

**Minutes of the
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
September 27, 2005
Georgian Room, Indiana Memorial Union
Bloomington Campus
1:30 - 4:30 P.M.**

Attendance

Members Present: Chris Bjornson, Julie Bobay, George Bodmer, Polly Boruff-Jones, Donald Coffin, Andre De Tienne, Erika Dowell, Ronald Finkbine, Mary Fisher, Michael Foos, Ken Gros Louis, Barbara Hawkins, Adam Herbert, Dolores Hoyt, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Elizabeth Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Robert Kravchuk, Cathy Ludlum Foos, David MacKay, Bryan McCormick, Anna McDaniel, Dale McFadden, Alice Merz, Ted Miller, B. Keith Moore, Joseph Near, Bart Ng, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Markus Pomper, John Ross, William Schneider, Alex Shortle, David Vollrath, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Eric Zeemering

Members Absent with Alternates: Luis Davila for Harold Ogren

Members Absent: Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Jacqueline Blackwell, Roseanne Cordell, Jennifer Delaney, Brian Fife, David Fulton, Karen Gable, Eyas Hattab, Giles Hoyt, Debomoy Lahiri, Michael McRobbie, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, C. Michael Renfrow, Nakisha Robertson, David Turnipseed, Michael Wartell, Nanci Yokom

Guests: Julie Knost (University Affirmative Action Officer), Brad Wheeler (Dean of Information Technology, Bloomington), Alan Wright (Bloomington), Ben Boukai (Mathematics, IUPUI, Co-Chair UFC Finances and Facilities Committee), Nassar Paydar (Vice Chancellor IUPUC)

Agenda

**1:30 pm – 2:30 pm Business Meeting
Georgian Room, Indiana Memorial Union**

1. Approval of Minutes

April 12, 2005

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY05/Minutes/04.12.05.htm>

2. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)

(President Adam Herbert)

3. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)

(Professors Bart Ng and Theodore Miller)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U1-2006.htm>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U2-2006.htm>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U3-2006.htm>

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

5. Mission Differentiation: Indiana University Mission Statement (First Reading) (25 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Theodore Miller, Co-Secretaries, University Faculty Council)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U7-2006.htm>

6 Discussion of the UFC Finances and Facilities Committee (15 minutes)
(Professors Benzion Boukai and Robert Kravchuk, Co-Chairs, UFC Finances and Facilities Committee)

**3:00 pm President Adam W. Herbert's State of the University Address
Frangipani Room, Indiana Memorial Union**

HERBERT: Let's call the meeting to order. Forgive us for being a few minutes late, the Agenda Committee had a number of items to discuss today to kind of get the year started. Since there are some, a number of-- I won't say old faces-- a number of faces around the table that everyone knows from our previous year but a number of new ones as well. So why don't we start off maybe down here at this end of the table and I'll just ask each of you to introduce yourself and indicate the campus that you are representing. That might be helpful to get started.

OCHOA: Terry Ochoa, IUB School of Education.

NEAR: Joe Near, IUB Medical Sciences Program.

BOBAY: Julie Bobay, IUB Libraries.

SCHNEIDER: Bill Schneider, IUPUI History program.

PATTERSON-RANGLES: Sandra Patterson-Randles, Chancellor, IU Southeast.

LUDLUM FOOS: Cathy Ludlum Foos, Philosophy at IU East.

JOHNSON: Elizabeth Johnson, IUB Lilly Library.

HUNT: Kevin Hunt, I'm in Anthropology here in Bloomington.

DOWELL: Erika Dowell, Lilly Library, IUB.

WIGGINS: Gary Wiggins, Informatics, Bloomington.

MCCORMICK: Bryan McCormick, Bloomington, School of HPER.

HAWKINS: Barbara Hawkins, Bloomington, School of HPER.

WATSON: Maxine Watson, Biology, Bloomington.

MERZ: Alice Merz, IPFW, School of Education.

MOORE: Keith Moore, Indianapolis, School of Dentistry.

BORUFF-JONES: Polly Boruff-Jones, Indianapolis, University Library.

FOOS: I'm Mike Foos, IU East in Biology.

NG: I'm Bart Ng, IUPUI, Mathematics.

HERBERT: Adam Herbert, the university. [Laughter]

MILLER: Ted Miller, I'm from the Bloomington campus.

FISHER: Mary Fisher in Nursing, IUPUI.

HOYT: Dolores Hoyt, IUPUI, University Library.

McDANIEL: Anna McDaniel, IUPUI Nursing and Informatics.

MacKay: David MacKay, Kelley School of Business, Bloomington.

IVIE: Bob Ivie, Bloomington, Communication and Culture.

COFFIN: Don Coffin, Northwest, Economics.

BODMER: George Bodmer, Northwest, English.

POMPER: Markus Pomper, Mathematics, IU East.

WHEELER: Bill Wheeler, Mathematics also, from Bloomington.

ROSS: John Ross, an old face from Kokomo, in Computing.

KINTZELE: Marilyn Kintzele, Kokomo, Accounting.

De TIENNE: Andre DeTienne, IUPUI, Philosophy.

KRAVCHUK: Bob Kravchuk, Bloomington, SPEA.

VOLLRATH: Dave Vollrath, IUSB, Business and Economics.

HERBERT: OK, does anyone else, why don't we come over here, I see at least two or three faces over here that are members also.

