

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
December 7th, 2021
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Karen Banks, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, John Carini, Rachael Cohen, Allen Davis, Madeline Dederichs, Anna Deeds, Constantine Deliyannis, Danielle DeSawal, Kaitlin Doucette, J Duncan, Kelly Eskew, Jackie Fleming, Ky Freeman, Anthony Giordano, Jason Gold, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Israel Herrera, Colin Johnson, Ben Kravitz, Robert Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Sally Letsinger, Scott Libson, Margaret Lion, Annette Loring, Theodore Miller, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Massimo Ossi, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Rob Potter, Cathrine Reck, Dan Sacks, Steve Sanders, Elizabeth Shea, Jim Sherman, Marietta Simpson, Kashika Singh, Rebecca Spang, Dubravka Svetina, Lisa Thomassen, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Stephen Wyrzynski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Jim Ansaldo, John Applegate, Toni Arcuri, Hussein Banai, David Daleke, Lessie Frazier, Brian Gill, Nandini Gupta, Justin Hodgson, Pete Kolbaum, Nancy Lipschultz, Valentina Luketa, Pedro Machado, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Courtney Olcott, Katie Shy, Thomas Sterling, Erik Willis, Jeffrey Zaleski

Guests: John Arthos, Clark Barwick, Douglas Knapp (alternate), Steven Kreft (alternate), Michael Lundell

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the [minutes of November 16, 2021](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for David Charles McCarty](#)**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Marietta Simpson, Faculty President
4. **Question/Comment Period** (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to President Simpson by emailing bffcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
5. **General Education Report** (30 minutes)
Kurt Zorn, Acting Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
[Discussion item]
6. **Update from the Task Force on the Future of General Education in the Third Century of the Bloomington Campus** (15 minutes)

John Arthos, Task force co-chair
Clark Barwick, Task force co-chair
J Duncan, Task force co-chair
[Discussion item]

- 7. Proposal to add sustainability literacy as a shared goal in the IUB General Education** (45 minutes)
Kelly Eskew, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[First reading – discussion item]

[Current BL-ACA-H9, Indiana University Bloomington General Education](#)
[B14-2022 Proposed revisions to BL-ACA-H9, Indiana University Bloomington General Education](#)
[B15-2022 Proposal to Establish a Sustainability Shared Goal](#)

TRANSCRIPT:

SIMPSON: Good afternoon, everyone.

Welcome to our final meeting of 2021, who can believe that?

I certainly can't. But it's good to see you all here.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 2021

We will start our normal way with the first agenda item of the day, which is the approval of the minutes from our November 16th meeting. Do we have a motion for the approval of the minutes?

Yes, Colin. do we have a second?

Thank you, Lucia.

Any discussion?

Seeing none. All who approve say aye.

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye.

SIMPSON: Anyone opposed?

Thank you. The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DAVID CHARLES MCCARTY

SIMPSON: Moving on to our second item, the memorial resolution for David Charles McCarthy. Eliza?

PAVALKO: Thank you, President Simpson.

Professor David Charles McCarty was born in Chicago, Illinois to Charles Albert and Mary Loretta McCarty. He received his B.S. and M.S. in Mathematics from Iowa State University in 1975 and 1978 respectively, an M.A. in Philosophy from the University of Minnesota in 1981, and the DPhil from Oxford University in 1984, where he studied with Dana Scott. He began his career as an Assistant Professor at Ohio State in 1983. He was a Joint University Lecturer at Edinburgh University from 1984 to 1987, and an Assistant Professor at Florida State from 1987 to 1990. He joined Indiana University in 1991, first on a visiting appointment and then as Associate Professor in 1995. He was promoted to Full Professor in 2003. He was a member of the Cognitive Science program and an adjunct professor in Computer Science and in History and Philosophy of Science. He was the director of the IU Logic Program from 1996 to 2002 and the director of the Cognitive Science Logic Certificate Program from 1996 to 2008. Professor McCarty held visiting appointments at Konstanz, as a DAAD Research Fellow, 1998-99, and at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, as a Senior Research Fellow at the Sidney M. Edelstein Center for the History and Philosophy of Science, Technology, and Medicine, 2019-20. He was a Fellow at the Copernicus Center in Cracow, 2015, and President of the Indiana Philosophical Association 2012-13.

Professor McCarty's primary fields of research were foundations of logic and mathematics, early analytic philosophy, and the history of mathematics and logic in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. He published over 120 peer-reviewed papers. He wrote on intuitionism, the completeness problem for intuitionistic logic, Markov's Principle, constructive validity, realizability and recursive mathematics, potentially infinite sets, denotational semantics, Church's Thesis, logical truth, the meanings of the connectives, limits of mathematical explanation, mathematical realism, structuralism, antirealism, the philosophy of logical atomism, as well as Hilbert and du Bois-Reymond, Carnap, Brouwer, Helmholtz, Frege, Wittgenstein, Dedekind, Gödel, Anselm's ontological argument, Goethe, historical fiction, the pathetic fallacy, and other topics. His book, *To an Infinite Power: Mathematical and Philosophical Writings of Paul du Bois-Reymond*, in press at the time of his death, was published posthumously by Oxford University Press in 2021.

Professor McCarty had several main lines of work in logic. He was one of the world's leading experts on constructive mathematics and intuitionistic logic, and all matters related to their history and philosophy. He proved a number of results on these topics that are of permanent importance both to people in that field and to outsiders. For example, he answered the question of whether one can prove the completeness of intuitionistic logic inside of intuitionistic logic the way one can for classical logic; he showed that this cannot be done. But his work in logic should not be reduced to a list of technical results. Rather, it was a decades-long deep involvement on topics coming from the area of constructive mathematics. While he did do technical work—lots of it—he always did so as part of philosophical or foundational explorations or arguments.

The topics of constructive mathematics and intuitionistic logic have always had a special and noteworthy relationship to more mainstream views in logic and philosophy of mathematics. Indeed, during the time that McCarty started to work on these topics, they were very much a minority pursuit: a small number of people did study constructive mathematics, but many of

these people were doing so in order to provide an outsider's understanding, a translation of constructive mathematics into something other than what was originally intended. Professor McCarty's work challenged this move. It is also fair to say that he didn't just study constructive mathematics, he advocated it. It should be noted that he was far ahead of his time in this: these days, computer scientists who think about philosophical matters typically are advocates of constructive mathematics. So, his contributions as a philosopher of mathematics and of logic will be increasingly more important in the future.

It is sometimes said that the highest form of teaching is iconoclasm. In this, Professor McCarty would be one of our greatest teachers in the philosophy of mathematics. He pioneered the reconsideration of the continuum. Mainstream mathematicians "know all about" the real numbers, since the foundations of the real number system were laid by people in the 1800's. Professor McCarty demonstrated that the question of how to think about fundamental objects like the set of real numbers was not settled in a straightforward manner. Indeed, he and his PhD student Lisa Keele (Lee Buckley) brought back from obscurity the views of Paul du Bois-Reymond and others. Even more striking was his reconsideration of the notion of finiteness in mathematics. In a move that he was uniquely qualified to make, he reformulated finiteness from a constructive point of view, obtaining results that were sometimes incompatible with classical mathematics.

Professor McCarty was a legendary if intimidating teacher. He had exacting standards and expected a lot of his students, but he was extraordinarily clear, and an inspirational teacher and entertaining lecturer, known for being very supportive of students and generous with his time. He taught a wide range of subjects, from mathematical logic, intuitionistic logic, computability, category theory, set theory, and the foundations and philosophy of mathematics to cognitive science, philosophy of language, the later Heidegger, Existentialism and Phenomenology, 19th century German philosophy, ancient philosophy, metaethics, political philosophy, aesthetics, and film and philosophy, among others. In remembrance of Professor McCarty, a former student, Joshua Alexander, wrote, "He was tough as nails but cared so much about our academic success. He would host these amazing weekly work groups with his logic students, which always ran into the night, and then we'd go out afterwards for drinks at Bears Place, where we'd talk about logic and the profession, but also about music, which he loved almost as much as he loved logic and teaching. He invited us to participate in academic life from day one, but also demanded that we live up to what that invitation meant and that we take seriously what academic life was all about." Professor McCarty was also notably successful as a dissertation supervisor, providing both encouragement and rigorous feedback, and seeing many students across the finish line. He was exceptionally proud of the accomplishments of his PhD students.

Professor McCarty curated a vast library that he used for his research projects, which included the first logic book he bought in high school. He was an avid reader, loved traveling, exploring museums, eating exotic foods, teaching, mentoring students, taking walks in the woods with his grandson, music—especially Erich Wolfgang Kornold—and opera.

Professor McCarty's illustrious career as a logician and philosopher of mathematics is a message that foundational matters are calls to action, that simple-minded slogans that 'everyone knows' are always worth examining, and that a life of passionate engagement with issues at the heart of mathematics and logic is a life very much worth living.

Thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you. For all of us who are able let us please stand in memory of Professor McCarthy.

