

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
March 1, 2011
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS: Randy Arnold, Robert Arno, Elizabeth Boling, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Jennifer Chaffin, Andrea Ciccarelli, Angela Courtney, Nick D'Amico, Gregory Demas, Carrie Docherty, Erika Dowell, David Estell, Tony Fargo, Tom Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Matt Guterl, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manning, Robert Noel, Mary Popp, Diane Reilly, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Marla Sandys, Pnina Shachaf, Sarita Soni, Sonya Stephens, Joey Tartell, Herb Terry, Maxine Watson, Sue Whiston, Tony White, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Bielasiak, Arthur Bradley, Joyce Byrer, Michael Coleman, Frank Di Silvestro, Janice Duchene, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Donald Gjerdingen, Karen Hanson, Neil Keltly, Eugene McGregor, Jane McLeod, Sherri Michaels, Michael Ogden, Paul Purdom, Elizabeth Raff, Ranu Samantrai, Sima Setayeshgar, Richard Shockley, Geoff Sprinkle, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Neil Theobald,

GUESTS: John Applegate (EVPURAPP), Alan Bender (Biology), Megan Bottoms (HESA), John Carini (Physics), Roland Coté (Registrar), David Daleke (Associate Dean, UGS), Katie Dawson (IDS), Craig Dethloff (FCO), Jocelyn Karlan (FCO), Jon Riviere (HESA), Eric Williams (HESA)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

February 15, 2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/02.15.11.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Russell O. Salmon and Donald J. Ludwig

Russell O. Salmon: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B30-2011.pdf>

Donald J. Ludwig: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B31-2011.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

5. Request for Exemption from the IU Bloomington General Education Requirements (20 minutes)

(Professor Sonya Stephens, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Professor Munirpallam Venkataramanan, co-Chair of the General Education Committee) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B32-2011.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/RNBSNPlan.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/RNBSNConsort.pdf>

6. IU Bloomington General Education Committee Recommendation on the AAC&U Liberal Education & America's Promise (LEAP) Initiative (30 minutes)
(Professor Sonya Stephens, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Professor Munirpallam Venkataramanan, co-Chair of the General Education Committee) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U4-2011.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/GECLEAP.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/EPCLEAP.pdf>

7. Merger, Reorganization and Elimination Policy Reform (30 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/contingencyPlanningPolicy.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY11/MREProp.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DOWELL: Extra time for people to get settled. Welcome everybody. As you've noticed, Karen is not here. She's out of town and sends her regrets. But we have, I think, both Vice Provosts with us in various capacities on the agenda. So although we aren't making them run the meeting we do have at least some serious representation from Karen's corner. Let's start out with the approval of the minutes. Do we have any corrections or other emendations to the minutes, Herb?

TERRY: I have a question about the minutes, first. My understanding of the minutes was that they were supposed to be a transcript of what happened here. With all of the warts, and all of that sort of thing, things where we misspeak, and that sort of...

DOWELL: Mmhm

TERRY: But I've noticed that Tom condenses the memorial resolutions when he's here. But it looks like the entire resolution is cut and pasted into the minutes.

DETHLOFF: That's correct.

TERRY: Okay, can you explain why? Why is it not what I thought it was, a summary of what we do or a verbatim transcript of what we do?

DETHLOFF: It's actually to honor those for whom we have the memorials [indistinct] in the records of the minutes.

TERRY: The circular remains – might I suggest that –

DETHLOFF: – the circular remains and we include it.

TERRY: Might I suggest that I sort of prefer that we somewhere provide a transcript of what's said and then you've got editor's notes elsewhere in here, you insert as an editor's note the reference to the whole resolution or something.

DETHLOFF: It's something that we can consider, yeah.

TERRY: Yeah, that's all I would ask is that it be considered. We had this debate some years ago when people were allowed to sort of clean up their remarks [laughter] and eliminate mistakes that they had made and I remember the outcome then was that this was supposed to be a summary of what was said here, verbatim. It can be decided later.

DETHLOFF: Well, I mean we always clean up to some degree and that's simply because linguistically the amount of mistakes that we make when we discourse with one another does not make for a smooth read or even a coherent read. I don't think anybody would go so far as to say that to include all "umm"s and "gonna"s and "wanna"s is something that we would want to do. And in actual transcription practice, those things are omitted because they are simply too hard to distinguish from things like "going to" and "want to" and so these are things that we've incorporated.

TERRY: I would just ask the Agenda Committee to consider what it thinks should be done with the memorial resolutions and I was there in the minutes and I have five small corrections, I don't they're worth boring you with. They're instances where I am pretty sure that the word that has been transcribed is not what the individual involved said. I don't think that one of our colleagues indicated that Brad's email, Brad's database, should be used for "fund-rating". I suspect they meant fund-raising. And it's things like that. [Laughter] It could be used for fund-rating, but like I said...And then a bunch of smaller stuff, typos and corrections which I would just like to give to Craig and ask that they be incorporated.

DOWELL: Fair enough. Any other comments on the minutes? All right, can we move for approval, a motion? So moved. Second? All right. All in favor? [Aye]

DOWELL: All right, thank you. Now we have two memorial resolutions. Tom?

GIERYN: The abbreviated version, then. [laughter]

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR RUSSELL O. SALMON AND DONALD J. LUDWIG

Donald J. Ludwig was born in 1914 on the family farm in Amherst, Ohio, and passed away in 2009 in Bloomington, Indiana at age ninety-five, having lived a full and productive life in the service of others. Donald Ludwig graduated from Amherst High School as Salutatorian in 1931 and was a member of the football, baseball and track teams. He attended Oberlin College, lettering in football and baseball, and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1935. In 1939, he enrolled in Teachers College, Columbia University in New York City, where he earned a Master of Arts degree in Health and Physical Education in 1941.

Donald Ludwig returned to his hometown in 1941 as a mathematics and physical education teacher at Amherst High School and also served as athletic director and head football coach prior to being drafted into the Army Air Corps in 1942. He served in Australia and the Philippines as a Sergeant Major; he was one of the last to leave the Pacific Theatre upon being discharged in 1946. He then returned to Amherst High School where he taught until 1949.

In 1949, Donald Ludwig enrolled in the doctoral program of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) at Indiana University. He completed the doctoral degree in 1953 and was appointed to the faculty as an assistant professor in the Department of Health and Safety (now Applied Health Science). Dr. Ludwig was promoted to Associate Professor in 1959 and Professor in 1966. In 1970 he was appointed chairperson of the department. Throughout his nine years as chair Ludwig played a major role in the department's growth and continued development into one of the most respected and prestigious programs of its type in the nation.

After stepping down as chair at age sixty-five, Professor Ludwig continued to teach and direct doctoral dissertations until retirement in 1984. It is a testament not only to Dr. Ludwig's intellectual capacity and well-respected work ethic, but also to his deep commitment to student engagement and intellectual inquiry that during his thirty-one years on the faculty he chaired ninety doctoral dissertation committees and served as a member of 160 more.

As an academic, Dr. Ludwig was recognized as an authority in the organization and administration of school health programs and in the areas of first aid, civil defense, and emergency health care. He was recognized for his work in expanding the body of information and providing expert advice to scholars and researchers through his teaching and writing. He served as a consultant to and evaluator of academic programs in health and safety at Michigan

State, North Carolina State, Tennessee, Louisiana State and Florida State Universities. In 1977, the American Medical Association presented him with the School Bell Award for his six consecutive years of service as a consultant to the Conference on Physicians and Schools.