BJORNSON: Chris Bjornson, Accounting, Southeast.

FINKBINE: Ron Finkbine, Computer Science, Southeast.

WRIGHT: Alan Wright, IU Bloomington.

PAYDAR: Nassar Paydar, Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus.

BOUKAI: Ben Boukai, IUPUI, Mathematics

HERBERT: And I want all of you to know who this young lady is here. She is critical to the operations of the UFC. I'll ask her to introduce herself.

KISH: Hi I'm Kelly Kish, from the critical operations office of the UFC. [Laughter]

HERBERT: Are there any other members sitting on this side? Why don't you introduce yourselves anyway since you're here?

WHEELER: Brad Wheeler, IU Bloomington.

KNOST: Julie Knost from the University Affirmative Action Office.

SHORTLE: Alex Shortle, IUSA President.

ZEEMERING: Eric Zeemering, Moderator of the Graduate and Professional Student Organization at IUB.

GRAVES: John Graves, Graduate Assistant for the Bloomington Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HERBERT: Thank you. Well first let me just tell you that this is going to be an exciting year. We have new trustees, a Board that is very definitely energized. I am not going to take advantage of the Presiding Officer's Business time because you are going to hear from me for more than 5 minutes shortly, so I'll just wait. But I do want you to know that this is going to be a year that will be very focused on missions, goals, accountability, and I'll say a little bit more about some of those matters during my State of the University Address. But I'm looking forward to working with all of you and I'm going to turn my time back in to the committee so that we'll have an opportunity to engage in some other discussion. So let me now turn to Bart to give you a report on the business conducted by the Agenda Committee.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

NG: Thank you. First of all I want to welcome everybody to this first meeting of the UFC for this academic year. Like President Herbert said, we've got a lot of work to do and so we look

forward to an exciting year. Let me just give you a brief report on what we talked about at the Agenda Committee meeting. For the past several weeks, I have--, both me and Ted Miller, have heard from and gotten messages from some of the smaller campuses raising concerns about the so-called Intercampus Research Fund. There seems to be, that fund seems to have been suspended pending review and the President made inquiry into it and basically we are working with the office of-- the research office, McRobbie's office I should say, and are trying to get as much information as possible. The point really here is that the President also expresses, wishes that should there be, in the future should there be any change of these funds we will be fully informed and consulted before any action is taken. So the good news is that this is being worked on. We don't anticipate problems so we'll just try to sort out the details; we'll clarify with Vice President McRobbie's office and I think that we're fairly confident that there's no interruption of support of that kind.

We also spent, actually, the majority of our time talking about the UFC's involvement in the Mission Differentiation or continuing involvement in the Mission Differentiation Project. As every one of you I'm sure knows that this past year all the faculty councils have worked very hard on writing the mission statement for each campus and the MDP team has made its report in which there is a whole series of recommendations and there's sixteen to be exact. That document really has not been considered in its entirety by the UFC. So that is part of our job in the coming month to actually vet that document in some sense. What was very useful, in the Agenda Committee we sorted out what are the recommendations that actually would go before the Trustees. There's in fact a schedule now. Ken Gros Louis shared with us a schedule on those recommendations that are going to go before the Board of Trustees; that need Trustee approval. I won't really go through it in great detail with you except, in November the Trustees will actually vote on the mission statements, all the mission statements for the various campuses. That is going to be done. The Trustees will also take up, as I understand it, the recommendation that each campus set its own admission requirements under some broad guidelines, university guidelines. Now that part, or rather the Trustees are not going to vote on individual specifics of admission criteria but rather the policy that each campus be allowed to set its own guidelines. And with that vote, the UFC will write a general policy, a general framework for the construction of campus specific guidelines and each campus faculty council will be asked to develop these guidelines. So that is the part that will require work on our part.

It was also agreed that recommendation number 9, there were a lot of comments, we have heard a lot of concerns and comments about the implications of that recommendation as to how it would impact the nature of research on the smaller campuses and the discussion was very useful and it was agreed that we will in fact try to pick up the recommendation and try to suggest alternate wordings to clarify the meaning of that recommendation. So, as I said, that discussion was extremely useful, at least it was quite clear to the Agenda Committee what part of that report would need our direct input and what part of it is really for information purposes and also specifically which recommendation would be voted on by the Trustees.

We will be searching for the Dean of the Graduate School, there are names already being forwarded by both the Bloomington campus and the Indianapolis campus and we have asked the presidents from the other campuses to forward names to me so that I will in turn forward it quickly to members of the Agenda Committee and then we will come up with a pool of

possibilities for Ken to consider to be put on this search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School.

And then finally we spent about 10 to 15 minutes talking about general education and that is actually an issue that is very very complicated and I'm sure that Bill Wheeler will further comment on this. Or rather, will be taking the leadership role in this continuing discussion and I will just leave it at that, again, in the interest of time.

Now, I do want to point out to you that at least you're given... I think you're actually given the document the actual documents. The three UFC documents: U-1, U-2, U-3, all dated 2006. The first one, which is a list of all the members, is an updated list of all the members of the UFC. The second document, Circular U2, is the committee list for the UFC and then finally, the last one is a summary of all the actions that had been taken up by the UFC this past year. With that, I think that's the end of my report for Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Thank you Bart, I did notice that in haste to get into the business of the meeting I forgot to deal with item one on the agenda and that is approval of the minutes of the April 12th, 2005 meeting. That is on the website and we do need to take action on that. I recognize that some of you are new, so you may have to trust those of us who are here at the last meeting. But, is there a motion for approval of the minutes of April 12th, 2005?