Thank you. You may be seated.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SIMPSON: Today I'm honored to preside over this meeting in the absence of our Interim Provost. I'd like to use the executive report time to speak about our colleagues here on the Bloomington campus. But first, allow me to revisit something I asked of us from the very beginning of the semester when I asked us to remember that we were not each other's enemies and that we could disagree and still preserve our humanity. This semester has tested all of us. I have no doubt that the rest of the year will continue to do the same. But please hang in there. You are an amazing group of people who believe strongly in your points of view and that is indeed one of the many strengths of this body. Common goals, not necessarily the same approach to getting there. You care and I thank you for hanging in there during the difficult times and make no mistake these are difficult times. But also, these are times that are filled with possibilities for positive change too.

One of the difficult issues that we face right now are the mental health and well-being of our students. In response to the repeated concerns expressed by our faculty, the BFC will devote the first meeting in February to a discussion of these important issues. But also, our faculty and staff are under extreme stress. This issue will continue to be in parallel discussion with the Executive Committee. We will provide updates as we determine how we can provide greater awareness of resources presently available to our faculty and what other ways we can think to support each other during this time. We had discussions with one of the candidates and I have to say it was highlighted to me, it was something that Mem brought up about the care caucus. Sometimes I think we all need to be aware that everybody is facing something during this time. Our caregivers that are caring for young children and some caregivers who are carrying for adult parents, people who have been diagnosed with illnesses during this time, there's been a lot of stress on people. We're all in classrooms and working and all of that. It's a lot. We need to continue thinking about ways that we can support each other, things that are available on the campus to support each other and how we can talk about the resources that are here and maybe some that aren't here that need to be here to support more of the faculty on this campus.

I'd like to say congratulations to the 20 teaching professors. Among them, many former or current members of the BFC or standing committees. In the words of Interim Provost Applegate, these outstanding instructors bring excitement and innovation to the campus and daily advance IU Bloomington's core educational mission. These are the leaders in their fields and their lifelong

and dedication to teaching and learning is exemplary, shaping generations of students, and ensuring IU Bloomington's commitment to academic excellence. In our room today are two of them, Lisa Thomassen, and Israel Herrera. Congratulations to both of you. Could not be more proud of you in this amazing achievement.

The last thing I'd like to share in the executive report is that over the last week and this week, the campus will welcome five candidates to the campus for the provost position. If you have not been able to attend any of the sessions, please do, so that you can offer your feedback on the candidates. John Applegate is with us today. There's a public session I believe at five that you can join either on Zoom or in the live space. The BFC has been invited to meet with all of the candidates. Please if you can, try to attend one of those sessions, either the public session or the session with the BFC where you can post questions to the candidates. We really do want to hear your feedback about the candidate. That is the last part of the executive report. Thank you, everyone.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

SIMPSON: Our next part of this agenda as I flip back and forth, is the question and comment period. There were questions that were submitted ahead of time. One question that came in was about the attendance policy and how difficult things have been during this first semester with us not being able to require notes from the health clinic and having an attendance grade basically and how difficult that has been for instructors. And so, in planning for the spring semester, the question was, what would the course guidelines be if the situation continues in the spring? I wanted to make everyone aware that guidance would be coming soon from Eliza's office for next semester. And also, Eliza's office recently issued some guidance for the end of the semester, which talked about, and I clicked on one of the links in there, that talked about perhaps us thinking more about student engagement as opposed to student attendance. So, I'm not sure if you saw that email, but there was actually some really helpful things in there. Eliza, would you like to speak to that?

PAVALKO: Yeah, I'd be glad to. You can also find all these on the front page of our website. And the issue of student engagement as opposed to attendance, also CITL has some really good recommendations on that, and we link to that there. So, you can find that, and we'll be incorporating that into that start of semester memo which I hope to get out to you all next week because I know everybody's starting to think about next semester, so we will work to get that out to you very quickly and incorporate as much of that in as we can.

SIMPSON: Thank you. There was another question about benefits that came in and payroll and I forwarded that question to the Benefits Committee. Jim Sherman has the questions and some answers to those questions, Jim.

SHERMAN: Yeah. Thank you, Marietta. These are questions that come in pretty regularly every few years. The first one was how come we don't get our December paycheck in December, and it's delayed until January? Why don't we just do it at the end of every month? Well, there are good reasons. It was instituted in 1981 to take advantage of tax law changes at that time. So, it went into effect. Well, why do we still have it? We've thought about getting it not me and not the

Benefits Committee, but people in the CFO office. And the big problem with changing it is that the year that you change it, you would get 13 paychecks and that would put some people in an upper tax bracket and make them ineligible for certain government payouts, you would get an increase in your salary with no raise. So, it would adversely affect some people if that were done. I've never understood the problem. Right now, you get 12 paychecks a year, you just get two in January and none in December and your December it is delayed by a week. So, it doesn't seem like it's that big a deal and I think that's why they haven't changed that policy.

So, the second question had to do with and this one does come up very frequently. I'm on a 10-month appointment and so I get 10 paychecks and then I have to go two months without a paycheck, can't they spread it out over 12 months? Seems reasonable. Not as easy to do as you might think. There are some system limitations in spreading out salaries across months that you don't work and that's not something the benefits committee deals with it's something that has to do with payroll and the CFO office, so you can take it up with them. But there's another reason that's important for faculty. Sometimes faculty they say, "Yeah, I'd like to get 12 months' salary," and they sign up for it. And then they discover they got a grant that will pay some of their sum or salary and all of a sudden, they don't want the summer pay to come from IU. And with grants, you don't always know ahead of time whether you're going to get them. How much it will be? Whether you can get summer salary from it? So that too can adverse the effect some people. They've thought about doing it and other universities do it and the decision, again, it's from payroll and the CFO office decided that the cost of changing would be greater than the benefits that we would get.

The third question had to do with one that I know. Jason Gold on this committee came to me a year or two ago and said, "Wow, the benefits premiums have really jumped up. I just got my August paycheck, and they took out triple the amount." And I explained that. "Well, that's because Jason, you haven't been paying for the two months in the summer." So, it hasn't gone up any, but they're just recouping what they deserve to get. And I think I'm going to suggest to HR that we do a better job of communicating that to our 10-month employees because it can be a hardship to people who all of a sudden have triple their health premiums taken out of their paycheck. There really is no way to get it paid with a little bit more every month. It would again be a logistic nightmare. So, all of these things have a rationale, they're not decided on some random basis and if someone who's smarter than the people who now deal with it can make a suggestion, we'd be happy to take it up at the Benefits Committee.

While I have your attention and speaking of the Benefits Committee, I want to tell all of you that next semester just as this one, we will continue to have a Road to Retirement series for people within 7-8 years of retirement and focus on the different sessions' issues like social security, Medicare, what to do with your HSA? What to do with your retirement accounts? What is the psychology of retirement? So those will be repeated. In addition, HR is starting a new series for people of all ages, with probably a special focus on younger people to communicate things like take advantage of your HSA, you may want to know about the Roth contribution option for your voluntary accounts. You want to know more about your voluntary accounts. What are your investment options and what should you be thinking about? So, there will be a whole series of

sessions and they are well-worth it. And you can take advantage of it, but please communicate it also to your colleagues, they're well-worth sessions. So, thank you for letting me explain and to plug what HR is doing.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Jim. Yes?

SPANG: Just want to say thanks to Jim, I knew that I was going to be getting a new insurance card, so when something was in my mailbox yesterday labeled do not throw away, I actually did not throw it away, whereas my immediate instinct was, yeah, that goes in the recycling. So, if you've got something that says do not throw away, it means it.

SIMPSON: All right. Are there any other questions or concerns? Yes?

GUERRA-REYES: I have a question, not for Jim, for the general BFC. This is me as a relatively new person to faculty governance. The School of Public Health Dean has requested semestral meetings with the BFC representatives and has said that this is something that other schools do. And I just wanted to know if this is a common practice for other schools and other BFC members?

SIMPSON: Can you repeat that again, Lucia?

GUERRA-REYES: So, the dean of our school has requested meetings with the BFC members of our school, and we have been told that that is a normal thing that happens across the university, and I don't really know if that is something that other schools are doing or not? I'm just question because I don't know.

COHEN: Yeah. I can say it in the libraries we meet as a council with BFC rep monthly. So yeah.

SIMPSON: J?

DUNCAN: In the Luddy School, we probably meet twice a semester with our dean, but yes, we have those meetings.

SIMPSON: Margaret. It looks like your hands poised.

LION: I just actually I wanted to ask questions then because I'm public health and we're new to this. What do you discuss during these meetings? What has been the focus for it? So we can also help our school.

SIMPSON: Go ahead.

COHEN: Libraries always gets an update of what is happening here as well as any other issues happening internally. It's a mix of both internal and external. It's our faculty. We have our own council as well. It's a mix of both, the meeting. We have, for example, Chuck is our unit rep, he would bring an update of what is happening here and then anything else we have governance wise.

SIMPSON: J?

DUNCAN: Basic information sharing we highlight what's going on in the BFC and that gives the dean an opportunity to know if there's anything he needs to talk to the chairs of the departments about to push for faculty to do something or be aware of something.