While at Indiana University, Donald Ludwig received the Amoco Foundation Outstanding Teacher Award at IU's Founders Day ceremonies in 1969. In 1980 he received a Citation of Honor from the national professional health science honorary society, Eta Sigma Gamma, in recognition of his role as an "esteemed teacher and national leader in health education." He also received the Leadership Award from the Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation; was a Fellow in the American School Health Association, and a Service Key recipient from Alpha Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

Professional service included serving as president of the Monroe County Board of Health from 1971 to 1984, and the Indiana University representative to the board of the Public Health Nursing Association from 1959 to 1984. He was also a member of the state of Indiana Senior Games Advisory Committee for eight years, conducting track and golf events for senior citizens. As a certified USA Track & Field official, Don Ludwig worked as a timer at IU track and field and cross country meets as well as Big Ten Championships, the 1987 Pan Am Games, the 1988 Olympic Trials, and numerous Indiana High School State track and field meets. In 1983 he was recipient of the first IU Outstanding Track Official Award from the Athletic Department. He also served for over two decades as an NCAA football statistician at home games.

As a 1964 graduate of the School of HPER, first as a student and later as a professional colleague, I can personally attest to impact that Dr. Ludwig had on all he touched. He was a man with a great capacity for work, a gentle sense of humor and practical sensibilities. He loved his family, his students, his profession, his country and his university. Through this love he gave his very best daily in the service of others. Donald J. Ludwig was the genuine article; a proud member of the Greatest Generation.

Our colleague Russell O. Salmon, Associate Professor Emeritus of Spanish, died on May 28, 2009 in Bloomington. Born in Port Jervis, NY, Salmon was a graduate of Williams College (BA 1956, Spanish), the Middlebury Graduate Language School (MA 1962, Spanish) and Columbia University (PhD 1969, Spanish and Latin American Studies). He began teaching in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese as a Lecturer in 1967 and as an Assistant Professor in 1969; he was tenured and promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in 1975. Although he retired in 1998, Professor Salmon remained active in research, teaching, and service—to his department, the Honors College, and the Individualized Major Program. Among his other post-retirement activities was a service-learning course on Mexico for the Collins Living-Learning

Center in which his students traveled to Guanajuato and worked as volunteers in an optometry clinic.

Salmon's strong background in history and Latin American Studies brought a new dimension to the study of literature in the department in the 1970s, and he was responsible for what nowadays would be regarded as an interdisciplinary and cultural studies approach to teaching Spanish American literature. His course on the *caudillo* was innovative and highly popular among undergraduate students, and it became the template for a series in the department's core curriculum.

Professor Salmon's cross-disciplinary and transnational research and teaching interests centered foremost on the Southern Cone and Central America, and undoubtedly were inspired by the Mexican writer Andrés Blythe, his former Columbia professor. Chile was Salmon's initial and life-long research focus, and he published articles on Alberto Blest Gana, Jotabeche, Joaquín Edwards Bello, and Pablo Neruda, as well as the Argentine Domingo Sarmiento. Throughout his career, Salmon was interested in the socio-political themes of the novel and poetry, and his early writings examined the *roto* (poor Chilean urban class), the *pueblo*, and the *caudillo*. Later on, he turned his attention to Nicaragua and the poetry of Ernesto Cardenal. Shortly after his retirement in 1998, he produced a special commemorative edition of Cardenal's *Gethsemani, KY*, which he presented to Cardenal at the Feria Internacional del Libro in San Juan, PR on the occasion of the poet's seventy-fifth birthday. Salmon translated the poems into English and edited the beautifully handcrafted volume with Lilly Library conservator James Canary. He also edited a bilingual volume of Cardenal's poetry, titled *Golden UFOs/Los OVNIS de oro*.

Russ was a gifted classroom teacher who made the study of literature and culture always exciting and relevant to issues of the day. Joy Logan, a former student and currently a professor at the University of Hawaii, writes: "I always admired Russ's social consciousness and activism and was so appreciative of his grounding our studies of literature in the realities of contemporary Latin America. He was such a good role model for us in this sense, and over the years, as I have grown in my own career, I have tried to keep the example he set for us close to heart. I know that it has made a difference in the way I approach any class I give on Latin America and I will always be very grateful to Russ for this."

Teaching across the Spanish American and Latin American Studies curricula, Professor Salmon directed countless independent readings on a range of topics, including the fantastic in Argentine literature, María Luisa Bombal, Mayan culture, German émigré literature in Latin America, and ethnographies on Mexico. He was a major contributor to the department's

honors program, chairing numerous theses on Mexican, Chilean, Guatemalan, and other national literatures. At the graduate level, he also left a significant legacy; former student Eduardo González, now a professor at John Hopkins University, offers an assessment of Professor Salmon that illustrates the impact of his mentor: “. . . he will remain in my memory as a devoted scholar and a man of great integrity and subtle charisma.”

Following in the footsteps of his colleague and friend Merle E. Simmons, Russ Salmon devoted many summers to overseeing IU study abroad programs in Mexico for our undergraduates, and he spent the academic year 1983-84 in Madrid as the study abroad program director. Over his career, he directed twenty-two study abroad programs for IU and the CIC. His passion for the overseas study experience resulted in the Spanish Language Workshop for Teachers that he directed for thirteen summers in San Luis, Potosí, Mexico. In 1995, the Indiana chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese bestowed upon him the Postsecondary-Level Teacher of the Year Award. Four years later, in 1999, he received the campus-wide Teaching Excellence Recognition Award for his many contributions to graduate and undergraduate education.

At one time or another in his career, Salmon held nearly all of the administrative positions in the department. He was Acting Chair whenever long-time Chair Merle Simmons was out of town or on leave, and he directed the large graduate and undergraduate programs several times, in addition to the department's Honors program. Salmon was altruistic in his approach to service, as he was when he took on the Directorship of the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies in 1988, a position that he held for seven years. It is difficult to know how Salmon managed to find time to serve on so many departmental, college and university committees. The list is long and includes elected positions on the University Graduate Council and Bloomington Faculty Council, as well as membership on advisory boards for the William H. Mathers Museum, the Indiana Center for Global Change and World Peace, and the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies. Because of his strong dedication to undergraduate learning, combined with his incredibly mellifluous radio-announcer voice, he was repeatedly asked to give keynote addresses and workshops for campus events on behalf of alumni and incoming freshman. His selfless service led, in 1987, to Salmon receiving Indiana University's Outstanding Service Award.

Salmon's community service was a mainstay of his professional and personal life. He worked tirelessly on behalf of Inter-American projects, such as the Bloomington Sister Cities International: Bloomington-Posoltega, Nicaragua and its offshoot Bloomington-Santa Clara, Cuba; Witness for Peace Elections in Nicaragua (he was one of 112 delegates selected from a nationwide pool to monitor the election); the 10th Pan American Games (Indianapolis); and the

Central American Forum. Much of his time was dedicated to lectures and workshops for church organizations. In addition to his teaching and service commitments, Salmon was a devoted swimmer who religiously reserved the lunch hour to swim. He swam competitively in the U.S. Master Swimmers Organization for over forty years and won third place in his age group at the International Senior World Games in Orlando, FL in 2003.

