon it. I would hope the Agenda Committee would know the difference between some item that might be

controversial out there among the general population and something that might be less controversial and would be careful about adopting something that it knew might immediately be subject to a forceful remonstrance. I don't know what other solution they've got. I'd like know actually what Mary's experience has been with that because her group has also discussed, I assume, this –

GRAY: Yeah for the CRC we had this discussion of how to create an Executive Committee that would be able to make decisions, particularly thinking about the summer because, strangely enough, things happen over the summer. We landed on giving the Executive Committee that we're imagining the power to make decisions separate from any sort of remonstrance period, except that the Executive Committee requires a simple majority that must include the president and president elect. So there's an expectation that there are bodies in the room that will be held accountable for decisions made on behalf of the faculty and then the faculty – any elected representative of the faculty – can bring the decision, where applicable, back to the Faculty Council and it can be overturned. The problem, of course, is that there can be decisions made that are not something that can be undone. And we decided there was value in giving some teeth to what sorts of decision making power we can nominally have [laughter] and that the pros outweighed the cons.

TERRY: Do any of the other campuses have a similar sort of mechanism for a forceful action by an Executive Committee and a remonstrance or anything like it?

DOWELL: Let's hold that question, maybe to the side, and at least follow up with a couple of the hands that here. Steven, in South Bend?

GERENCSER: Yes, thanks. Actually that was one of the things I was going to say is that we do have a process for the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to act in place of the Senate in a matter of emergency and generally what we have done is that – which happens very rarely so it's hard to say generally but we had to invoke it this past summer – is that the first full meeting of the Academic Senate that we bring that action to the full Senate in which it is then actually then approved again by the Senate as a full body. So there has been a process of being able to act in abeyance of the Senate's meeting during the summer and then we bring that action to the Senate. And it has worked well when we needed to do it this summer and we were reluctant to do it, because we prefer it, the Senate, but we recognized an emergency that needed to be dealt with when our PTR committee lost two members and no longer had the capacity to act when it needed to. So that's one thing I wanted to say. Secondly, I was going to say that even though it means lots of driving, I really do like the idea of meeting in person and I would suggest also the newer access is something to be done informally to encourage the sort of side meetings, the engagement with each other, the engagement with members of the administration; some sort of formal informality, whether it mean a lunch beforehand or a coffee time afterwards, some means for us to get to know each other and get to know administrators would be really welcome and that need not be

formally part of this but something the Agenda Committee could take up. And the third thing I would like to ask about is the choice to keep the president as the presiding officer. I just wanted to say that I guess at our Senate meetings at IUSB what has worked well is to have the president of the Academic Senate be the presiding officer, in this case the equivalent would be one of the co-chairs of the committee and then there would always be a standing place for the–in our case our Chancellor in this case the President – to give a significant report and to be available, but it seems to me those who are setting the agenda, who understand the issues before the UFC might be the best to lead the meetings and be the formal officers of the meetings of the UFC.

DOWELL: Laverne, I think you were the next hand and then Chuck.

NISHIHARA: First, at IU East we do not have an Executive Committee that makes emergency decisions. We've tended to go with online votes when necessary, and when emergencies have come up that has seemed to work all right in the early summer, let's say. I did have a question for the task force regarding the quorum and like, you know, my other representative from East we have no problem with traveling to IUPUI for UFC meetings and we see how that would be a good thing. I do have a question of whether it might hurt the quorum in the sense that the representatives from Bloomington might be less likely to make the drive and attend the meetings, and I don't know the answer. [laughter]

DOWELL: Actually, Laverne that was my question, too. It's that in some respects this report reflects a lot less change than I was sort of looking forward to talking about, and so, you know, what makes the task force think that we can get quorums and actually form four or five committees annually in the sense that we haven't been able to get quorums, and in some respects we haven't really tried to form committees when we don't have something that we know they absolutely have to work on in recent years? So are you optimists or do you have a secret plan for getting bodies in seats?