SIMPSON: Just by a show of hands, are there any other representatives here meeting with the councils in their units? Great. Can I make a suggestion that if you aren't, that you do make it your business to go back and meet with the councils in your unit? It used to be the practice in our unit that one of our representatives was always a member of our School of Music council. So that happened routinely in our meetings. So, we just have to ensure this year that we continue that practice. But I just want to say that we are supposed to be a representative body, so part of what our responsibility as representatives actually is, is to make sure that what we do in here, gets back to our units so that when we come in here to voice opinions, we are voicing the opinions and we've seen Con do this when he comes in and gives the reports from what his colleagues are saying and we've seen other people, other representatives in here do this, that we're making sure that it's not just our opinions that we're voicing that we've actually heard from the people that we represent. So, let's make sure that we do that, so that we are not only getting our constituents viewpoints, but even the administrators within our units. So that would mean that we have to meet with our council and our representative bodies within our units. Lucia, you were going to say something.

GUERRA-REYES: It's just a clarification. We do meet with the council for the School of Public Health. This is an added meeting only with the dean.

SIMPSON: Yeah. That makes sense.

GUERRA-REYES: I was just trying to get the lay of the land.

SIMPSON: Got you.

GUERRA-REYES: Thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you. Margaret?

LION: No, I was with Lucia on this. Thank you.

SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other comments? Yes, Israel.

HERRERA: Yes, just also kind of clarification Marietta for our campus regarding what we discussed in UFC last November 30th about the Faculty Board of Review. You asked Alex some questions about if we should bring this to the campuses. But it wasn't clear to me if as a representative, I can also share and get the feedback or how are we going to work the proposals in our campus. The procedures or getting the feedback from different constituents.

SIMPSON: I don't know that we clearly even defined how we're going to do that to tell you the truth, Israel. I'll have to get back to you on that. But it's definitely something that we want, to get those documents to everyone. So, let me clearly define that and then get back to you on that, okay?

SANDERS: Marietta, may I speak to that?

SIMPSON: Oh Steve. Steve's right here. He could probably answer that.

SANDERS: Not to preempt anything Marietta said and it's not a conversation I've had yet with the Executive Committee yet. I co-chair the Faculty Affairs Committee and so in concert with my co-chair and actually in great part due to Eliza's urging as well. Starting in January, the Faculty Affairs Committee will be digging into the document that Alex shared and we're going to prioritize that. We've pretty much wrapped up our major fall project which was a review with a misconduct policy, and we'll be bringing that at the appropriate time in the spring when there's time on the schedule, but our next priority is to turn our attention to all of those proposals related to the Faculty Board of Review Policy.

SIMPSON: Thank you. Thank you, Steve. Great, if there are no other comments or questions. Yeah, Karen?

BANKS: I hear you talking about the board of review. I have a question about the grievance process. So, the president has committed resources for bringing in a diverse faculty and schools and departments are implementing DEI initiatives, but for DEI to work, it has to be a complete process. So, I have a question about the grievance process. Is there any evidence that the current grievance process is working or is there any evidence that it's not working? I'd expect with a university this large, there would be a lot of problems going through the mediation committee, there are not. Right, so why? I know that there's problems, why are faculty not bringing those problems to the Mediation Committee. So, what's wrong? Do faculty know about this process? Do faculty not know about this process? Is there a problem with the name grievance when faculty are looking for justice? So many of you shop online, so if you go onto an online shopping site and you find that links are broken, what do you think about that company? If you go to the website for the grievance website, there's a lot of broken links. So, I would like to see some investigation about this grievance process. This is very important that our faculty feel like they have a process where they can get justice.

SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Karen. I will take that back. Thank you. Are there any other comments?

Thank you everyone.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT

SIMPSON: We will move on to our next agenda item which is the general education report and for that we have Kurt Zorn, our acting provost for Undergraduate Education, Kurt?

ZORN: Thanks President Simpson. First before I start, I want to acknowledge the person to my left, in case you don't know him Michael Lundell, who is our Senior Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. The reason he's here is because he is arguably one of the most knowledgeable people about general education on the Bloomington campus and I would not feel comfortable being here without him sitting next to me very honestly.

So, this gives you an idea of what we're hoping to do in the next few minutes. So, you can see a list of the activities for 2021. Recently, just last week, Interim Provost Applegate approved

membership for this coming years General Education Committee. New general education course proposals are due this week. And the review of these proposals will be completed by the end of January. And then the annual GenEd Committee meeting will be held mid-February. And you can see from here the membership, 69 voting members and so forth, the number of proposals, not all were approved last year, and this will be replicated again this coming year, this process.

This gives you an idea of who chairs our common ground subcommittees. And I want to note that these individuals did this last year as indicated on the slide and all have agreed to serve in the same capacity again this current year. So, I want to thank them for the work they do.

In addition to reviewing and approving new course proposals, another task of the committee is maintaining the list of GenEd courses. And each year the approved courses are added to the list. And courses that don't meet the eligibility requirements, as shown in the bold on this slide, are removed from the list. And to help with this, we have something that we've developed recently, the course offering tool. And this is intended to assist the departments in scheduling courses and maintaining course eligibility. And this just gives you a quick view of what this tool looks like. Like I said, this tool has been available for a number of years through the GenEd website. And just in case you're concerned, this component is CASS protected. So, somebody from the outside cannot get to this unless they have authorization through CASS.

So, the BFC in April 2019 required an annual shared goals report. And as a result, we created a shared goals subcommittee. And as you can see, Vivian Halloran chaired it last year, which was the first year for the subcommittee and will chair it again for this current year. So, the subcommittee met for the first time in fall 2020. And what it does is it reviews the annual shared goals reports from the college and the schools that basically address how their students are meeting the shared goals and how the units are assessing the shared goals. And this subcommittee then, from that information, provides a summary report. And in the fall of 2020, the subcommittee looked at all the shared goals, but focused specifically on Diversity in the United States shared goal. And this slide basically summarizes that information. And as you can see from the bullet points, there are really two approaches that the college and the schools are using. Either a one course diversity requirement, which is what the College of Arts and Sciences and the Luddy school are using, or a coverage of the shared goals through topics across the curriculum in Nursing, Kelley, O'Neill, School of Education, Public Health, and the School of Social Work take that tact. And as you can see, the subcommittee then said, "Let's see if there are some advantages and disadvantages to both approaches." And as you can see, in one course the US still has requirement, signals the importance of the topic but it may mislead the students to think that diversity is not necessarily integral to the overall education within that school or academic unit. Conversely, the coverage across the curriculum basically helps demonstrate the connection of diversity and inclusion across a number of topics. But it may not allow the student to see how they all come together. So, the committee has a few recommendations, basically, as you can see, I'll let you read that. The shared goals subcommittee is busy at work this fall and is reviewing the shared goals reports from the colleges and the schools and will provide a report to the General Education Committee in the new year.

So, another question is, what is the participation in the assessment of GenEd? Assessment is an important part of the process. And I want to make it clear that assessment is done at the course and department level. The GenEd Committee is responsible for monitoring the assessment of the curriculum, but not necessarily the assessment itself. That is up to the departments and the instructors in the various courses. So, the committee does not evaluate the assessment so to speak. It monitors and lets units know how they're doing in fulfilling their requirement to do assessment. So, slide 11, hopefully you can read this gives, you the participation rates with regard to assessment over a period of time from fall 2015 through spring 2021. There is something called the learning outcomes repository, which was built by our office to facilitate the submission of assessment data. And this is where these data about assessment participation rates come from. And before 2017, you can see that we were doing quite well with regard to participation rates. And that was the lead up to the campus accreditation in 2017. And after accreditation happened and we did get accredited, there was a bit of a slump in the participation rate, perhaps this is because of some fatigue and a sense that assessment wasn't critical and can move back a little bit in the priority list. I'm just trying to give some speculation of why that happened. And then you'll see that the numbers began to tick up in spring of 2019, fall of 2019. And the strange thing happened in spring of 2020 and participation rates fell and the BFC suspended the assessment requirement for a short period of time. And now you can see that in the spring of 2021 were on the right trajectory. Let's hope we can continue.

The learning outcomes repository contains additional useful data. Instructors are asked to address all GenEd learning outcomes that they address in their class and assessment data that they collect for these learning outcomes. And these data are used to assess the coverage of learning outcomes and student success as reported by the instructors. So, the next two slides, this one and that one show across a common ground, basically some observations on the learning outcome, coverage, and student's success rates. For example, English Composition. Nearly every English Composition class reports coverage and assessment of every EC learning outcome. And between 90-93% of the students assessed were reported as meeting or exceeding expectations. So that's good to know. You might then look at Mathematical Modeling. What jumped out to both Michael and me is fewer than half of the MM classes report addressing Math Modeling learning outcome number three, and none report assessing mathematical modeling learning outcome number three. So that's interesting and important information. It basically leads to the question, why? Why is this happening? So, the logical question that we ask is why? It may be that the learning outcome definition is not on target and needs to be revisited. The important thing is this question will be raised with the Math Modeling subcommittee this year asking them why they think there has been difficulty in assessing these learning outcomes. So, these data can be used as a feedback to improve hopefully.