HAWKINS: I move.

HERBERT: Is there a second?

MOORE: Second.

HERBERT: Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say "aye", opposed "no", minutes are adopted.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Now we come to the... I do try to move through some of these things as you'll discover. We are now at the point of question and comment period. Are there any questions or comments, any questions that you would like to direct to either Bart, Ted or me, or any comments? We'll start over here on this side and come back around.

LUDLUM FOOS: Bart you mentioned the discussion of general education. Now I don't know how much of an answer you can give to this or maybe I should be addressing the question to Bill. What should the individual campuses be doing at this point in terms of general education? Should we be already discussing this or should we be awaiting University Faculty Council action before responding to something from the UFC?

NG: I will let Bill answer that question because I think he is quite informed on that one.

WHEELER: I'm not sure that's the right way of describing it. The UFC Educational Policies Committee referred that to this Council as a discussion item for this Council to send down to all of the campuses for discussion and feedback and so at this point in time we're hoping that on the individual campuses that there is a discussion going on about general education and that responses, suggestions, criticisms, will be coming back to the Educational Policies Committee so that they can undergo revision when they come back to this Council. We never in this Council on this floor had the occasion to actually discuss it. So it might be useful perhaps if the Agenda Committee could put it on the agenda for some time before December. The UFC-EPC at its last meeting, last April, and as a result of a request of the College of Arts and Sciences on the Bloomington campus said that we would leave it in the state that it was last April until December so that campuses would have a fixed document to respond to. Some campuses have actually taken votes on that document. That wasn't what we were actually aiming for because we don't expect that proposal to be the final one that comes to this Council. So what we're really looking for more than a final action by a council is for suggestions and changes that people would like to see. That would be the most productive thing; it would be for the schools and the campuses to have discussions and then send back either directly to my co-chair Betty Jones or myself or to the Agenda Committee or by whatever means it will eventually get back to the EPC, suggestions, criticisms, praise if you find it, although I don't really expect that. But you know, again suggestions as to what changes you might like to see in it before it comes to this Council as an action item.

NG: Thank you, Bill.

HERBERT: Ted?

MILLER: It does seem to me that over and beyond the EPC document, a number of the campuses have or are working on a campus level general education program. It doesn't seem to me that there's any reason why each campus should not undertake such a thing. You'd be in very good company if you did.

HERBERT: I think there was a ...

MOORE: I have a question either for President Herbert or perhaps for Bart. This summer and more recently within the last week or so, we have received memos from Vice President McRobbie's office indicating that the central office in Bloomington would be taking on a far stronger central role in administration of research and sponsored projects. Initially it was unclear to me whether this was temporary because of the vacancy of... due to the departure of Mark Brenner in Indianapolis but the last notice that came from McRobbie's office more or less implied that this was not temporary but was a permanent change in how research and sponsored projects would be administered on all of the campuses from the central office and I wondered if you had a comment on that? Perhaps I misunderstood the nature of the memo that I read.

HERBERT: To be honest I haven't seen that memo. I was looking over at Ken to see if he's seen it.

GROS LOUIS: I've not.

NG: Actually I have seen it, I talked to my chancellor about it and I also talked to our chair of the research committee about it and it is my understanding that there is some compliance issue there. In other words, somebody will have to sign as the so-called representative of the university. I believe that it is temporary, to the best of my understanding and knowledge.

MOORE: Well did you get a copy of the thing that came out; it's been within the last couple of weeks.

NG: Yes, I have seen that.

MOORE: That's what made me think that perhaps it was going to be more permanent. I understand the temporary problem because somebody who is authorized by the university has to sign on the bottom line of grant applications. I wondered how temporary that would be.

HERBERT: I'll work on that just to get a clear handle and I'll get back to you with the appropriate response.

MOORE: But as far you know there hasn't been a change there hasn't been a change in the policy in terms of the way this is being administered?

HERBERT: That's correct, that is definitely the case. Bill?

SCHNEIDER: I'm looking at the summary of actions taken last year. A number of them as usual were done at the April meeting and I wondered if it would be appropriate to comment on... and I think most of them required Trustee action. Could you quickly report on the status of those?

NG: The status of those, sure. Just hang on, let me get to my list here. Let's see, the Review Procedures for Chancellors, I think the resolution for School of Continuing Education so far and so on, those I do not believe we need to comment on those. The Review Procedures for Chancellors has actually had its first reading, I believe at the June meeting this past year and there was one suggestion for a change of one or two words and both Dave Daleke and I believe that is acceptable. What really confused matters a little bit at that time was because a wrong version was given to the Trustees so there was some miscommunication there. But I don't see any problem. They will be acting on it, I would say in the next Trustee meeting. So that is going to go through as far as I know.

The Paid Family Leave Policy for Academic Appointees, I'm afraid I have to report, has met with a great deal of resistance and skepticism on the part of the Trustees. This will need a very substantial amount of work this year in terms of getting more data, what is the cost. The Trustees actually raised issues that are more philosophical in nature than just simply cost. So actually Ted

and I will be meeting with one of the Trustees to really sound them out as to what their real concerns are. So we need to take this up again definitely.

The Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct, I believe that was passed, as far as I know. Is that correct?

KISH: Yes.

NG: Yes, that was passed by the Trustees during the last meeting last year. The Background Check Policy was brought up for discussion. There was a rather spirited discussion in that meeting. I think it was tabled and it was going to be taken up again.

HERBERT: It was the first hearing, so it will come back.

NG: Yes, it will come back and, again, Ted and I will be talking to a member of the Board to get from them what their concerns are. I think this one, with a little bit of work, I think we can make it; we can send it back and revise it. So I'm hopeful about that. I will say the greatest challenge is with the Family Leave Policy. That will need a substantial amount of work.

HERBERT: Are there other questions, or comments?

AGENDA ITEM #5: MISSION DIFFERENTIATION

HERBERT: Hearing none, let's then move on to item 5, a discussion of the Mission Differentiation and our two co-chairs will handle that.

NG: Actually I think in this case, the mission differentiation, you will recall that again, each campus has its own mission statement. Surprise surprise, Indiana University as a whole did not have a mission statement until the Mission Differentiation Project got launched. What you have in front of you is the Indiana University mission statement. This is what we want to talk about today. Now this mission statement as I understand it has been drafted by the mission differentiation project team, is that correct Ken?

GROS LOUIS: Yes.

NG: So perhaps Ken can actually say a little about this before we start looking at this mission statement and making our comments.

GROS LOUIS: Well we went through several versions as you can imagine and a mission statement as we all know is supposed to be short and succinct. It can always be followed by value statements and things of that sort. I think the attempt here was to try to touch on the major academic issues that we have to indicate that the institution does have students, not only from Indiana but throughout the country and the world. There was an addition, fairly late, made on student services in the next clause, "outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services." The feeling being that on all of our campuses the student services are very strong. The

President had asked that in each individual mission statements, that there be some reference to our role in economic development state as well as our goal of achieving full diversity and that was added here. The “friendly, collegiate, humane set of values,” we’ve got six or seven other adjectives but we thought those three were sufficient and maybe they are more than sufficient. Maybe “collegial and humane” or “friendly and humane” or “friendly and collegial” but maybe not all three. These mission statements do get updated; I’ve had several comments from individuals indicating that it’s not always going to be the 21st century. So when the UFC is meeting 100 years from now, it will be the 22nd century, the mission statements will probably be revised between now and then. So I think 21st century is okay because its going to be that for a long time and I don’t think any of us in this room will have to worry, well maybe Alex has to worry about this 22nd century but not the rest of us. That’s the background.

NG: Ok, Ted?

MILLER: I think we all have come to understand that the individual campus mission statements, after approval by the Trustees will be sent to the Higher Education Commission for their approval.

GROS LOUIS: Right.

MILLER: Would the Higher Education Commission be interested in a mission statement for Indiana University?

GROS LOUIS: I would assume so.

HERBERT: Please?

KRAVCHUK: Are we open to comment on this?

HERBERT: Absolutely.

KRAVCHUK: I’m not generally one to nitpick, I’m usually more of a big picture kind of guy. Details aren’t my thing. It’s unusual for an accountant, I know. [Laughter]

HERBERT: We have no comment about that.

KRAVCHUK: The last phrase sort of catches me as a little bit odd however; “leadership in creative solutions for the 21st century problems while maintaining a friendly, collegial, humane set of values at every level of the institution.” It strikes me that that may be a bit redundant in the sense that the statement itself above that already articulates our values in a sense and this is really a statement of affirmation of the values that we’ve already affirmed. If they’re values then it’s an imperative that we be committed to it in other words. So that I would want to propose perhaps a little bit of a word change to make it a little bit more concrete, to exchange the words “set of values” for perhaps something like “learning environment” or something else that would be something that we could actually plant our feet on. Merely a suggestion.

HERBERT: Ken do you have any?

GROS LOUIS: Now that you mention that a lot of people have said that the two words “set of” could be replaced by some other word, you’re suggesting one, or simply dropped. “...while maintaining a friendly, collegial humane values” or “while maintaining friendly, collegial humane values at every level of the institution.” So drop the “a” before friendly and drop the “set of.” But your suggestion I think is equally valid.

HERBERT: Are there other comments or suggestions to Ken? Please.

DE TIENNE: Yes, concerning that same last clause I think that last portion of that last clause that begins with the word “why” I think we should separate it to make it a sentence on its own. Otherwise it sounds like we are doing all of these things because before it and then once we actually do other things we manage to maintain the collegial atmosphere and so on and this implies some miraculous effort. I think we should not make it simply “while maintaining” these set of values. It ought to be a set on its own. That’s one remark. Another remark concerns the beginning statement which fairly says that Indiana University is the state’s oldest and so on and then it says “and now accessible on seven other campuses.” I do like the word accessible, it’s a bit condescending and I think we should have something more inclusive. For instance, extended and now extends to seven other campuses. I think that will better reflect the nature of this one university. And one additional remark concerns the second sentence. I do not think we should say “yet also,” at the end of the third line on my sheet here: “yet also a world leader in professional medical and technological education.” I think we should say “and a world” because being grounded in the liberal arts and sciences doesn’t imply that there ought to be a contrast with also being a world leader of which would make it into a conjunction and not a contrast. I have one more suggestion on the following sentence which says “IU provides:” and then we have this list of things separated by semi colons. We could improve the syntax of it, especially-- when you read it at first it says “IU provides: broad access to students within Indiana, throughout the country and the world.” I suppose it provides to students access to our university within Indiana or is it we provide others access to our students. These students, are they within Indiana or are they from Indiana and other parts of the world? This is pretty ambiguous and I’d like this part to be rephrased. I will not attempt to do so but I think more careful wording would help.