Russell Salmon is survived by his wife, Kate; his children, Russell C., Scott, and Sarah; and grandchildren Kiernan, Kippy, and Katie.

DOWELL: Please stand for a moment of silence. [Observed] Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: Okay, moving on to Agenda Committee Business. I don't have great, monumental things to report here, but just a few housekeeping items.

We did have an interesting email come in from an official of the Residence Halls Association. They're analyzing some results of a survey they took last year about their cable package and what cable television stations are included in it. And evidentially there was some question about what channels would you like, or what channels could you do without and the top channel that the residents thought they could live without was C-SPAN2. So they're asking us if there are any sort of curricular issues involved in perhaps C-SPAN2 disappearing from the campus cable package. That's about all I know about this and I would be happy to give any of you who have opinions about it the contact information for the young woman in the Residence Halls Association who so kindly asked us to comment on this. So if any of you know of – particularly people in Telecommunications, I suppose or others in Political Science perhaps – might have some sort of use for C-SPAN2 in their teaching and expect students to have it. I expect that many students have really great cable packages off campus and they probably even have C-SPAN3, but so, small thing, don't really know what to do with it and so I'm throwing it out there and we'll see if we can garner some response for this young woman.

I want to thank everyone who commented on the early retirement proposal plan that was circulated at the last meeting and that's been floating around campus in the interim. I know that Herb and Roger, the chairs of our Budgetary Affairs Committee, have compiled comments and forwarded them to Neil Theobald and Dan Rives, I think, for consideration in the final outlines of that plan. And progress is proceeding on the final ballots so I think we'll see that coming together so that we can all vote for Council and President and so forth for next year. And we won't announce who's volunteered to be on the ballot yet I don't think. Is it finalized? Shall I? They're here. At any rate Carolyn Calloway-Thomas has agreed to run for President and so has Diane Henshel. And we'll see. I thank you both, greatly, for being willing to put

yourselves forward that way and take over. Let's see. That's all I really had. Other things are going on in the Agenda Committee but there isn't a lot to report at this point. So, are there any questions or comments for me? Or for, I don't know, Maria, anybody else in the room? We don't have our, you know, oracle of the administration here today so...Herb?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

TERRY: I just want to add my thanks since I got all of your emails on the Early Retirement Plan and also [indistinct comment] that it's not too late if you have heard anything else if you act really quickly. Roger and I will be meeting with Neil tomorrow and we have maybe four or five, some of them, I think, important comments that have come in at the last minute. I can tell you that I got an email back from Neil indicating that this was a good effort, that some things had come up that they hadn't thought through or hadn't anticipated and that there would be some thought given to what we had sent before the thing is forwarded to President McRobbie so it was worth our time, I think. And I should say we heard not just from faculty but we heard from some staff. We heard from most of the campuses. I was about to say that we didn't hear from the School of Medicine but we got an email from somebody in the School of Medicine today. So again please, I think we have an opportunity to identify things that haven't been thought of and get them thought of in advance. We have a great start for an FAQ page or something. And so if any of you are sitting on any comments or questions, send them quickly to me and I'll get them to Neil tomorrow.

DOWELL: Thanks, Herb. Good, let's go on to Item 5 then on the agenda, Request for Exemption from the IU Bloomington General Education Requirements.

AGENDA ITEM 5: REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM THE IU BLOOMINGTON GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

DOWELL: Sonya, would you like to introduce this?

STEPHENS: Sure, thank you. We received a request over a year ago now, a statement of concern let's say, from the School of Nursing on the Bloomington campus who particularly had concerns about their all-online degree. And although the documents that you've received, particularly the request for exemption, makes reference to a recent decision by the General Education Committee to require six credits on this campus, in fact all of the requirements are going to be problematic for these students since they are not in residence at all and the Bloomington campus does not offer all of these courses online. And so we couldn't work out how on earth these students who are online only and not physically present on this campus could participate in our General Education Curriculum.

You've received both the one page request for example that was sent to the General Education Committee. You've also received the student plan which sets out what the requirements for the degree as a whole are and the statement here about how the program works, the R.N. to B.S.N. Consortium. This is a Consortium degree. It's offered system-wide. This does, however, appear as a Bloomington degree for these students; that we have found out since arriving at the meeting. [laughter] It is, I think, of the most important things for you to know is that this is important for the state and it's important – one of the reasons it was offered – is being offered on the Bloomington campus is because the ICHE and the School of Nursing at Indianapolis was very concerned about opportunities for those students who graduate from Ivy Tech with an ASM and this why this degree is being developed. And so it provides a service, high quality online education in nursing for students statewide. The Gen Ed Committee received these requests, considered them at great length, there was a discussion about it at the Gen Ed Committee and in the subsequent ballot it was approved with an overwhelming majority. We had more members of the Gen Ed Committee voting in this ballot than we've ever had before and there was a huge majority that voted to support this exemption. Now I should explain that this is the first exemption we've seen and we hope it will be the only exemption we see from the Bloomington Gen Ed Requirements. The intention was that the Bloomington Gen Ed Requirements should be for all students seeking their first bachelor's degree at IU Bloomington. We have seen requests for exceptions to certain parts of the requirement. We've seen one of those and that requires only the approval of the Bloomington General Education Committee. Request for exemption from the Gen Ed Requirements, however, require not only approval by the Gen Ed Committee, but by this Council. So we're bringing this to you now as an item for action since the students need to know.

DOWELL: Bob?

ARNOVE: So is there no residential requirement for the entire program?

STEPHENS: No.

ARNOVE: No face-to-face interaction?

STEPHENS: Well, there it's a kind of a blended method so they do have face-to-face interaction. They teach [indistinct] there is a technological space, there are opportunities for students to interact with faculty. But they don't come on to campus for classes.

ARNOVE: What reasons would you give for the residential requirement? Generally, it's considered to have a value over and above the content of the instruction.

STEPHENS: So the six credit residential requirement is a new requirement. It was passed only in the fall of this academic year. It was the result of long deliberations by a task force set up by the

Gen Ed Committee to look specifically at issues of transfer. And the Transfer Task Force produced a report which recommended to the Gen Ed Committee that because we wanted to create opportunities for students transferring in, that we should be very open to the transfer of a significant number of credits but because the Bloomington campus, they felt, offered unparalleled opportunities to students to explore a range of disciplines and in ways that may be different from those available to them at other campuses or at Ivy Tech, they wanted them to have the opportunity to experience Bloomington General Education wherever they came from. And so this was seen as a kind of compromise on the one hand but a recognition that we needed to be open to transferability of credits across the state and from out of state but we really felt that the Bloomington experience is an experience and that six credits was a kind of small number to expect of any student coming onto this campus to acculturate them into the Bloomington way of doing things and approach to higher education.

DOWELL: Randy?

ARNOLD: Do they still meet all the Gen Ed course requirements? It's just the residence requirement that they're not meeting –

STEPHENS: – Right. –

ARNOLD: – for their program?

STEPHENS: In this particular one?

ARNOLD: Yeah.

STEPHENS: Right, they don't, and so if you look at the program plan the significant differences here are that the students don't necessarily have any world languages, world cultures or overseas study. The mathematical requirement is not in here and pretty much everything else is because it's six credits of Social-Historical, six credits of science, English Composition, and that's it. But the shared goals are not in here either of course, but the shared goals are recommended rather than required.