One of the functions of this annual report to the BFC is to inform this body of the Indiana Higher Education Commission initiatives, the effect of the GenEd curriculum on the Bloomington campus. So, when GenEd began at IUB, there was very little constraint placed on it by the Higher Education Commission. This has changed over the years. The Higher Education Commission has gotten very interested in general education across institutions in the state of Indiana.

The latest constraint is the Indiana College Core and what this slide does is it gives you the history of where we started. So, we started with the creation of a statewide Transfer General Education Core. And the goal was to increase college affordability, making transfer from one institution to the other public institution easier particularly from our two-year institutions to our four-year institutions. So, these are all laudable goals. But the important thing is STGEC was not a common set of courses or requirements, but basically, some competencies and that allowed campuses to decide how best to meet those competencies. So, it gave us a lot of flexibility. And this milestone can be awarded to students who complete the requirements and so forth. And if they transfer, these STGEC requirements must be considered fulfilled at the receiving institution. So that gives you a little bit of background.

In 2020, the commission decided that the STGEC is a mouthful, doesn't mean anything to anybody. So, they decide to come up with a new name, something called the Indiana College Core, and this was actually after a few permutations because they had some other names that we didn't like very much. And when I say we, it's Michael and me and also a lot of the other public institutions. The important thing is in early 2021, the commission has launched a very aggressive campaign to encourage high schools in Indiana to basically partner with higher education institutions and make the ICC, the Indiana College Core milestone available. So, this is basically the STGEC dressed up a little bit differently and more aggressively marketed. So, the important part is those students who earn the ICC milestone before matriculating to IUB are not subject to our general education requirements. This is nothing we can control. This is mandated by the state. And so far, this hasn't been a big issue because the number of beginning students who had earned the STGEC milestone, the predecessor to the ICC, was pretty modest although rising steadily, going from as you can see, 21 in 2015 to 2014 in 2020.

LUNDELL: 214

ZORN: 214, Michael's paying attention to what I'm saying. I obviously am not.

One thing I wanted to mention was we have been working on a strategy to minimize the effect of this push and what it would do to the Bloomington campus. And we have already sent a proposal to the EPC for its consideration. Then the next two slides basically just give you an idea of the total number of credits that beginning students are bringing in an entry. Obviously, it's going up and we expect the slope to increase with the ICC and this basically breaks it into the number of credits. So, the number of students with greater than three hours, greater than six hours and so forth. I realize I went through this fairly quickly, but I am going to provide the slide deck to Elizabeth to make available to everyone.

So, at this point, I want to acknowledge a long list of people. Lisa is our co-chair. Lisa, I want to thank you. You've been doing this for a few years. I know you're doing it with Dennis before I took over the acting position. By the way, congratulations along with you Israel for your promotions. And then the various chairs, members and so forth. Lots of people were involved here doing a lot of good work and I'll leave it open for any questions if you have any. I want to note I did it in like 15 minutes too.

SIMPSON: Jim.

SHERMAN: Kurt, do out-of-state students have the ability to get credits at IU for things they do in high school?

ZORN: Not through the Indiana College Core but of course if they take dual credit, they possibly can. We actually have our advanced college project program, has outposts in Illinois at this point. High schools that actually come to us and asked us to help them with their dual credit offerings. So, the answer is yes, but it's not really in this context, Jim.

SIMPSON: Colin.

JOHNSON: Kurt, I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about these developments as they relate to time to completion of degree because it seems to me that those are related issues on some level. I was under the impression at one point in the context of various discussions about general education. Some of what was driving concern and planning was the idea that students were going to be coming in with a lot of credit and then we would have to adjust our expectations. And in terms of how long students who are likely to be on campus, how we were able to perhaps reach them? Whether it's through degree programs, general education programs, that thing. But that at one point, I seem to recall hearing from somebody, and I can't attribute. That in fact, despite people's assumption that students would take, for example, the advantages they gained by bringing credit into IU and graduate earlier, that in fact, most students on campus actually end up remaining here for at least four years if not more. Which seems like a relevant thing to consider when thinking about our concerns as they pertain to GenEd because I think one of the tendencies is to approach the question of general education in terms of credit hour retention. That's the administrative concern is, "Oh God, we're going to lose the whole year of students in a system that assumes four years of attendance." And I don't think that's actually true if I'm not mistaken. I wondering if you could speak to that because it does seem to be like an important part of the picture here.

ZORN: There are a lot of facets to the question you are asking, and I'll try to remember to make the points. I think who you probably heard this from was from Dennis because I know we've had those discussions over the years. So far, we have not seen a significant impact. Along the lines you say that people are staying, our students are staying and they're not finishing quickly.

However, I do want to point out that the initial impetus for the STGEC and now the ICC is to get students through college in three years instead of four years. That is the, at least, philosophical goal of the Higher Education Commission. And like I said so far, that hasn't really impacted IUB that much. However, with the new thrust with ICC, the Indiana College Core, and the way they're presenting it to the high schools, we're afraid that this will change that mix. That there will be an increasing number of students coming to the campus who really do want to get through in three years and they are in a hurry to finish and don't want to come in and to experience the whole, what the campus has to offer both academically and extracurricular. So, we do see this as a potential. I hope it's not a problem, but we want to be aware of that coming forward. I hope that answers your question.

JOHNSON: It does. If I can just quickly follow up. The reason I ask is because I think those dynamics form the way we think, for example, about general education and how to respond to

changes, if that's the case and if that's, for example, looming concern, then it does suggest that one of the things we need to be doing is thinking not just about how to provide a solid general education or how to contend with shifting requirements that may drain credit hours out of the system in ways that could be deleterious to the mission. But really how we generate a relation to general education that we can communicate to students. That says this is not just a set of requirements to get through. This is central experientially to what it means to be a student at Indiana University. And that requires being more articulate and thoughtful and behind the project of general education than simply manipulating requirements and that sort of thing in order to plug leaks. And that's in the, we really have to get behind it if we want to retain this as a signature aspect of an Indiana University undergraduate education. That's why I asked.

ZORN: You're actually absolutely correct. We've been thinking about that and our frontline, of course, is our academic advisors who meet with the students when they're coming through new student orientation. So, we're going to do our best to try to get some consistent messaging across the units with regard to that and the reason for GenEd. It's not just something that you're checking a box, that there's a reason behind it and a rationale.

SIMPSON: John Walbridge?

WALBRIDGE: Excuse me. Do we have data to show that the students who are coming in with these credits, whether from high school or from Ivy Tech have the knowledge and skills that they would have gotten taking the GenEd courses here?

ZORN: We do have data that looks at their retention and success. And so far, we haven't seen a significant decrease in those numbers. So that serves to me as a proxy for the preparation.

WALBRIDGE: I'm sorry, retention of what?

ZORN: Retention. Just retention and also graduation.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you.

SIMPSON: Are there any other questions for Kurt? Yes, Rebecca?

SPANG: We all know that averages can be misleading. So, your slide of average, I think the average student was bringing in 18 credit hours. And then you had a brief and it went by very quickly the one that showed the breakup of how, right that one. So, something like 60% of students are bringing in at least three credit hours.

ZORN: Well, three or less is the top line.

SPANG: Right. So, we have actually on this campus, something like two populations. A population which is maybe 45%, almost 50% of the students who bring in no credit.

ZORN: Right.

SPANG: And then another population that brings in on average 18 credits. What can we do to prevent those populations from being effectively segregated in terms of curriculum? Because I'm terribly afraid that that's what's happening. Because if you don't bring in any credit, you take lots

of 100 and 200 level courses. If you do bring in lots of credit, you go immediately into 300 level courses. You end up taking double majors, you have space to study abroad. What can we do to make sure that those populations interact with each other and learn from each other?

ZORN: That's a good question. I'm not sure I have the answer to that very honestly. And maybe the group that is following me, may have some suggestions in there thinking we've had some discussions just last week but it's a good question.

SIMPSON: Yes, Dan.

SACKS: I wonder if you could tell us a little bit more about like average time to completion here. It seems to me just looking at the gross statistics that my concern at least is not that students are graduating in three years, but that they're not graduating in six years. So do you see like to me more on-time earlier graduation is a good thing. There may be some revenue issues, but at the same time we're bigger than we've ever been, students go out faster, maybe we can bring in more students. Should we be concerned about students leaving too soon or is it a view like a positive that it's easier for students to meet our requirements?

ZORN: I mean, I understand what you're saying. However, if I was in the seat that Rick Van Kooten is in, I'd be really concerned about the push to fulfill general education requirements before students arrive in the Bloomington campus. Very simply. So, we've got to find some balance. And as John mentioned, I maybe, I better not say it. I worry sometimes about the credits coming from two-year colleges. I'm not so worried about AP and so forth, but I do worry about students coming from dual credit being offered by other institutions. I'm not worried about dual credit being offered by our ACP program because I know the quality controls we have and so forth, but I do worry about some of the other credits coming in. I know that's not a satisfactory answer, Dan, but it's the best I can do.

SIMPSON: Any other comments or questions? All right.

Thank you, Kurt. Did you? Oh, Israel, sorry.

HERRERA: Yes. So, you're saying that it could be three grades or less from any kind of credit that the student can get in high school. About languages, it could be more than three because it could range from 12-15 and even 18 if they have the AP, that is something state-wide. So, for languages, besides that 15 or 18, are there more credit that they are getting for studying languages in high school?