TERRY: Well, we did not give Richard Nixon the secret plan to end the war. I think we're optimists. I think also that we would hope that Bloomington might act in some extent out of fear. [laughter] And that Bloomington would conclude they have to go to these meetings, that it would do that. We're optimists, I think that's all you can say.

TARTELL: I think it's going to be difficult to give up a full teaching day to do that –

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: We're all optimists here as well!

TARTELL: – where now it's a half-teaching day.

DOWELL: Okay, hang on a second. Let's see. It's okay. Chuck first and then Joe–Joey? Joe, sorry, and then Jennifer. Chuck?

GALLMEIER: I just wanted to say that we also have an Executive Committee that is authorized as a representative body to take emergency meetings if we need to. We don't do it very often and then we also bring that to the full body but we do have an Executive Committee. I also wanted to second my colleague at South Bend – I like, as said earlier – the Agenda Committee, but physical presentations are much better and aligned with that idea and I think they are much better and it would also be nice to have some informal aspect maybe even including some wine from time to time. [laughter]

DOWELL: All right, and Joe you want to make your official…?

TARTELL: Sure. I mean, I can appreciate it, I think it's a great idea to have the physical contact but if you can't get people to walk over here on your own campus, I don't see how you are going to get them to leave their campus. And it's very difficult from a scheduling standpoint, you know, for those of us who have large contact hours to give up essentially half a teaching day that would then be giving up a full teaching day to make that meeting. I think it's less likely that you're going to get people there.

TERRY: Well, we don't have large contact hours –

TARTELL: I do.

TERRY: – compared to what the regional campuses have and some of the faculty at IUPUI.

DOWELL: That depends on the school.

TARTELL: I think I do.

TERRY: Yeah. We are asking people to do it less frequently, four times a year instead of eight or whatever the current schedule is. We would hope to have two – let me go one step further. I think we were thinking it didn't turn out in this report about some of the things that had been proposed in terms of using these meetings for non-structured interaction between faculty from different campuses and with the administration. It would be highly structured but one of the things I threw out at one of these meetings was that we should do this when there isn't major business for the UFC to do, as an opportunity for the President to have a kind of a parliamentary question period and address faculty and it would be up to the Agenda Committee to make sure that there are questions to ask, but we might do something like that. You've got to make it seem relevant to people. And then there's buried at the end of the report there's one other thing that we've proposed which is that the UFC at some point considered a resolution indicating that effective – "significant effective service and faculty governance should be considered possibly a faculty merit evaluation, tenure, and promotion." One reason people don't go is because they think it doesn't count.

DOWELL: Okay, can we go to some more questions? Jennifer, from Indianapolis?

HEHMAN: I was looking at 'G' and I also noticed in the report there's no mention of the Academic Handbook and how that plays out because UFC is responsible for that. And we need to have some kind of, obviously, Communications Committee perhaps to be a standing committee to manage both the engagement and communicating any issues amongst all faculty and all the UFC representatives, and being managers of the newsletter but almost maintaining things like information about how to go through grievance procedures, and boards of review. I've had experience working with that. We have somebody on board, a faculty member not just some hired staff, to make sure we have information out that's weighted as needed, to have your standing issues, to know who the administrators are, who you should communicate with and to manage the network of communications, that's my two cents.

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: Thanks, Jennifer. Elizabeth here in Bloomington and then Kokomo, right?

BOLING: I'm not sure how realistic it is but if these four meetings a year were partially taken up with committee meetings that might be a way to make the committee service a little less onerous and hold the possibility of people actually serving.

DOWELL: And is Kokomo? You had your hand up, is that right? Am I getting the right campus? You, yes? [laughter]

FRENCH: Southeast.

DOWELL: Southeast! Not everybody has their names behind them and if I had known… I'm sorry if I've met you and I'm screwing up and forgetting, but anyway, I'm sorry.