DOWELL: Herb?

TERRY: I truly don't know where I will come out on this, but I was active in this Council for many years that it took us to get Gen Ed accomplished. I repeatedly told the Trustees that we were doing what they asked us to do which was that – they thought – actually I think many of them thought – there should be something in common with an IU degree no matter what campus it was granted by and we eventually talked them into the proposition that there should be something in common with every degree at each campus. So that there should be something the everybody who came out of Indiana University Bloomington with a degree that at the top

said “Indiana University Bloomington campus” had that in common and then that was what this Council worked very hard to produce for the Trustees and there were lots of opportunities for all of the schools that had some trouble with that to speak up and they found ways to accommodate it. What strikes me as unique about this is that although we seem to have determined that this is a degree awarded by the Bloomington campus, in fact it appears to be more a system-wide degree. This is the same thing no matter which campus you run it through. Is that correct?

STEPHENS: That’s exactly right and but because it is a degree offered on the Bloomington campus it makes these students subject...

TERRY: Yeah.

STEPHENS: ...to Bloomington Gen Ed requirements.

TERRY: I think, ultimately, that may be the dilemma and the direction in which, who knows, the New Academic Task Force may take us. We may start issuing core school degrees or something. That’s not inconceivable. We may have other reasons for wanting system-wide degrees in which case I would assume the UFC or something like that would look at whether they wanted General Education requirements associated with those degrees. This is a remarkably constrained view of General Education. While it has the same categories as our General Ed plan, with a couple of exceptions such as foreign language or whatever, when you get right down to it the School of Nursing does what many other schools wanted to do and we said they couldn’t.

STEPHENS: Right.

TERRY: They determine here which courses are – as far as they are concerned – approved for General Ed and the student, at best, has nine courses that they might choose that don’t seem to be subject to the approval of the School of Nursing’s committee which decides which General Ed courses to [indistinct]. Well, I certainly agree that the state needs more nurses, because it doesn’t have the resources to expand its nursing programs with real faculty. It has a terrible time hiring faculty to teach courses that meet Bloomington’s research standards. I would hate to see us kill this, but if we do approve it, I think we ought to approve it with some understandings that this is an extraordinary action. That it is not something that we see elsewhere and with some direction to, if nothing else, the UFC, saying that we should take a look whether maybe in fact Indiana University should have and offer state-wide degrees. Maybe it should have something that doesn’t create this fiction where you run it through some campus on which you never set foot and where perhaps there doesn’t seem to be any assurance that the instruction comes from people – who knows – might not even be faculty appointed at this campus. So I’m willing to go for it, I guess, but I sure would like to see us

adopt some resolution when we do that that lays out the fact that this points in the direction we need state-wide degrees, maybe we need state-wide or system-wide General Education requirements, heaven forbid and that this is a very special circumstance. Otherwise we open the flood gate to many of the other schools that asked for things that were very similar to this and we said no to.

STEPHENS: I think this is a very special circumstance. Whilst it is a very special circumstance, I couldn't agree more with some of Herb's remarks. I think that we have already heard from some schools a kind of sort of planning in the advising that they at one point they wanted to make kind of public about, you know, take these courses and it'll advance you through your degree program quicker and you'll be satisfying our requirements as well as Gen Ed with a very constrained set of courses. Whilst we anticipate that that will happen, it isn't in the spirit of General Education and it isn't what we believe the General Education Committee set out to do in approving a range of courses in each of those categories and so it's in some way with regret that we came to this juncture because I think that we really did not want to envisage exceptions to a campus-wide curriculum. But this is such an extraordinary situation with students who are not resident and a relatively small number of students in a particular discipline in which there is a recognized need and in a system-wide degree where it's awarded. So as we understand it from Roland the degree does say that it's issued at Bloomington but Bloomington is, by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education for this purpose, considered a satellite of IUPUI School of Nursing. So... [laughter] So.

DOWELL: Bob and then Padraic?

ARNOVE: Were intensive summer sessions considered as possible residence requirements that had to be met? And then I just want to say that Open University had to convert to [indistinct comment] does require at least some summer residency and when you look at the success rate of students in online programs there are very high dropout rates. And FACET conducted a study a number of years ago of the different modalities of providing instruction and found out that students who did not have a background in a structured classroom situation did not fare very well in just totally all online instruction.

STEPHENS: And I regret to say that I do not know sufficiently well the modes of instruction of each of these courses to tell you hand-on-heart that there isn't some of that. My understanding is that they deliver this though a range of different instructional methods including interaction with instructors though Skype and other such things, and they may well have some intensive opportunities at certain times. I don't know that but the students are not, because the degree requirements say that they can complete this degree completely by online course delivery and we are not in a position on the Bloomington campus to say that we could offer a sufficient number of General Education courses online for them to meet them. I think if we were in that

position we might take a different view, but we do not have these courses online and I think nor would we necessarily want to encourage these students to go take them elsewhere. So I think that we sort of felt that it wouldn't be meeting the spirit of the General Education curriculum to say well they're online if you go look here or there. Nor is it in the spirit of the General Education curriculum to say that you must be resident on campus when your degree is entirely online. We can't do that.

ARNOVE: The whole thing with online courses is who's developing them given that they meet the requirements. So like Introductory Sociology or Cultural Diversity classes, have those courses already been developed?

STEPHENS: So...and this is a question. I think that one of the things that the School of Nursing does is allow students to take online courses from anywhere in the system to meet these needs and so they do have a set of course that are available to them. Okay.

DOWELL: Padraic, would you like to?

KENNEY: I think that what's striking in the language of the program plan and to some extent the document explaining the Consortium as a whole, is that there's a kind of a disconnect between this degree program and what we do at Gen Ed on this campus, don't you think? In a sense there's sort of, you know, it's an outside unit. I recognize it's a unit on this campus, very much so, saying this is what we already do, can we just adapt and agree that we'll have this and you'll have that and while that – I also see why we should support this – I wonder if there shouldn't be rather more of a give and take, which there isn't right now. And so what I would suggest is this, I'm just thinking off the top of my head so there may be reasons why this doesn't make sense. It seems to me that we should be able to say, all right, you know, this is fine; we recognize the need for it and so on, however, we as the Bloomington campus, the General Education Committee, would like to offer our guidance and consultation so that you can better integrate your Gen Ed-like components into this degree system. Here's what I'm – and part is a question of language – I mean to me it seems just like, well, something from another era, frankly. To see a cluster labeled Humanistic Appreciation, that's what we used to call as undergrads clapping for credit. [laughter] I mean I recognize that these might be great classes but it has that sound [laughter] where it's 'I appreciate that music,' and, you know, and then I'm humanistic. And so I wonder whether if this question of renaming and saying, you know, 'Come on, Humanistic Appreciation? Because that's not what IUB offers. We need something more than that otherwise we wouldn't have a Gen Ed program.' So it might be a question of naming but also I think it's a possibility of offering our expertise, I say as a whole campus, because Gen Ed was something that was created out of a comprehensive research university and we should have something to offer to make their program better. If they want this to be an IUB degree and there's a need for it to be an IUB degree, presumably it's also desire on the

School of Nursing to have it look as much like an IUB degree as possible, and there are ways in which it can't. You know, for example, you know, there aren't going to be two years of world languages because schools that are trying to do language online are finding that it doesn't work. So fine, there are ways that it can't work but I think this could look more like an IUB degree. So I would suggest that we say yes, that we say we have expertise we'd like to offer – consultation whatever – to better integrate this and then say we hope this is going to work we'd like to look at it again in five years.