ZORN: I'm sorry. I'm not quite sure I understood the very last part.

HERRERA: A student could get credit for world languages, one of the components. But they can get the credit from all different things or scenarios that it could be the courses in high school, the years in high school we had Spanish for example, but also with the AP exam, they can also get credit for that. Besides those two components, are students also getting credit for any kind of situation related to world languages?

ZORN: Well, I think Michael could provide a better idea of all the various sources of credit coming in, so we could have Cambridge.

LUNDELL: We could have. Yeah, we won't see that for a while, but that's the latest push.

ZORN: There's the international, isn't there?

LUNDELL: Yeah. I'm not sure that I really got your question, though.

ZORN: They're not getting credit for languages in the high school. These would be dual credit courses that students are taking in the high school, which are basically college courses that are being offered at the high school level. So, I don't believe that there'll be any by coming in with credits to Bloomington college credits if they're just taking high-school credits. So that's where I was a little confused with the question.

They can take placement tests once they get there.

LUNDELL: There's the placement tests. I don't know if the departments offer that and then offer equivalent credit for that.

ZORN: That's different than these data, the placement tests. These are courses. Again, AP, dual credit, those types of things, where they get college credit while they're still on high school and they bring them in with them. And then you do have placement tests where you can get some credit based on your performance on those placement tests once you get to campus, but those would not be showing up in these data.

SANDERS: Marietta, is there time or do we need to move on?

SIMPSON: Yes.

SANDERS: Okay. Kurt this is going back to something I think that was suggested by Colin and Rebecca's question, that historically we think of general education as not just imparting a base of knowledge, but as providing a common experience. There are such, it seems to be powerful centrifugal forces that push students to affiliate with, early on with a school and for schools to snap those students up through direct admit programs and so forth. I know you've talked about you assess what students learn in classes, whether they get the mathematical modeling and the English composition, is there any way of assessing general education courses to demonstrate what students learn from being in a class that is diverse across. That Kelley students benefit from being in classes with College of Arts and Sciences students and arts and sciences students benefit or somehow pick things up from being in classes with Luddy students and SPEA students. I don't know what the control group is. Maybe that's just a pie in the sky but is there any way to appreciate and underscore the idea that one of the purposes of general education should be this, bringing students together who might not otherwise encounter each other, who have different interests and backgrounds and aspirations. That's a philosophical argument. I just don't know if there's a research way of actually proving that that's a good thing and that we could do better at it.

ZORN: You're asking an economist to answer that question. I'm probably not in a good position. It's a little bit out of my comfort zone.

LUNDELL: It would be fascinating to know and if anybody has any great ideas about that, we'd love to hear about them.

SANDERS: There's been plenty of research that students benefit from being in diverse classrooms. Classrooms that are diverse racially and ethnically, and so forth. I'm looking for evidence to support the idea that we need to keep this aspiration of some common experiences that pull students out of their silos of schools and let them encounter other students and different kinds of ideas.

SIMPSON: Yes, Danielle, Ted, and Colin. And then we need to wrap this up. I'm very sorry, because we need to get to our next agenda item, but Danielle.

DESAWAL: So, Steve, I think that we would find that with the high-impact practices. So, for higher education we do have data about that higher education-wise. Those things have been researched. So, some of that probably comes out of the Center for Post-secondary Research here at IU that looks at it through institutions across the country. So probably Dr. Jillian Kinzie could be a great resource to help with some of those types of insights. But also, higher education journals also do have some of that data that talks about that importance.

One of the things to think about is the difference between students who have shared experiences that are more similar than different. So, when you create experiences that are across the board different, then you can't measure them the same way as if it's a shared experience that's more similar in those spaces. So, when we give students lots of different choices to choose from one shared learning outcome, you're not going to find the same types of similar experiences between them because the courses are all different. But when you put students together from different interest areas for the same type of experience, then you start to see more common learning that happens between them. And there is stuff that's out there. I'll see if I can find some stuff.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Danielle. Ted.

MILLER: Well, let me just say I think Steve is asking a very, very good question. Now, I haven't been following this extremely closely. For those of you that don't know me, I'm an Emeritus representative. So, I've been retired for a number of years. But I was actually president of the BFC when the GenEd program was adopted. So, I know a fair amount about the curriculum. And I also know how in my mind anyway, I thought the campus should implement this program. But I'm not sure that the campus has actually implemented the program in a way that allows Steve's objectives to be satisfied.

So, for example, in some of the curriculum across the campus, if a student's objective is to finish their degree in four years, they are required to satisfy a particular GenEd requirement by taking a specific course. So, in the SPEA curriculum, the economics course is a required course. And if a student chooses to satisfy the social behavioral requirement taking other courses, they've got to add economics as an additional course. So, in many of the curriculum, the students are funneled into specific courses to satisfy GenEd so that they can graduate on time if you will. And I frankly think that if we didn't do that, we'd be in a much better position to satisfy the thing that Steve is

talking about. But the campus has chosen to implement this program in a way that really forecloses, in many cases the kind of things Steve was getting at.

SANDERS: This would just be like 10 seconds. I mean, my point also I didn't say was also directed at my concern about students don't have the opportunity to do that because of the amount of credit they're coming in with already.

SIMPSON: Thank you. Colin? And Colin is our last comment on this.

JOHNSON: Well, I just wanted to say sort of following up on Ted's comment because I was also party to that as well as some other people when that was adopted, and really Steve to the comment you made, it's not clear to me that we ever really developed general education. There are many philosophies have general education. It's not at all clear to me even when we forged this curriculum, that we ever managed to have a successful conversation on this campus about what our philosophy institutionally is. And what that philosophy is has an enormous bearing, for example, on how to respond to your question and your question and your question. Because if you think of general education in the way that you're thinking about it. Not as preparatory skill formation in advance of concentration, but rather as a shared intellectual experience that's supposed to cultivate a certain set of general habits of mind and dispositions towards learning, which is certainly a model that exists in certain curricula as opposed to others, then what we do does not speak to that really very effectively. And that just maybe perhaps serves as a good segue for the next group of people on the agenda.

But I still think as complicated as that conversation is, it's arguably one of the most important conversations for any institution to have because it lays bare in some regard, very fundamental differences and belief that people are bringing to what they're doing. Not just on a curricular level, but in their own classrooms, like literally how they think about teaching and learning. But it is an enormously politically fraught conversation obviously, particularly when it's embedded in a system that routes power and resources and other things through curricular structures. And that was clear when we were forging that curriculum when it was originally implemented. It was a compromised formation, and I don't think anybody thought it was anything else.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Colin. Thank you, Kurt. Thank you very much for your report from the General Education Committee.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: UPDATE FROM THE TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE THIRD CENTURY OF THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS

SIMPSON: Next, we have the update from the Task Force from the Future of General Education in the Third Century of the Bloomington Campus. We have John Arthos, a task force co-chair with Clark Barwick the task force co-chair and J Duncan, also task force co-chair. Gentlemen.

ARTHOS: Thank you. J and Clark and I and Micol is not here. She's teaching right now. So, we're the members of the steering committee. And what I have here for you is what I'm going to try to cover in just a few minutes. This is not a report on findings. There was some concern, people were hearing that there are findings. There are no findings right now. We're in the process

of discussing all of this and taking recommendations from you. So, we wanted to fill you in on where we're at and how you can communicate with us. That's really what we want to try to do today.

Here is the structure of the task force. It's now comprised of the four of us as the steering committee, but also now these subcommittees who are one of the main vehicles through which you can communicate with us. So, make sure you locate the person in here. I'm sorry. Yeah. Here are the subcommittees, the liaison committee and I have that on the next slide are the main contacts for the units to the steering committee. So, if you can spot the name of the person who's on the liaison committee with us.

DUNCAN: Just to point out that the people on these committees are acting as two-way conduits. They are both asked to be distributing information to you and also to be taking your feedback and questions. So, if there's a specific concern you have or a question you have, I'd encourage you to reach out to the person who's in your school for this liaison subcommittee and ask them about it and they can funnel that back to us as well. Yeah, especially before the New Year because this committee is trying to get those preliminary reports in by that point.

ARTHOS: So that's the overview of the current structure of it and the contacts. Now one of those sub-committee is comparable institutions and I thought you might be interested in seeing the sister institutions that they chose to contact. We recommended Big Ten institutions and that's the list that they're using. But we're also considering other universities and colleges as we go along.

BARWICK: At least four Big Ten universities have recently redone their GenEd possibly more. So, this is something that a lot of schools are interested in doing.

ARTHOS: And the comparable institutions sub-committee has actually finished their report and submitted it to us. And so, we'll be making that available. Elizabeth is helping us set up a page that will put all of these documents so that they'll be available to you and to the faculty soon.

The actual full charge document is going to be one of these documents that will be available to you. But this is the kernel of it that we were given, that the task force was given in April of 2019. And that's to assess and report on the future of general education on the Bloomington campus, making recommendations for evolutionary changes in its requirements and structure for adoption and implementation.