FRENCH: One of the concerns I had is that if we want to more [unintelligible] work I would be concerned about not disseminating the information electronically and having that available too, at least if somebody were unable to make a meeting, particularly if you're going to have four meetings you're going to have a lot more stuff going on in each meeting. If for some unfortunate reason a representative or someone on campus was unable to attend they would miss an awful lot of the stuff and they might be able to come in, work electronically, whereas I might have difficulty making a two and half hour trip up to Bloomington, or up to Indianapolis, and coming back. So I would be concerned that it might limit the communication if you don't at least offer electronic in some way. Also, consistent with that sense we're going to have quite a bit going on at each meeting. I would increase the likelihood if you have a limited number of meetings that more people would tend to show up and if it that's the case I'm not sure if having – just like I don't know if I would want someone to necessarily represent me from another campus I would be interested in thinking about, with the Chancellors or some other

representative, whether two regional Chancellors would necessarily understand all of the needs, or be able to respond to any questions that would come up and the dialogue that we were having to the UFC group…

TERRY: The one comment I would make on that is that we're not proposing to change the representation of faculty from the regional campuses. We simply propose to change the representation of ex officio administrative members.

FRENCH: I understand.

TERRY: We can see what they think of that, actually.

FRENCH: We have a lot more limited opportunities to get together in other words it's going to be much more difficult to say, 'Well, let's just see what somebody has to say' and if we just did this with respect to the [unintelligible] deadline because we had time. Well, with four meeting we are not going to have time, we'll have time, but we are not going to have opportunities to get together. If something comes up, if there is a specific question from any campus that the individually faculty rep did not know, it might be very helpful, it probably would be very helpful to have an administrative body from that campus to respond to the questions. Those are just a few things that I had in mind.

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: I think that's a big – I don't know, in any discussion like this, you're faced with trying to reconcile our ideals about representation with the reality of who comes to meetings, which typically recently we have not had many Chancellors attend. Sandra is a notable exception, although she's not there now. But I'm not sure where I was going with that, except that's my major, you know, issue with whatever changes we make is what – I think this term came up at our discussion at the Bloomington Faculty Council – are we just re-arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic? Should we just not do anything? We're meeting approximately four times a year now. In fact this is our first meeting of the year, right? I'm not forgetting one. And we'll probably be lucky to have two next semester although maybe we have more scheduled, but I think we just have two next semester. And so at any rate, I'll be coming back with more specific comments, certainly, and I'd encourage everybody else to, and also I think it would be interesting in this report to actually know what would actually require a constitution or bylaws change and what is really just a practice change. As I think the electronic meetings vs. in-person meetings – we've gone back and forth a little bit – I don't think that's legislated anywhere else in our policies about how we meet so that's certainly subject to continual massaging. You know, maybe half and half would be a compromise, you know, to have a couple in-person meetings and try to include food and drink in some way. At any rate I think it would be interesting in the report to know what actually has implications for our actual guiding documents and what is sort of a suggested practice that we should adopt, outside of those documents.

TERRY: We can do that, we didn't want to go there until we had a sense of how these would fly with the members.

DOWELL: I understand. All right: other comments, for now? Indianapolis, yes?

MANNHEIMER: Just a brief comment, again it's the devil's in the details, if you are concerned about getting people to come up from Bloomington, get a van, or get a bus. Let people have that glass of wine at 4:30 and not worry about driving back.

HEHMAN: They could stop at Oliver's on the way.

MANNHEIMER: I was actually on this, I guess, body, many, many years ago and we had one meeting that I'm guessing – I'm not remembering correctly – up north someplace and the university sent to plane from Bloomington to Indianapolis and we got on the plane and we flew up to South Bend or wherever the heck it was.

GRAY: Do we still have…?

TERRY: No, we no longer have the plane.

DOWELL: I flew to a meeting too, years ago.

TERRY: Years ago. No, we no longer have the plane.

DOWELL: All right, other comments? Or should we wrap up there and encourage everyone to send comments to Craig? Yes? Anything else? Thank you everybody for sticking it out. Goodbye.