STEPHENS: I'm sorry I think that the problem they will run into is that this is a Consortium and so the degree looks the same wherever it comes from and now, whether the School of Nursing is in a position to be flexible on how it looks on each campus, I don't know. And I think that really is a question that only the School of Nursing can answer.

DOWELL: I actually have a question. I guess why is it important that this degree be offered from Bloomington if it is indeed online only? Again probably a question for Nursing, I don't know.

STEPHENS: Roland, do you have any ideas?

COTE: I'm sure this is the School of Nursing. Perhaps the Consortium wanted it that way.
[comments indistinct]

STEPHENS: Degrees are offered by county?

COTE: Degrees are offered by county. They're approved by county, yes. [indistinct] has approved that this degree be offered [indistinct comment] as a campus.

APPLEGATE: They are approved by county. Yes that is correct.

STEPHENS: All degrees are offered are approved by county. So...

COTE: Well, that's how ICHE works. Let's not get into that.

DOWELL: Okay. Herb.

TERRY: Would the consequences, and if we look at their letter, they say it's probable, etc... "restriction will inevitably lead to the suspension of the RN-BSN program," on the Bloomington campus. But given the nature of this degree, residents of this county could still complete the degree at any other IU campus that decided to approve it. Wouldn't that be true?

COTE: That may be true, I don't know.

TERRY: It seems to me that we need information from the School of Nursing to move forward that we don't have.

STEPHENS: So I think one of the interesting...that's a valid point...one of the interesting things here is that even though we had online degrees approved they've generally been thought of as being – offered and we know what the virtual environment is – but they have generally been thought of as being serving a regional population.

COTE: This is a unique, I want to echo a little bit of what Padraic just said, this is a very unique situation. This is a situation where a student is generally coming in with a significant number of transfer hours and I think that's one of the things that's happening. We're basically going to be conferring a degree, a bachelors degree, to a student who probably has two, two and a half, years' worth of IU course work and because right now we, Bloomington, does not have a large selection of online course work available we may eventually develop some of that. And I think that –this is where I want to echo Padraic – that if we do choose to pass this or to allow this that there be a term on it for review. Yeah, a four year term for review because in four years IU will probably have developed a more comprehensive approach to online education and can probably deal with online education which is I think one of the main issues here.

DOWELL: Padraic?

KENNEY: Following up on Roland's comments, I just want to say one thing that when we think about online courses, and that's a conversation that's ongoing, I worry that we fall into the trap of talking about online courses as if we're not there yet, that we are somehow deficient and we don't have enough online courses yet. The rhetoric of this discussion occasioned by this letter can suggest that, you know, someday when we're really together we'll have enough online courses that everything can be done online, but unfortunately we haven't reached that point. This is not a deficiency on our part and it will never be a deficiency on our part that we don't have enough online courses yet to satisfy a particular petition. So that's just sort of 'by the way...' so we have that on the record.

DOWELL: Very good. Over here, Laura.

GINGER: I know this is listed as an action item but it seems as if we need somebody from the Nursing School. Probably get one or both of these women who signed this letter to come to a future meeting and answer these questions because there's just too much we don't know and we can't expect Sonya to know. So that's just an observation.

DOWELL: Would you like to offer a motion to table?

GINGER: Oh. Umm. Okay. Yes. [laughter] I do want backup for [indistinct comment] I just don't think we know enough to, in good faith, vote on this.

DOWELL: I don't think you are the only person thinking that. Sonya, do you see any particular obstacles to...

STEPHENS: I think the only concern is the admission of students which they are engaged in and so the longer we leave this... I mean, it is a problem for them even that it has taken this long, but on the other hand we had to wait for the request from them and it had to go to the Gen Ed Committee. It's done those things. It needs to be approved or not by this Council at some point so if you need more information then I think the only thing you can do is ask for representation from the School of Nursing and...

DOWELL: Take it up at the next meeting, perhaps.

WATSON: I just want a clarification so one reason I could imagine they want to leave the degree at IUB is do they get credits? Does the department get teaching...?

STEPHENS: Enrollment?

WATSON: ...enrollment credit, Sonya?

STEPHENS: They do, but I think that most of the sort of responsibility center stuff is dealt with from IUPUI. I don't know that they manage a budget and I don't think they're short of enrollment. So this is really in response to a perceived and real need to educate nurses in the local community.

WATSON: Yeah, but I was just asking that if the we were to say that we don't want to have that to happen on the IUB campus, because it weakens the Gen Ed requirement, is that harming the department?

STEPHENS: I think that raises a very interesting question why must we offer this online degree at all campuses? It raises a very interesting question. I think that's one that's really worth pursuing.

DOWELL: Alright, we're just looking up what we need to do about that motion to table, that I suggested. Do we need to vote on that? Finding out right now. Okay. Alright is there any more discussion of this motion to table. Herb?

TERRY: Yeah, I'd like to ask the Agenda Committee to give us a week or something like that in which those of us who came to this meeting with questions could forward them to you so that you would actually ask the School of Nursing for some specific information and so I'd like to add that sort of motion to be tabled but with a time period to be designated by the Agenda Committee for receiving questions from the members.

ARNOVE: You also have the minutes, though. The discussion that we had.

DOWELL: That's true. Absolutely, and I think that makes sense we certainly can work on arranging for someone to be here at our next meeting and then do our best to let them know what the key points were that we want addressed.

STEPHENS: That will be helpful.

DOWELL: Any other comments? Alright then we need to take a vote. All in favor of the motion to table this action item for consideration later? In favor? [Aye] Any abstentions or any votes against the motion to table?

STEPHENS: I'm going to abstain since I am between the two parties. [laughter]

DOWELL: Alright. Well thank you Sonya I feel, I came in here completely ready to trust the General Education Committee but it looks like we came up with some other questions that maybe hadn't come up...

STEPHENS: Yes.

DOWELL: ...in their consideration. So, we'll work on getting somebody from Nursing and getting our questions to them in time for them to know what we are thinking.

AGENDA ITEM 6: IU BLOOMINGTON GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON THE AAC&U LIBERAL EDUCATION & AMERICA'S PROMISE (LEAP) INITIATIVE

DOWELL: Alright, item six on the agenda is something that I just want to say a couple of words about before I hand it over to Sonya again. This is, what you have before you, you have a proposed resolution that came to the UFC recently and is then being brought out to all the different campuses for consideration. It has to do with the adoption of the AAC&U LEAP Initiative document, their essential learning outcomes, and how that could be used at Indiana University. The key parts of the resolution I want to point out to you if you haven't had a chance to look at it thoroughly are the three bullet points at the end which endorse some different levels of engagement with a LEAP framework. And so they kind of, I think of them, one is that the university should endorse LEAP and encourage campuses to adopt it. The second bullet point kind of endorses the initiative to work with other institutions in the state to designate the state a LEAP state and then the third urges campuses to figure out a way to use LEAP as a means to ease transferability among state institutions. That said, I'd also like to point out that right now it's out for discussion to the campuses and that in talking with Vice President Applegate who's here in the back and will probably say something at some point and Barb Bichelmeyer from his office that the intention is to bring back to UFC what people can agree on and not to force any campus into a program that they don't want to be a part of. But what you have in front of you is that this resolution in its current form is before UFC and then responses

from the General Education Committee and the Educational Policy Committee. And I'll leave it at that and Sonya would you like to...