So once again, this is the time we really need your input. And the recommendations are going to start to come out in 2022 at the end of the spring and then we're going to write a report in the fall. The methods we've been using, so mainly, in terms of the content of the curriculum and the model, with faculty and with administration internally on campus, it's been a giant listening tour over the last couple of years. But we've also used other methods. We put together with the help of the Undergraduate Education Office and George Rehrey, a Qualtrics survey questionnaire that went out last year to all sophomore and junior students. That report is done. That will be available to you including the comments and the data because that part is done. But then the subcommittees, as we've just mentioned, we have been spending a lot of time in the archives

looking at documents, looking at the history. The research and consulting in terms of the actual apparatus, the model itself. We spoke early with Ted and with experts who know the history of this plus using the available documents in the archives. So, there's been internally a mixture of methodologies that we've been using depending on the types of questions that we were asking.

Externally, we have been doing consultations with campuses that have been recently engaged in reform of their programs, that have been highlighted as exemplars in *The Chronicle* and other places. And also, some of those interviews are going to be available to you. We recorded them and we have the permission of the campuses to share those with you. So, when we put the webpage up, we will have the links to those recordings.

DUNCAN: Just as a quick note, not all the institutions that we had those interviews with were what we would consider exactly our peer institutions. But sometimes there are very interesting ideas that came out of some of these, even though they were much smaller than IU.

ARTHOS: The schedule took longer than we expected and longer than the BFC Exec Committee expected. And partly, that was because the enormity of what this represents that we were asked to think about. But gradually we came to see these are three starting points. The first two I think were pretty self-evident fairly early on, that there's widespread commitment for strong general education program, and that there's a broadly shared desire for improvement especially in the areas of improving and updating the model, enhancing the quality of the program delivery, and communicating effectively with students and faculty about the purposes that Con was talking about. And then finally, and this was a harder one for us to come to, but gradually I think we have come to believe that real improvement is possible, given our constraints, given everything else.

The goals that we set ourselves after having done this for about a year, a year and a half, were that number one, the program should be clear to students and that the program should be inspiring to students. Those two in particular floated to the very top of our goals. And then that the faculty can believe and be invested in whatever plan we move forward with. And that the program should align value and feasibility, which is why we've tried to enlist the support and consultation of administration at every step of the way. And you can see how that's built into our subcommittees structure.

So here is the content part. And these are elements and models. These are not things that we really want to opine about today because that's what's coming up. We're still in the process of collecting your data. But in any case, some of the more interesting options, for example, and we actually have a committee, a subcommittee for these first two. And enduring questions approach, a clusters, or thematic, or pathways approach these are slightly different models. A capstone experience and I'm using that, I put the quotes there because that could be almost any number of things. There are many things that are understood by capstone experience. First-year experience, which is what Steve and Colin we're talking about and Ted. There seems to be a lot of interests in that. It's also probably the hardest to implement from an administrative perspective.

Then early on, we were hoping that linked courses or team teaching could be a viable methodology here. And then when we did the comparable institutions report, has been a lot of

emphasis on strengthening the diversity requirement. So that's something that we're going to pay a lot of attention to as we go through this process.

We also have to pay attention as we put this together, obviously, on the infrastructure. And that includes things such as support of advisors, involvement of NTTs, program promotion, and communication. Because as you said, students don't really even know. And sometimes faculty are teaching courses that they're not aware. So that has to be a major part of how this is done. Figuring out how to communicate what this thing is. And then of course we have to pay close attention to methods of implementation and assessment which is part of our charge.

DUNCAN: I want to take a second to really reiterate that advisors are crucial to this process. It has become apparent to us very very directly how much the student experience in general education is mediated by that 15 minutes they might talk to an advisor. We can put up whatever website we want, we can have initiatives. If the advisors don't understand the goals, the students are not going to understand the goals either.

ARTHOS: When we get our webpage up which will be available to you, these will be some of the documents that will be on it. The historical documents of the GenEd, the comparable institutions report, the undergraduate survey results report, subcommittee contacts, the town hall feedback. We've had two very useful town halls and we'll probably have another one.

An external programs, interviews that I mentioned to you that are recorded. There's a wonderful chronicle handbook that we used early on to help us think about and also find where are the exemplars are, who was doing exciting work in this area. So that we're going to want to share that and then a frequently asked questions page so that we can start to answer some of the more specific questions that people have.

Now, the timeline, we're thinking that that page will be up by January. We're hoping that the spring will be the time to get all of the subcommittee reports that have reports due to us. We're thinking about having a subcommittee summit. And then we're going to be following through on recommendations both from the subcommittees and from the faculty and administration who are communicating to us in these various ways. And then in the fall is when we have a goal of writing and submitting the report to the BFC and then having obviously town halls about that. And then McCalla in particular is very anxious that we really stick with this, and we do the follow through the task force itself, do the follow through on this. So that's what we have for you.

SIMPSON: Scott it looked like you were pointing to someone.

LIBSON: I was just reminding you to turn on your microphone, which you did. Your microphone was off before.

SIMPSON: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Scott.

Good. Do we have any comments or any questions for the task force? Thank you, Mike, very much. I appreciate it. John Walbridge?

WALBRIDGE: Given the report we just heard on the state requirements, how much wiggle room is there in the space between what Indiana insists that we do and what in practice the students have to do to finish majors and such? I mean, do we have moved maneuver to change things very radically?

DUNCAN: So, one of our subcommittees is looking at questions like that and I think their report will be very helpful. But in conversations that we've had, actually with some of the people who just left us, there are some options that we can consider, especially when we're looking at first share experiences and co-curricular requirements. There are some ways that we can implement things so that students can have a coherent experience or at least get to know each other across those silos that Steve was mentioning in the context of furthering their general education. So, I think we'll have more for you when we have the report from that subcommittee.

SIMPSON: Did you want to add anything to that Michael?

LUNDELL: Oh, yeah. I did. [inaudible] But this is real issue, it's an issue that you need to be very conscious on as we put this together [inaudible] because as the script pointed out over the last 12 years or so, is that huge push [inaudible] preparing the data to reach further and further and further and [inaudible]. On one hand, we are getting these straight from them. On the other hand, you're limited to [inaudible] and so for many of the school, Education, or the School of Music, especially, there's no little label. And so, I think that there are things that we could do that will allow you to work around those requirements or push the envelope. That's one of the reasons why this [inaudible] being pushed into high school is such an issue. Because if we see this play out the way the institution likes to play out, what they would like to see is students in Indiana earning this milestone [inaudible]. We believe that there's a reason for general case requirement. And we believe that it's really important for building to [inaudible] they need. And yet our mission is steadily working against that. [inaudible]. But I do think that we [inaudible] and we build up our efforts.

SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Steve?

SANDERS: Guys thank you for the presentation and for your work. Would you say that the mindset that the committee has gone into this with is we start with the current model, and we nip it, we tuck it, we adjust it, we figure out what's not working and what could be working better, or do you imagine bringing forth something that is a zero-base, let's blow up the current thing and imagine a new model of general education that we're going to build from the ground up. It seems to me those are two fundamentally different approaches to use in coming at something like this. I'm curious where your committee has been on that.

DUNCAN: So, if you take a look at our charge, our charge is very much not to look at the current model and tweak it by 6%. It wasn't that sort of exercise. The charge was to come up with new ways of approaching this and new ways of envisioning this. At the same time, if you look at how any sort of actual change would have to be implemented, it would be impossible to blow up the current model and just go immediately into something new with no connection between the two. So, if we saw a new model that was generally liked by everyone in that the BFC decided to adopt, what would be mandatory in that situation would be an overlay of some

kind. Either preserving the current model and then giving you another option that was more attractive, more directed, more focused, better serve student's needs, or that how to transition system built into it. You simply can't blow up something like this and leave those students stranded because students are admitted under a certain set of requirements. So, I don't think you'll see something that is completely one or completely the other.

SANDERS: [Inaudible] but I'm talking about for a new student coming in, again, might be experience something totally different or is this going to be some significant renovations of what we do right now?

ARTHOS: Well, this was something we really struggled with in trying to understand our charge. The way that the charge is written is that it's a thought experiment and that we were told specifically that we should not have this modest tempered out of the gate. But we struggle with that all the way through this process because we don't want to have some pie in the sky, idealistic idea that had no possibility of being implemented. So, we've been trying to balance those two imperatives and partly, what you're saying is what's the case. But I think also, what will happen is that the solutions that the subcommittees come back to us with in their concrete recommendations are going to actually suggest the directions that we might go in. So, I think we're going to get at this empirically.

SIMPSON: One more comment. I'm sorry, Rebecca had her hand up first, Colin, and then we need to move on to the next agenda item. Yes.

SPANG: I just wanted to bring to everybody's attention because they've loom so large over this meeting, the composition of ICHE, the Indiana Commission of Higher Ed. This is a body appointed by the governor, there is one member who has a degree from IU, he's an executive at Cook Medical. The others have degrees from Ball State, University of Indianapolis, Indiana State. The majority of them work in finance. Two are the founders of successful small businesses. There is one faculty member on it. I remember hearing a presentation some years ago by a faculty member who was the faculty representative to the Indiana Commission of Higher Ed, and he said it was just miserable. So, there is a real issue here about the curriculum being taken out of the hands of the faculty. And we need to have a hard think about what we're going to do about that.