HERBERT: Good suggestions.

BODMER: I was thinking that we’d change “broad access for students” rather than “broad access to students” it makes it a little less ambiguous.

HERBERT: So it will say “for students from Indiana,” I think the suggestion was to say “from Indiana, throughout the nation and the world.” Are there other comments or suggestions for Ken to consider? We’ll go with you on this side.

LUDLUM FOOS: I have a comment, I don’t know if it’s a suggestion or any of that, I was just so surprised to see the last part about maintaining a friendly collegial humane set of values after the individual campuses were all instructed not to put value statements in the mission statements we submitted.

HERBERT: Ken are you getting all these?

GROS LOUIS: Yes I am. I don't think I understood the point about the last clause of the previous speaker. If you can repeat that please, from your very first point.

DE TIENNE: Well the last clause says "while maintaining a friendly collegial, humane set of values," I think that statement which has to do with emphasizing that the ethical dimension ought to be stated on its own and not simply as a companion of what precedes. Because of the word "why" it sounds as though this was something we managed to do despite all of these things that we are doing and I think this was also deserving of special admiration and I think we should keep them separate to the strengthen the meaning of that last part.

HERBERT: So you're saying delete "while maintaining" so that its "IU provides a friendly, collegial, humane" something.

DE TIENNE: Yes, but we simply put a period before "while," removing the while, it would turn this to something else.

GROS LOUIS: Make a new sentence there?

DE TIENNE: Yes.

HERBERT: Are there other comments or suggestions for Ken?

MOORE: I like something that Andre said in his discussion of this last phrase of the last sentence. He reworded it to read "friendly, collegiate, humane atmosphere or environment." I think either of those might be a better choice than to repeat this values situation. For what it's worth, I think that might worth considering.

HERBERT: Other comments?

COFFIN: Just a specific suggestion on the last phrase there. Just to keep it parallel with regard to whether or not we decide it needs to continue to be there, change the comma after "problems" to a semi colon and drop "while maintaining." So that then as we are providing all these other things, we are also providing a friendly, collegial, humane set of values.

HERBERT: OK.

POMPER: I'd like to speak out against the pause. It seems to create a contrast where none is intended.

HERBERT: Yes, I think that's pretty clear

FISHER: I was just going to say that one of the issues that we frequently deal with on all of our campuses is civility and maybe this is not the place it goes and if we had a friendly, collegial,

humane atmosphere, then civility would be taken care of. And I don't have a specific suggestion about it.

MCFADDEN: As someone involved in diversity and affirmative action and others, although I don't have any concerns or quibbles about this wording, I'm not sure what a simple definition, if that's the intent, of full diversity is, or what model effort can mean. I know a lot of crafting went into this. So I'm trying to get some sense of full diversity, what that can mean in a positive way. And model effort, the particular question is this, the means by which it is achieved is the form or model that we strive to use? Model is not being used as an editorial word, is that correct? Model does not imply good or bad, it's a system?

GROS LOUIS: Is your question with the phrase "full diversity"?

MCFADDEN: Yes, Ken.

GROS LOUIS: Okay. This came up in other conversations and I'm sorry Charlie Nelms is not here to explain it. Apparently this is the, and maybe Julie can speak, but this is the current phrase being used nationally. Meaning full diversity not only in terms of ethnic origins but also in terms of sexual orientation, gender balance, all of the ways in which we are diverse. So the phrase full diversity has relatively new meaning to us for twelve to eighteen months. But it's apparently the current phrase. Julie do you have any observations?

KNOST: I think that's right. I think diversity itself was a word that was introduced when things like affirmative action came under attack to be a broader meaning like full diversity. It shifted back to issues primarily about race and ethnicity as being diversity. So full diversity was put into to reincorporate a broader definition than simply race or ethnicity.

MCFADDEN: So full is inclusive not quantity.

KNOST: Yes it's inclusive, that's what's meant.

MCFADDEN: Thank you.

KNOST: It isn't quite captured by multicultural, because again that shifts to the more ethnic basis rather than...

HERBERT: Okay, are there other suggestions?

HAWKINS: This is a very simple one. In the same long list of items there. There's a little lapse in parallel construction. I also think in that, if you go down and you say "a dynamic partnership" then you say "a model efforts." Do we really mean model efforts? Do we do lots of efforts that are models of themselves instead of a single effort? Do we have several partnerships with the state in economic development? So should it be dynamic partnerships? Might ease the lack of parallel construction...

FISHER: And model efforts?

HAWKINS: Yes. Dynamic partnerships and model efforts.

HERBERT: Others? Ken, have you got all those?

GROS LOUIS: I've got everything.

HERBERT: We will have a stronger document as a result of this.

GROS LOUIS: Let me just repeat what I have to make sure I have everything. I like in the second line changing the "accessible on" to "extended to." Does everybody agree that is the preference? Then in the fourth line instead of "yet," having "and also." And the next line...