STEPHENS: So we, when we first saw the resolution that had been put to UFC as a discussion document we were a little bit concerned that the General Education Committee was unaware of it, the academic officers seemed unaware of it as a resolution although we talked about LEAP values in certain meetings. I think when this was put out to the various groups among the Bloomington faculty for discussion, the question was this something that Bloomington faculty would embrace and since it specifically refers to general education or liberal education and this Council has delegated much of the responsibility for general education to the General Education Committee. It was agreed that the General Education Committee should consider the matter at some length. Now you've just heard in relation to the BSN that we had had the Transfer Task Force had been meeting through the spring and summer of last year and had, literally days before this UFC resolution came up, had just sort of shared its report with the Gen Ed Committee saying that it was very keen to encourage transferability, that was one of the purposes of General Education, but it felt that Bloomington General Education was Bloomington General Education and we hadn't spent five years developing a curriculum to have it kind of swept away by a new framework. And I don't think that the intention was to sweep it away but I think that there is some concern amongst members of the General Education Committee, and particularly amongst those who served on the Transfer Task Force, that to adopt, as the UFC resolution suggests, a framework, and this is the first part of the resolution, "That the University Faculty Council of Indiana University endorses the Essential Learning Outcomes...as the guiding framework for General Education programs at all campuses of Indiana University." To accept that might in some ways undermine the framework that faculty on this campus had established. That said, I should tell you that from the very beginning we looked at the LEAP values and the tuning competencies which are now part of the Degree Profiles, the Degree Qualification Profile that Lumina's presenting pretty much, and decided that many, many of the outcomes or program goals of Bloomington General Education express the same values as LEAP and Tuning or Degree Qualification Profiles. So we were reasonably comfortable that these were values that we could embrace. But then they're values that are kind of motherhood and apple pie. They are not things that anybody would think were a bad idea. They're solid faculty-approved values for liberal education. Where their concerns came, at the General Education Committee and amongst the faculty who serve on it, were in the specifics in a sense. What they were really saying is quantitative literacy is not the same as mathematical modeling. And the Bloomington General Education Committee has established very high standards for the mathematical modeling skills of students on this campus which if you just say they must meet quantitative literacy standards do not meet ours and that whilst many of the values in LEAP are in the outcomes of the Bloomington General Education curriculum, the Bloomington Gen Ed Curriculum goes further in some ways and does things a

little bit differently. So I think that the concern of the Bloomington General Education Committee that we wanted to present to you here is that whilst we do embrace the values as they are expressed by the AAC&U there are concerns about what embracing those values might mean, what a guiding framework might be, and indeed what a LEAP state is, because the stated intention is to try and get all or as many Indiana institutions as possible to be part of this so that the governor can proclaim us a LEAP State. But when I have asked what is a LEAP State, nobody seems to be able to tell me. And that appears to be up for negotiation, the closest I have heard is that it is enough for institutions signing on to this and the governor endorsing it as a framework that Indiana will embrace, for it to be significant enough to make a critical mass. Now there's one other thing that I think I should say, there was a meeting organized by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education last Friday at which LEAP was discussed along with other initiatives and it was pretty explicit in conversation with the various individuals that this is about a package of transfers and so the third part of the resolution, although separate and we were not asked to respond separately at that time, and so the statement from the General Education Committee does not respond to each part of the resolution separately. That's now been a request so we kind of came late to that. It was pretty clear that this was about transferability and that really we're moving towards packaging transfer. In discussions with the vice provost for teaching and learning at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, I should say that Wisconsin is LEAP state except Madison isn't in it. [laughter] In discussions with my colleague there what he said to me is, we've embraced the values, we've interpreted them slightly, they're part of the Wisconsin experience that they have been proclaiming, but we would not go to the package of transfers because we believe that was a faculty governance issue and that the faculty determine whether a student has met the transfer requirements for any particular discipline or any particular course. So that was his explicitly stated reasons for not doing this. At the ICHE meeting on Friday it was said on a number of occasions that LEAP states such as California and Wisconsin do not include the flagship institutions. Indeed in California, as I understand it, it's Cal State and not the University of California. It's Wisconsin but not Madison. And it was also said that there are very few if any R1 institutions that have signed on to this. So whilst I think that we can embrace the values in LEAP and that's what the General Education Committee has endorsed in the statement and again it's an overwhelming majority that voted in favor of this statement from the Gen Ed Committee which was prepared by the Transfer Task Force. Our concerns are that we don't know what it means to endorse LEAP as a set of outcomes or values. We don't know what it means to encourage others to do that and the General Education Committee certainly feels that it can't encourage other institutions to sign on to this if it's not entirely comfortable about signing off on it itself and so, and it is certainly not happy about packaging transfer, because that then would require us to completely revise the General Education Requirements that we have adopted. So that's really where the General Education Committee stands on the UFC LEAP.

DOWELL: Padraic would you like to say anything on behalf of the Educational Policies Committee?

KENNEY: Yes, we talked about this also in December and how the letter as part of the discussion in front of you. I guess the main thing I would – let me make two quick points. First, what struck us as we looked at this, which is again I have to point out they're nice values in a very general way but the odd thing is combining General Education because these values as we read them refer more generally to the learning outcomes of an entire college career and if you look at the part under Essential Learning Outcomes in the LEAP document, I mean, when it says, "practiced extensively across the curriculum in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance," or towards the bottom discussing "synthesis and advanced accomplishment." This actually has nothing to do with Gen Ed. And it just seemed to me a reflection of poor understanding on the part of the person who chose this as a document to have to be relevant to Gen Ed because they simply are in different languages, refer to different species, if you will. So that's the first thing, that these are nice values, they just don't have anything to do with Gen Ed. There may be some other document that will be relevant to Gen Ed but it isn't this one. In fact, it's really relevant to a mission statement for the entire campus and we'd be happy to see these values as part of the mission statement. Second point I would make and this is in the third paragraph in the EPC letter, when you try to think about okay, what would be wrong with taking a package of credits? And it gives some very specific examples. Sonya mentioned one of them, mathematical modeling, is something we supported that is not what we can easily imagine a Gen Ed program at a school that supports these learning outcomes that doesn't include mathematical modeling. I would also mention language study or writing skills which can be understood in different ways. The reason we have an institution called IU Bloomington that has its own faculty and its own courses is because we have our own standards about things like that and we cannot assume that they are identical across the country in the LEAP states or not. So it really seems just to be a kind of a moot point. One can like the values and we like them because they're motherhood and apple pie and one can approve them as being generally relevant to what we do as a university, but they can have no possible relevance to Gen Ed and still less to package of transfer.

DOWELL: Diane?