SIMPSON: All right. Thank you, everyone, for this discussion. Thank you all for the report, and we look forward to the further discussions that are going to happen around this.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: PROPOSAL TO ADD SUSTAINABILITY LITERACY AS A SHARED GOAL IN THE IUB GENERAL EDUCATION

SIMPSON: Our next agenda item is a proposal to add sustainability literacy as a shared goal in the IUB General Education. And Kelly Eskew, who is the co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee, will lead us in this. I want everyone to be aware and reminded that this is a discussion item. So, Kelly, thank you.

ESKEW: Thank you, Marietta. I'm here in my capacity as the co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee. I also sit on the BFC and the BFC Exec, and I teach in the Kelley School of

Business. My co-chair, David Rutkowski, could not be here today, he's my imaginary co-chair. And I'm here today with Sarah Mincey. Sarah is the Managing Director of the IU Environmental Resilience Institute which is part of the grand challenge, and she is also the Director of the Integrated Program in the Environment, she is one of the co-chairs of the task force on Sustainability as a Shared Goal. Additionally, Brian Winterman is the other co-chair of the task force, and he's our Information Literacy and Assessment Librarian, and I'm glad to have them here.

I'll talk more about the task force in a minute, but I want to be clear up front, as Marietta just noted, we're not asking anyone to vote today. We're not asking any school or any department to create a new course or new course requirements. And we know there's a lot of consternation out there because I've been getting emails. But we ask this body to listen with an open mind, which I know that you will, to take the proposal back to your departments, to your units, your academic deans, the other relevant administrators, and to share back to us, to me, to David, Brian, or Sarah your helpful input. And the helpful input can be critique, it should just be friendly, please. And I'm sure that it will be.

I do want to apologize that the proposal attached to the agenda, references, appendices that are not there and have some typos in an effort to pare down what we were presenting today for clarity. That is my error, and I will provide an updated and clean copy to Elizabeth to share with everyone.

I want to note that, and I'll speak to this again in a second, but I want to go quickly so we have time for some comments, that input was broadly sought from the schools. We asked them to meet with us, we did receive some excellent feedback, it's part of an addendum that I'm happy to share with everyone. Many units didn't respond, we followed up. Should we have followed up more aggressively? Perhaps, that's a debaters point. But we really want feedback. And we're here today to take a breath, that's why we're not voting. To get feedback from the units who feel that they have not been heard from, and then we will come back to you in March or maybe April and ask you to vote to approve the change to the policy, which is a minor language revision, and to endorse the proposal itself. So that's my preamble.

I also want to note upfront what the institution and its constituents have said about concern for sustainability, including climate change. IU Student Government Congress Enrolled Proclamation 110 was passed last year, and it demands a shared goal and sustainability. It says, "Indiana University students are graduating into a world that is undergoing rapid ecological degradation, the climate crisis is already impacting our lives and will continue to do so. Addressing the climate crisis will require drastic climate action from all industries." Now, sustainability and climate are not synonymous, but they are related. Marietta spoke about student mental health concerns. Anecdotally, I personally believe that the mental health crisis that we're seeing with our students isn't just about COVID, and it's not just about social justice issues that we see in the news, it also has to do with climate change, and so I feel this call. This is one of the resolutions at the bottom of this proclamation. "Recognize that solving the climate crisis is a pressing challenge and this university should respond by providing education around sustainability."

Here's our own bicentennial strategic plan. Core value number seven, sustainability for natural, human, and economic resources, and you might want to put a pin in those three prongs. Strategic priority number one in our bicentennial strategic plan, developing sustainability, understanding campus as a laboratory. Here's something that we did last year, a resolution for enhancing sustainability. One of the many statements in it, you can find it on our own website, "to work actively to support academic research and service in sustainability."

President Whitten, this is a few weeks ago, Indiana University is leading on the issue of climate change. Then I must note this, the UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres in response to the sixth assessment report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that came out on August 9th, 2021, called it a red alert for the planet. I was privileged to attend the second week of the United Nations Climate Change Conference, COP26 in Glasgow. Leo Banks is my classmate. We were both students in Professor Jessica O'Reilly's class and received our delegation credentials as a result, and I'm most appreciative. The overwhelming sense of urgency from leaders from around the globe, including climate envoy, John Kerry, Frans Timmermans from the EU, the G77 nations, etc., can't be conveyed in this meeting, but I doubt that I need to convince most of you that the world faces an existential crisis. And our children, our students, need tools to go out. You cannot be optimistic about a problem if you have no tools to help you solve it, and I think that's one of the things that we can do here.

Let me talk about the task force. Two years ago, the then IU Sustainability or IU Student Government Sustainability director introduced this idea at an open forum on GenEd. And Sarah reached out to her, and they crafted an initial proposal, they brought it to the BFC presidency, they brought it to the EPC. And in February of 2020, the EPC approved a shared goal task force and suggested membership and brought in Brian. Also on that committee were representatives from Eskenazi the School of Art, Architecture + Design, as well as human biology, the Kelley School. Sarah also is an associate professor in O'Neill. So broad representation of some key constituencies. We had a great student intern and the IU Student Government Sustainability rep.

Throughout the spring, summer, and fall of 2020, the task force worked on the proposal. In late spring of 2021, as I noted earlier, emails went out from Brian to all the schools, and offered to meet and discuss the proposal with them. Those we didn't hear back from, we followed up again in late summer 2021, so heading into this semester. And here's some of the things that the task force did. First, it defined sustainability. Now, there are a lot of definitions of sustainability, but the one that was used ultimately comes from the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. These are the UNSDGs. A lot of people are thinking about sustainability probably think about 13, 14, and 15, clean air, clean water, climate, but the UN defines them more broadly. And you can see if you think about sustainability in this broad way, that there are many ways in which all of us are teaching in this space.

We define sustainability literacy, thinking again, as we look at both this definition, environmental, social, and economic, and sustainability literacy, how that relates back to the language of the IU Bicentennial plan. We state in the proposal that academics units first evaluate and then monitor and report on achievement of sustainability literacy. And this is exactly what Kurt and this group have been talking about today, it is implementation and evaluation. Here are

some example learning outcomes, and these come from AASHE. AASHE is the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. Indiana University received a gold rating in February 2020 from AASHE, but only 27 out of 40 on the curriculum section. And the only points deductions there occurred in subsections called academic courses and learning outcomes, which scored seven out of 14 and 1.92 out of eight respectively, that's a failing score. So, these are suggested learning outcomes.

What would we do then if approved by this group? Implementation, evaluation, offering feedback through an implementation committee that might include members of the task force as well for continuity, fostering collaboration with the Sustain IU office, which I should note is very involved in operations and has a direct reporting line to Tom Morrison, but also reports to the provost. And that stands willing and charged with supporting faculty as we develop our courses, reporting back to schools and the BFC, and then bless it and release it, that's from me not from the report. But work on it, bless it, and release it, but re-evaluate it. You can't just send a program out there and not make sure that it's working well.

I would also note that if you look at the proposal, implementation might include GenEd courses, might include programs specific courses, it might also include co-curricular activities. So various ways to meet the shared goal. This's my last slide, but I want to tell you some good news. Over 85% of our students think their major is addressing sustainability, economic, social, and environmental. 61 departments are offering sustainability-related courses according to the report we made to AASHE through Sustain IU. And I'm going to note that some of my courses, which are all about sustainability, are not on that list. So, we could re-evaluate and we're going to have more, 34 are GenEd, and 25% of our students are already taking those courses. And we have 160 faculty affiliated with IPE and ERI, Sustainability Scholarship is our focus. And so, with that, I'll turn it back over to Marietta for questions and comments.

SIMPSON: Are there questions? Are there comments? Yes. Ky? Sorry.

FREEMAN: Is it on?

SIMPSON: Yes, it's on.

FREEMAN: Hello, everyone. My name is Ky Freedman and I serve as the Student Body President and I am joined here with Leo Banks, the Director for Sustainability for the IU Student Government.

So, I wanted to read a few statements that students have compiled this far with his proposal in support of it. Just so you all can hear where the pulse of the student body is really about talking about sustainability over this campus. So here it starts off with the first one that says, "Indiana University prides itself on giving students a well-rounded education, preparing them for whatever is to come in the real-world. Given the interconnectedness of the climate crisis with our economy, social, and political institutions. We must work across sectors and across disciplines to create a more sustainable world for all. This begins in the classroom by giving students the opportunity to learn more about sustainability and environmental issues, we are ensuring that our future leaders and workforces have the tools and skills set to address the increasing impacts of

changing climate within their industry. For this reason, I strongly support the sustainability shared goals policy proposal. As a society, we must change our relationship with the environment. Climate change knows no boundaries or borders, and we can no longer see ourselves separate from what is happening to our planet. Educating ourselves on how our actions impact the world around us, as well as understanding environmental justice and equity issues is the first step in making real progress for a better future.”