HAWKINS: Why "also"? Also makes an add on. Isn't it and...

FISHER: "And"

GROS LOUIS: Drop the "also."

HERBERT: The proposal was to delete the other also.

HAWKINS: It weakens...

GROS LOUIS: And the next line, "broad access for students from Indiana and throughout the world." Then "dynamic partnerships", "model efforts" and then in the last thing, either having a new sentence that now starts with "while maintaining," that would be the beginning of it. Or having a semi colon after "problems," next to the last line, drop the whole maintaining and then try to get a phrase that connects with what IU provides. Then changing maybe the word values to "friendly, collegial, humane atmosphere or environment."

HERBERT: Got everything I noted. Did we miss anything?

HAWKINS: Only one thing, if you, whichever word, atmosphere or climates, environments, maybe again you want an "s". So it would be friendly, collegial, humane environments.

GROS LOUIS: Plural?

FISHER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, thank you.

HERBERT: This is very helpful. I think it's a better document. Our intent would be to submit this to the Board as it's been modified for its approval. Let me also tell you this, just so everyone is aware, I mentioned this to the Agenda Committee. What I did was to, during our retreat, I presented to the Board, all of the mission statements that were approved through the faculty

governance process and by the chancellors on each campus. I did not edit any of those. They were submitted as forwarded to me. I want you to know that based upon the feedback that I have received from throughout the university; there are only two words that have generated angst, there are some several other words I could use but the bottom line is that those two words that have caused some concern come from the mission statement that was adopted by the Bloomington Faculty Council and approved by the chancellor. The two words were “flagship campus.” [Laughter] I decided that I would go ahead and forward those, all of them including the one from Bloomington to the Board, in the belief that it was inappropriate for me to make wording changes in the document after I had sent it back. I sent these back to every campus, asked for additional changes. The only way I could feel comfortable making a change would be to send it back to the campus and ask the faculty and chancellor to make those changes. I did not do that in this case so I just want all of you to know in terms of full disclosure that I submitted to the Board everything that we were given. This would be the last document that would go to the Board. My assumption is just from our conversation that the UFC feels comfortable with this as modified so that this would also then be sent to the Board having gone through a similar process, just so everyone is aware.

I don't know how the Board is going to feel about those two words. There was some discussion about it. We gave it to them in the retreat so that it was in essence the first hearing. At the meeting in November all of them will be back on the table for final consideration along with this statement. This again so everyone is aware. I don't want anyone to be surprised. I want you to know what the rationale was for my submitting those to the Board in the fashion that we did. I don't know whether we need to take a formal vote on this. Should we do that? Oh at the next meeting. Ok. Any other discussions about this? Let me turn it back over to you Bart. Is there anything else?

AGENDA ITEM #6: DISCUSSION OF THE UFC FINANCES AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE

NG: There is one more on the discussion on the UFC Finance and Facility Committee. Bob Kravchuk would you like to...

KRAVCHUK: Yes, thank you Bart. In thinking about how best to make use of the expertise on the Finance and Facilities Committee and at the same time actually give us something to do, Ben Boukai and I were thinking that the best way to be useful would be to serve as a conduit for information between this body and the university administration. So we'd like to get your suggestions and get a sense of the Council today.

This is not a resolution we're proposing at this point but merely talking points. Our proposal would be to change the name and the role of the Finance and Facilities Committee into a fully functioning University Budgetary Affairs Committee which would work in close cooperation with the Chief Financial Officer of the university to facilitate lines of communication about fiscal affairs between UA and the UFC. This appeared to be a good time to think about doing this, in that this body really doesn't have consistent and clear information about university fiscal affairs, especially in the current situation where for years now the university has been subject cuts from the state. We are all of us in our various academic units, subject to increasing overhead charges

whether in the form of campus assessments or the university tax which places a burden. And the fact that wherever you go in the university we find faculty demanding greater accountability for the funds which might otherwise be used in the units in fulfillment of their academic mission. We would anticipate some form of, even semi-formal, perhaps, budget conferences or meetings with the university vice presidents, perhaps the campus chancellors to the extent that they have issues they would want to bring to the attention of the UFC, in much the same format in the spirit of collegiality that currently exists for instance on the IU Bloomington campus where there is a fairly active Budgetary Affairs Committee that meets frequently with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for budget and financial planning. And once again, this is to serve as a conduit for information as well as serve as a sounding board for the university administration to the extent that they would find that to be useful. We would hope that we could get started soon, perhaps as early as this spring and that this body would empower the committee to report findings and make recommendations both to the UFC and to the university administration which in its judgment would be critical to meeting the academic mission of the university and to invest in building critical capacity for the future. So with that I would like to hear your comments or suggestions, both here and perhaps by email. So my co-chair is Ben Boukai who is sitting against the far wall, based in Indianapolis and we would both like to get a sense of what you're all thinking about this and how we might make ourselves most useful and as I said, also take advantage of the expertise that we have on the committee. Thank you. [Side A, Tape 1 Ended, some conversation lost]

HERBERT: ...comments first and then see if any of the members of the Council have any questions or comments.