HENSHEL: This is a question I think for Sonya and maybe Padraic. It seems to me that if you take Gen Ed you can actually fit Gen Ed within a bunch of these and just say no, but it has to be these specific ones, here's your options within them. So if you can go the way towards fitting the distribution of LEAP but becoming more specialized to be acceptable for this campus that would be one way of saying we can interpret it but it has to fit a certain set of criteria in order to have a second set gates to go through. By the way, it occurs to me when I look at this that it

feels more like somebody who was going for high school core training when they developed this, because it looks to me like the high school Core 40 kind of stuff when I look at it, which disturbs me a little bit because it means that they weren't necessarily thinking about higher education but just a little farther past high school. But anyway, I still hold to this question of, you know, if you could set up a second gate then maybe we could say a subset would be allowed and they would sort of fit.

STEPHENS: So that kind of gets at the Wisconsin experience, but what Wisconsin has done is taken these LEAP values and they have something in addition to this that they wanted to put in there and so we have already mapped these outcomes against our own outcomes with Bloomington General Education, as I said. So we know where they match and we know where we have a gap and we know where this doesn't meet our needs. And I think that the real conversations that are going on is, and Padraic alluded to this, does this confuse standardization and standards. That, you know, how do you know that students have met a particular level of attainment if you define it only by competencies and not by a combination of competencies and knowledge and experience and... And I think those are concerns that have been expressed by the General Education Committee, too. So I think that, and you'll note, you should read the note at the bottom of the Essential Learning Outcomes from LEAP because it does say that it was developed from a multiyear dialogue with hundreds of colleges and universities.

HENSHEL: I noticed that, but it still looks to me like...

KENNEY: They worded that.

HENSHEL: It just looks to me like what I dealt with when I dealt with Core 40.

STEPHENS: Right, and I think that those are genuine questions. To Padraic's point about this looks like something beyond Gen Ed, I think that the Bloomington General Education requirements which have intensive writing, experiential – including undergrad research – diversity in the USA, those things do reach into the majors and so General Education sometimes goes beyond a set of core requirements or curriculum requirements and are part of the broader undergraduate experience. And certainly as we think about what it means to be on a four-year residential campus we're thinking about how do we integrate the curriculum and the co-curricular where students are also learning to apply things in other things that they're doing – leadership, that sort of thing. I know that student affairs groups are using the General Education Learning Outcomes as developed by faculty on this campus to define expectations for students involved in co-curricular programming, too. So there is an effort to really make these real and they do map onto this, but the point is well taken. Can we have another level

beyond that? Well, I think that gets back to the point of what does it mean to be a LEAP institution or a LEAP state and I think we don't know the answer to that.

DOWELL: Maria?

BUCUR-DECKARD: If I can just add another layer to the conversation, I think the big elephant in the room is the real consequences of what we're talking about here in terms of funding for IU. I mean, this is not – what's happening with LEAP I don't think is completely disconnected from the politics at the state level and Indiana Commission for Higher Education in terms of these metrics that are being applied to, as I understand it, to punish us for the standards that we have established for ourselves and that end up playing out in higher costs and in longer time to completion and all of the things that have been signaled to us as in need of being addressed. So I think we need to be wise and politically savvy and John would be a good person to maybe speak to that at some point as well, in terms of thinking, you know, both about this internally how do we uphold the standards that we've set out for ourselves but how do we proactively engage with it so that we do not get left behind. That's what I'm afraid of, I don't want to, you know, give up our standards but I also don't want to see us, you know, having a huge cut in state revenue.

STEPHENS: Right.

BUCUR-DECKARD: If we don't address this in some proactive fashion.

STEPHENS: And John maybe you'd like to kind of follow on from that. So I think that we're not unaware of those pressures. It was discussed at this Council at our last meeting what the implications of the funding are going to be for us. But Indiana has also, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education in *Reaching Higher* has also made it clear that it expects Purdue West Lafayette and IU Bloomington to admit better qualified students and to do more with them in the service of the state. So we would be doing ourselves a disservice to say 'yes, we will sign on to this and it doesn't matter never mind our standards,' you know, 'we should just be a part of this,' and at some point we, I think, as an institution we have to make a decision about being proactive in creating opportunities for students to transfer in but we don't have that many transfer students. We don't have the capacity that some of the other campuses of Indiana University have so we can't get that revenue. We can't meet those targets. So we need to do what we do best and we serve for the most part a four-year residential population and we should to some extent play by the new rules and be very conscious of those and make sure that we are creating opportunities for the most able transfer students to come here so that they have access to an IU Bloomington education. At the same time we surely need to retain those standards because I think without retaining those standards we have nothing distinctive to offer.

DOWELL: John, would you like to speak?

APPLEGATE: Sure, and that's a great segue Sonya because actually the goal of this is to protect the university and allow the university and each campus to do just that. The funding models, I'm not sure that this maps on to the funding model so much. That has its own set of problems as you pointed out, but what it does map on to is this issue of standardization. And from where I sit, our office manages/coordinates our relationship with the Commission for Higher Education and other state institutions, governmental institutions, that are setting higher education policy – the Education Roundtable to a large extent for the School of Education, the Department of Education, governor's office, the legislature, and so on. The basic origin of our interest in this LEAP initiative, well, there are two of them. One is just defense and support of the idea of a liberal education and what is, I think, fairly described as apple pie and motherhood. I was going to say applehood and mother pie. [laughter] But in any event, what's fairly described on this and I think on all IU campuses as core values is not a core value outside of universities like ours and so what seems very general to us, and inarguable to us, is not a direction that states including ours are thinking about for higher education. The move is towards, you know, feeding the machine to be a little dramatic about it but, you know, training people for very specific tasks that are in the known economy. I mean this comes from the sort of catechism that we have for degree approval to the pronouncements from the state and from the national government about what they see higher education for and so I don't believe that affirming the values and joining with the values of a liberal education is a meaningless act. I believe that today it's more important than ever. I think there are lots of practical reasons, I mean we should be educating, you know, and you know this, we should be educating people not for their first job but for a whole career that has interesting and rewarding careers that are not thought of yet. I think that's a core value and I think that's something very worth being serious about and joining on to. Okay, so that's kind of the general idea of it, but let me talk about the kind of politics of it. There is a proposal that is not in legislation this year, it was, I believe, in legislation last year and it will certainly be in legislation next year supported by the governor, the Education Roundtable, the Commission for Higher Education, to create a mandatory ten-course General Education requirement. It would be ten courses. I'm talking courses, you know, American History, you know, English 101 – or 131 – but whatever number, English and that kind of thing, and that those courses that public institutions would be required to accept the package of those courses in transfer as meeting General Education Requirements. That strikes me as destroying the kind of richness that, I mean, of Bloomington, you know, hugely, but really, all of our campuses and the, you know, Ball States and Purdues of the world. That is something much to be avoided. It is a very real proposal and a very real possibility. So we are sort of casting around for ways of avoiding that. The rationale is that you want to encourage people to be able to transfer more easily and one theory of the way of helping people to transfer among institutions more easily is that everything is the same and so every little piece is