Second comment from a student says, “this initiative has had strong students support since it was first introduced. The IU Student Government passed a resolution unanimously asking for sustainability shared learning goals last spring. The strong support for the initiative is partly because there won't be any added burden to the student body since no additional credit hours will be required if this were to be approved. We'll be graduating into a world impacted by climate change, and we should all have a thorough understanding of the crisis in order to navigate and address it in a just way. The student body has shown our support of this initiative as being an effective way to provide us with an understanding of the climate crisis.”

And the last comment I have is I would like to emphasize the utmost importance of interdisciplinary sustainability education and how new sustainability shared goals can help achieve that for our students. Learning about environmental justice in conjunction with environmental injustice and racism, the impact of our economy on the environment and our relationship with the land over time are all vital ways in which students can see sustainability as more of a holistic aspect of society. One of the most impactful parts of the Sustainability Scholars Program for me was when we discussed a circular economy in creating playgrounds and furniture with the future in mind. With the things we create involve a relationship and aren't disposed of at the end of the journey. I believe that updated shared goals for sustainability can help our students grasp how the environment is relevant to them, even if it's just through a newly updated lesson within their disciplines. I'll pass it over to Leo just to talk a little bit more.

L. BANKS: Sure. Thank you. So, I have a couple of things to share with everyone, but I'll try and make it brief. I'd like to touch on that last point though about even one little bit of sustainability curriculum can go a really long way. So, a club here that's become quite influential in student organization on campus Students for a New Green World. That was founded by a student. I believe he was a business major, and he had not touched sustainability, launched in his life. And then he attended a panel discussion about it. And then he founded this student organization about it. And that student organization has gone to have conversations with Tom Morrison, all across IU, different administrators really pushing for that change. So even one thing can go a long way.

And then you have all these students who were part of these organizations who are now graduating with this experience, who have this knowledge that they can take to their careers, and that's going to be vital because the world is changing and because climate change and again, as Kelly said, climate change and sustainability aren't the same thing, but they're very connected. It is the defining issue of our generation. If we don't solve it, it won't be solved. I say that with the utmost conviction. And so, I think it is truly understood by the student body that this is something that needs to be addressed in our education.

I remember back in September 2019; I was sitting on the bus on the way into campus. It's when there's the global climate strike going on. And there are two students sitting a couple of rows behind me. And I happened to overhear the conversation. And they were shocked at the number of students in Dunn Meadow protesting. They had no idea that this was a big deal. If you can get through college without understanding what climate change is, you are in for a very rude awakening when you get to the labor force. So that's a real issue and for sure that's a small minority of students.

I have a survey here that I'll just share some facts from this was done back in December of the same year. And it got just over a thousand responses, which was done by a IUSG. And they had a one through five scale, one being sustainability is not important to me, and five being extremely important, three being ambivalent. And 81% of students ranked it as four or five. And then you get 14% ambivalent and 2% or 1% for the rest. So, this is an issue that students want to learn more about, they care about, and then there's a small percentage of students who don't know anything about it and we're doing those students to this service.

And I conclude by saying that one of the things that I've experienced a lot in my capacity IUSG I kind of make the rounds of all the different student, sustainability organizations, it's not only people from O'Neill who are doing environmental management or whatever, you get students from every part of the campus, there's computer science, every major degree, whatever is represented. But a lot of these people don't have the opportunity per say to have a really in-depth sustainability experience within their field. And that's why they're coming to the student organizations, they're looking for this experience because sustainability is going to impact them. I know there's great advancement being made in modeling sustainability over in Luddy. There's all these things going on, but it's not accessible to everyone. And so, I think it's very important to allow students to go and get that experience without having to step outside their degree programs as mentioned earlier. For some students taking some majors, that's a very arduous burden, you might have to take another year to do that. So, I'll wrap up there. But I would urge everyone really consider this. I think this can be worked into every program without too much of a burden. And it's truly essential for preparing students to graduate. Thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Leo. Thank you, Ky, very much for giving us that perspective. Are there any other comments, questions?

DOUCETTE: Hi, I'm Kaitlin Doucette. I'm the Graduate & Professional Student Government Research Ambassador, and I'm also the Sustainability chair for GPSG. I would like to thank IUSG for all of their work that they've done, and I agree with everything that you said. One thing I have to consider is that actions generally speak louder than words, especially if we're training students.

My one concern with adding this requirement would be that IU does not necessarily have its own climate action plan or divestment plan in place. I think it's something that we should maybe consider, whether or not part of the coursework, is focusing on critiquing IU's own policies, or providing some feedback to the university itself. Because I know at least for the Graduate & Professional Student Government, as well as the IU Student Government, that this is a huge

concern and something that we want to push forward and have change made at a university level. Just more of a food for thought is wondering how we can teach sustainability effectively, when our campus itself does not necessarily operate sustainably?

SIMPSON: Thank you, Kaitlin. Kelly, do you want to respond?

ESKEW: Thank you, Kaitlin, and I apologize for not mentioning that IU Graduate & Professional Student Government has a resolution that aligns with IU Student Government's and with the BFC's from last year, also calling for a climate action plan, calling for sustainability education. To follow up, we're one of four schools in the Big Ten without a climate action plan and the class that I was teaching right before I walked over here was busy critiquing IU's lack of a climate action plan. It is happening, but it needs to happen more. Thank you.

SIMPSON: Colin?

JOHNSON: This is just a specific proposal adjacent commentary, which is I think the issue that's being raised by that proposal to add this shared goal is actually indicative, and ties into the conversation we were having earlier in some regard about the philosophy of general education, and how we approach it, and how we could think differently about it, which also relates to the report that we received from the BFC task force.

One of the things, when you were talking, that I was very much reminded of is that for students, I think especially one of the ways you make general education generally relevant to them is that it involves something that feels not only enduring, for example, to borrow the language that's used by some of these formulations, but also urgent. There is a way to think about general education that also explicitly and intentionally prioritizes the kind of urgency and applicability of formal education. I think in terms of this specific shared goal, given our current framework, that's the way we need to talk about it. But future history is going to involve many things that feels urgent. I think we've seen that especially over the last several years. The end of humanity, as we know it, is obviously a major urgency that requires attention. I think that's what we're hearing from our students. It's not likely to be resolved tomorrow.

But I think there is a way that we, as faculty, could think and teach our students with an eye towards not only things that we can learn from the tradition of organized intellection, but also about what it means to apply those things under the sign of urgency and immediacy. But that would require us to think very differently about what it means to administer a general education program, quite radically differently than what we do now.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Colin. I do not want to miss anyone or not give someone the opportunity to speak. Are there any other comments or questions for Kelly? Steve and then Danielle.

SANDERS: Briefly, Kelly, you started out saying, "Don't get upset, this is just a discussion." The cynic in me tends to think that when this comes back at some point, there's going to be a lot of pressure to say, "Now, this really doesn't require anybody to change anything that they're doing. In fact, we're already doing this really." I hope what you have heard today gives the committee confidence and courage to be bold, and to say and recommend what needs to be said and recommended.

ESKEW: Thank you, Steve. I would also note that some of the schools that have thought about this, something very difficult, to add, that they would have to change their curriculum or add more to their curriculum. My co-chair, David Rutkowski, said, "I teach quantitative stuff. How do I incorporate it? I use datasets that involve the environment. I use datasets that involve climate. That is the way that in my courses I can address those." I think that challenging units to think about what are you doing and how can you include more of this information within your curriculum is a very important goal of the task force.

SIMPSON: Danielle?

DESAWAL: Yeah. I just had a question about why the pillars weren't included to the side of the sustainability literacy when we look at BL-ACA-H9? I guess that's on page two. Because when we look at, now, E was D, we can see this category include. I think context wise; I wonder if some of the dialogue we're getting is because in the policy, it doesn't have those three pillars to provide the broader context of the UN definition. I didn't know if there was a rationale. Just because that's not in the beginning, it's not defined in the policy. I wonder if that's a hang up.

PEAR: I think I've been nominated for this one. The problem, and I guess the beauty of H9, is that it's a very simple policy. If you look, there's just basically the bare bones guidelines. I don't think any other shared goals are defined in the way that Kelly has already outlined things today. That's why there's two things ideally to vote on when we get to that point. One is the policy, and the other is the endorsement of the larger definitions and implementation plan, and all of that. They would both be endorsed by the BFC, but one would be policy, and the other would live adjacent to the policy.

SIMPSON: Good. Any other comment or questions?

If not, thank you, Kelly. Now, remember you're taking this back to your units for discussion, and you're directing your feedback, Kelly, to?

ESKEW: Direct your feedback to Sarah Mincey, Brian Winterman, me, or David Rutkowski. Send it all to me, and I will share with them. Also, again, I will clean up that proposal. I hate typos. If a student turned that into me, they would be in so much trouble, so I'm in trouble. I will fix it, and I will give it to Elizabeth and ask Elizabeth to share it when she has an opportunity to next week. Thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you. Thank you all. I want to say that on the back table, there is our popcorn. Thank you to Elizabeth for always arranging nice flavors. There are also IU cookies, that is my gift to you for a wonderful holiday. I hope you all manage through the rest of the semester. Thank you for a really good meeting, and we will consider ourselves adjourned with five minutes to spare.