MILLER: Well I'll just say that this is really the culmination of a sense of frustration. I'll use that word, maybe it's not the best word but a sense of frustration on the part of the faculty over a number of year; really kind of sitting around and not thinking that they really understood what the university administration was up to from a budgetary point of view. At various times we've had Vice President Palmer come and deliver reports to us and I think they've been reports that have lasted for may be 15 – 20 minutes or so and we've all kind of gone away and in the aftermath I think we've all kind of wondered, "what did we actually learn from this report," and I think this is really an effort to develop a better set of information that will inform us all and ... I just think its something whose time probably has come.

HERBERT: Other questions or comments?

D. HOYT: I just wondered in paragraph four, in that second sentence, I don't know if I understand it but the university BAC that would be this new organization?

NG: Yes.

D. HOYT: Okay, I'm alright then, I just read that, thank you.

HERBERT: Others?

MOORE: Having served on both the Finance and Facilities Committee and wondering what in

the world that committee did, just from the name of it, but also having been active on the Indianapolis campus BAC and my own school's, I would commend the co-chairs that this is certainly something whose time has come. I think that given the financial fiscal realities, the challenges that we're going to be facing not for the next two years but predictably for some time to come, accountability at all levels in terms of budget and how money is spent, is one of the things that we really need to focus on. I also think that even though there may be a lot of the charges that go on, that we can't do much about, a better understanding of communications and knowledge between the administration and the faculty would certainly help ease some of the criticisms that I hear on our campus from various individuals about why is all this money going to Bloomington, which is drastically unfair but that's still the local perception. So, in any case, from my personal perspective I would strongly endorse this. I certainly would feel better about spending my time serving on this committee if I had the feeling that the committee really had the opportunity to accomplish something.

HERBERT: Over here and then we'll come on down the road.

WIGGINS: I've never served on this committee so I'm not quite sure what it's done in the past but I wonder about facilities aspect of it Bob. That doesn't seem to be addressed in here, is that something that's going to pass to another committee or do we do anything with the facilities?

KRAVCHUK: I don't know, I've been on the committee for a year and we haven't really talked about anything that resembles a building. So it's hard to know, I mean, to the extent that a capital program would involve expenditures sure we'd certainly want to be informed about that and try to inform the university administration about what the faculty might be thinking.

The way it works in Bloomington, I'm sure it works the same way at IUPUI you know it's a two way street of communication. A sounding board, a confidant, there's lots of things that the co-chairs of the BAC in Bloomington discuss with Ken that never ever again sees the light of day. Sometimes we say gee that's really a great idea and sometimes we'll say it's really a dumb idea, sometimes he tells us "that's a great idea or that's a dumb idea" and we keep it to ourselves and try to do the best we can. We also carry things back to the larger faculty council in Bloomington. We would anticipate carrying things back to this body and providing sort of a faculty perspective on things that the university administration might be proposing.

This is also good for the university administration for that matter. It's a way of getting everybody's fingerprints on something and maybe having a chance to influence it as it's in formative stage. I really don't see anything but benefits for doing this but it's my idea so I'm just...

HERBERT: Okay we have I think three other hands coming down to this row so, but I saw these down here first so...

LUDLUM FOOS: Am I the next one? I'd like to speak in favor of this from the point of view of the regional campuses, those of us who are further from the centers of the money. It's sometimes extremely frustrating to have really no idea of how the university budget process works and we know what we'd like to see happen and it goes off campus into a black hole. And so even just to

have a better understanding on the regional campuses of how all these pieces fit together, I think will be very helpful.

HERBERT: Bill?

SCHNEIDER: Following up on that, I think that one additional responsibility you might include in a revised statement of the committee's purpose is to provide advice to regional campuses that don't have quite as strong or developed Budgetary Affairs Committees as IUPUI and IU Bloomington. I know on our campus, our campus committee provides that advice to the schools and so it would analogous and I think it would be helpful.

The second thing is to make a follow up about what you said Bob about this advisory capacity, and if the president is amendable to or his designates vice presidents are amendable to get advice, confidential or otherwise from this committee, I think it would also be useful as something that the experience on the two big campuses have shown is worth trying.

HERBERT: Ok. Yes?

BOBAY: I've chaired this committee more than once in the past and so I understand, I think, pretty fully the frustration of trying to figure out what it is that we can do that would really be meaningful. I think we've made some small starts in the past that haven't really carried on. We have had connections with Vice President Palmer that some years were actually fairly detailed on specific issues or broader but then it didn't sort of become part of the culture and it didn't carry on. One of the problems that she talked to us about a lot in the past was a timing problem. It was this issue of building the budget and changing so fast and being in such a short time frame that getting advice and input sometimes is just simply not possible. I guess my point I just wanted to make here was that there are lots of other points of contact that such a committee can have with the administration other than the actual budget building process which is very intense and time constrained. There's the whole rest of the year and there's a lot of other issues that we could find meaningful ways to interact. So I'd like to speak in favor of this.

DAVILA: What are the other meaningful ways to interact besides the ones that are described here?

BOBAY: Well, the actual building of the budget, I'll put that aside. There are lots of other financial issues and concerns that happen throughout the year that aren't related to the actual building of the budget.

HERBERT: Okay, Mary.

FISHER: Yes, the one thing that I would like to see this body, in its new configuration, do is: several years ago the 18/20 plan was put in place to finance that program and the schools were taxed 20 percent of that cost of each person who retires for those 5 years and I have been asking desperately for years for us to give an evaluation of the impact of that on schools and their budgets and also the entire financing process of the 18/20, what is our current process with that, is that tax continued to be needed or not. We have a tendency, taxes come but they never go, we

could evaluate whether or not that tax continues to be needed and I think it would be beneficial because our schools are suffering under that burden.

HERBERT: Let me just... I'm sorry.

HAWKINS: I just have a very brief statement and it's in a different vein. Indiana University has a long tradition of shared governance and if this doesn't do anything else it puts principal into practice of the one university level, it makes all of us sharing in the governance of the financial issues that affect our work as universities. I think the principal of the practice is really a great movement.

HERBERT: Let me just tell you that co-chairs and I did have a brief conversation about this point. It's one that I'm definitely open to talking about. We need to differentiate in this what happens on the reference to the taxes. It's important to differentiate between the campuses and the central administration. I do have a problem... I have no problems with regard to the exchange of information, sharing some of that. I do have more of a problem in the context where each of the vice presidents has to sit before a committee and deal with their budgets.

Let me just tell you that at the university level and I think having some conversations about this will be helpful. I have less discretionary money to allocate than any of the regional campus chancellors. As a matter of fact, when I came here, I was stunned that the president has such limited resources to allocate to address university missions. So what the committee is going to find is that you'll end up sitting down and talking about-- once we deal with raises for faculty and staff-- this year I had less than a million dollars, much less than a million dollars to allocate among all of the university level units of the institution. As the committee sits down to take a look at the university level in terms of utilization of funds, there isn't a whole lot of money that we're talking about and so what I have to try to do is to figure out where the greatest priorities are. So I'm giving vice presidents thirty or forty thousand here, a hundred thousand here. I'm not sure that that's proven a utilization of time as is talking about the big picture of the institution. So if that's what we're talking about I think it's a different kind of story. So, I welcome the opportunity of talking with the-- before this comes back to you, talking with the chairs of the committee and also with the co-chairs. I think that we really do need to flesh this out a little bit more to be very clear as to what we're talking about.

I definitely think its important that you have a clear sense as to what the budget situation is and frankly one of the things we've got to do, and we're going to start that this year, is thinking more in a multi-year context which I think is of critical importance. We're going to talk about enterprise planning; we've got to be clear. I asked for a review of our bond and debt capacity, we've never done that and what we know is that we have a capacity for \$400 million of bonds to build facilities. So now we're coming back and this is where the facilities part comes on. What I said is that the priorities have to be academic space first, parking second and housing third. Now, the Board has not taken action on that but I can tell you that there are very strong feelings on the Board that we've got to deal with those first two. I leave housing in there because there may be a unique set of circumstances. The question is, which buildings are going to be given the highest priority in the context of all the campuses. There has to be a rationale for that that is strategic from the context of what we're trying to do as an institution. So, there are some

very fundamental questions that we're going to have to deal with and I welcome the opportunity of engaging in that conversation. What I think you'll find frustrating is sitting down and dealing with some of the peanuts that frankly I don't really want to have to deal with. So, we'll definitely have those conversations.

COFFIN: One thing that I would also like to ask the committee to take a look at is that the conversation so far in what I'm reading seems to focus on one side of the budget, which is the expenditure side of the budget. But an equally important part of the budgeting process has to do with the revenue side. So I think it would be extremely important for the committee to incorporate in its sort of mission for itself, looking at the university's tuition policy and in particular the long run tuition policy for the university because we all know that one of the things that has happened is that tuition has been increased much faster than prices in general. So then in real terms, student tuitions have doubled over the last 25 years. And that I think has real implications about the future of higher education, particularly public higher education.

HERBERT: Let me just tell you that I would challenge that statistic. As we've taken a look at - there's an index for higher education and it is not necessarily...

COFFIN: People who pay the tuition are dealing with consumer prices and adjusted for the consumer price index, which again, is people who are paying tuition, it's doubled in real terms.

HERBERT: A problem with that is that the cost structure for higher education is different from what's reflected in the CPI. So that...

COFFIN: I understand that.

HERBERT: And ultimately, and I can tell you that we are going to be looking at tuition, we're going to be dealing with some strategic planning about probable tuition increases and everyone has to understand that while philosophically I think most of us would want to take what you've posited into account. The reality is that the state, and I'll make the observation in 15 minutes, the state has reduced its funding to higher education as a percentage of the total state budget and in our case, the actual budget. And so the question is, do we go ahead continue to cut resources or do we hold our own through a combination of tuition and private giving. So these are major challenges and I think that we clearly need to engage in some of those conversations.

COFFIN: My point is that I think it should be part of this committee's charge as well as the expenditure side.

HERBERT: Ok. Are there any other items that need to come before the Council?

LUDLUM FOOS: I've heard pretty much all positive comments; can we expect to see a proposal for a first reading this semester, next meeting, do you have a time frame for this?

KRAVCHUK: Yes and no. I hope for this semester but I can't pin it down quite yet. I need to have conversations with the co-chairs and I think that given the nature of the discussion and some of the comments that the President has made, we'll probably need to have a conversation

with him as well about what makes sense. What we're really trying to do here is to come up with a procedure that would make sense for everybody.

HERBERT: And add value.

KRAVCHUK: I'm sorry?

HERBERT: And add value.

KRAVCHUK: And add value indeed.

HERBERT: Are there any other items to come before the Council? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 2:48 pm.