the same and, you know, it all sort of works on the assembly line. And again, I'm being a little overdramatic about it, but not too much. So we've been looking for ways to redirect that concern for the ability of students to transfer without having to add too much time to their education in a more productive direction. And the idea of instead of focusing on ten courses, of instead focusing on more general areas or competencies or indeed values seemed like the kind of thing that might be able to be an acceptable substitute for that and would give institutions like Indiana University, campuses like Bloomington or IUPUI or all of our campuses, the flexibility to draw on the enormous richness of the curriculum, the additional standards, if you want to think of it that way, or simply the substantive interest and uniqueness of something like Bloomington's General Education program. Our goal is to protect that, quite not at all as, you know, Sonya said, not at all to sweep it away, but in fact to protect it. Now, that is how that works and whether that's a good idea – I mean I can tell you what the idea is – I can't tell you that it will work. And it may be that it's not a bargain that this campus wants to make, this is at the core of being an academic decision. I talked about sort of the merits of whether having ten courses or not is a good idea – I don't think it's a good idea – but there's also a protecting the university and university faculty from the interference of saying these are ten courses which you shall take. Other states have done it. Other states that are perfectly respectable states have done exactly this kind of thing, so it's not undoable. It's certainly not unheard of. It's still not a good idea, and something that we are very eager to avoid happening. So, I mean, I would not want you to sign on to something, and Erika made this point very nicely at the beginning, the idea is not to, you know, cajole or, you know, threaten you with other future horrors or something like that, to sign on to something that this faculty is fundamentally uncomfortable with, or thinks is fundamentally wrong-headed. You know the whole idea here is that this is faculty decision making but the idea is to give you some background about why this idea came up, what the timing is, and the goal. And the one place I guess I have some concern is that I just want to make sure that it's well understood that the goal here is protect things like General Education and to protect the ability of this and every campus of Indiana University, each of which has a General Education requirement, that is, its own unique General Education requirement to protect that and not at all to standardize it.

STEPHENS: Can I just say one thing? I think that John, one of the things that you didn't say and I think probably would be helpful to the members of the Faculty Council, is that the intention of that ten-course General Education curriculum is also that it would be largely mapped onto dual credit. So, so...

APPLEGATE: It gets worse, in order words! [laughter]

STEPHENS: So much of this would take place in the high schools.

APPLEGATE: Right, precisely, thank you! Gen Ed, in this conception, is something to be gotten through. As opposed to this wonderful core of a liberal education – I don't know where you begin with that – but you're absolutely right and so it becomes something that is taken elsewhere, it's taken in a very simplified way, you know, American History 101 at different institutions is different. I don't want to suggest that American History 101 is a bad course or uninteresting or simple in itself, but it becomes this standard, 'This is the way you do it, this is the way you get through it, and by the way if you do that...' or AP.

DOWELL: Herb?

TERRY: Erika, I have a question about timing. Not the legislature's timing, but ours. This came from the UFC. How many more UFC meetings do we have and when are they?

DOWELL: There are two more.

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: And we weren't planning to bring this to the UFC again until the final meeting in April.

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: But I think in between that time there is certainly the opportunity to, you know, online rework the resolution, you know, to clarify maybe the meaning of some of things that we don't know what they mean, you know, the LEAP state –

APPLEGATE: Like the values idea.

DOWELL: Right, right. I mean to change it into something that could be, you know, a nut of something that everybody could endorse if we want to move in that direction. Herb, continue?

TERRY: Sort of related to that, I guess. I'd add one thing to John's analysis – you know I don't think that piece of legislation is likely to be revived in this General Assembly – but I think the stalemate that has developed in the Indiana Legislature is likely to make it much harder for us to lobby out of the house version of the budget bill things we really don't like in it. And one of those things in there means that this may have impact not just our state appropriation but on our ability to get the Commission for Higher Education to approve changes in tuition. And if our state appropriation is flat, and the Commission for Higher Education thinks this a really important thing for the state, then they may have an opportunity as early as May or April to react to a tuition proposal from us and be asking are they onboard on the LEAP proposals or not? I again would agree with John, we shouldn't do it out of fear but this may be the opening salvo of a titanic argument in this state over the quality of its education, the standardization or

non-standardization across its institutions, the role of the faculty in deciding curriculum and educational standards, and there are big economic consequences.

DOWELL: Bob?

ARNOVE: Well, we've been discussing the value of a general liberal education, what it consists of, and the role of the institution to decide what is a worthwhile undergraduate education so I would like to – this discussion that we have had here – relate it back to the previous discussion for example about the nursing education [laughter] about the value of that education and what we want to transfer into here.

DOWELL: Right.

STEPHENS: And you should know that IUPUI has already joined in to embrace these values in the resolution.

APPLEGATE: Yes, and –

DOWELL: – Years ago, that's correct, right? I mean –

APPLEGATE: – Right, right. They've been a – their General Education requirement is structured more like this, right.

STEPHENS: Right. So, I mean, [remark indistinct] your point is that this is a system-wide degree that we've been looking at and it doesn't fit with the Bloomington Gen Ed.

(Comments lost in tape change)

ARNOVE: It doesn't and Maria's point we have to look at because we're talking about a competency-based curriculum and the higher education commission's going to come to us in a year to observe and justify what you do how can you prove you meet these competencies. That would be taking away a lot of autonomy from this institution.

STEPHENS: That we can do, though. I mean, we can and that is, that this Council has mandated that General Education be monitored and we do have outcomes and so we will be monitoring these competencies and we will be able to say something about transfer and we will be able to say something about the success of the students who transfer in, we will be able to talk about whether the General Education has helped students graduate in a timely way, we will be able to answer those questions much better in many ways than we can now. So, you know, I think we should feel confident that we have these values in place and that we can monitor them and we can talk about them, and document them. It's not so much about documenting it's about demonstrating. So we need to be able to demonstrate it, and once we can do that I think that

that's another matter. I do think we need to be concerned about what it means to be a LEAP state since, I mean I'm not endorsing anything, but before we know what we are buying into.

DOWELL: Padraic?

KENNEY: I want to pick up on something Sonya said earlier but also on what Bob was saying and develop it a bit. What I would really want most of all in a revised statement either from our own campus administration even also a resolution that goes to the UFC is our administration needs to make the case strongly that IUB offers something to the state that a campus that's just like any other would not offer. There must be a reason why there is an IUB that makes the state of Indiana a more worthwhile state to work in, and to be a citizen of, and to bring business to better than states that don't have a campus like IU Bloomington and that theme needs to be made consistently. Even, I would say, even in the context of statements that are ostensibly about the entire system. And that's – so I guess that's one thing that bothers me when I look at the proposed resolution is that it talks entirely about Indiana University and the system as if the parts are interchangeable and I think even when we're talking to the UFC and we don't want to offend somebody at some other campus I think constantly the case needs to be made that what makes this system worthwhile, what makes people want to transfer is that there is an IUB that is different and has something more to offer than other campuses. Why would we even talk about transfer if it's just, you know, among different cars on the same train? There's something more we have to offer [indistinct comment].

DOWELL: Alright, any other comments? For right now obviously we're not settling anything today, but I think it is very helpful to those of us who are serving on the UFC and have an interest in kind of what and if this resolution comes back, what it looks like when it comes back, if it comes back. So thank you and could we have just a very short break, three or four minutes and recharge our drinks and come back and have another wide ranging discussion about our final agenda item.

BRIEF RECESS

AGENDA ITEM 7: MERGER, REORGANIZATION AND ELIMINATION POLICY REFORM

GIERYN: ...together for our final item. This is purely a discussion to help inform policy development. The two documents you have in front of you are existing policy that governs merger, reorganization, and elimination of programs. That's the longer document. The shorter one is what I would consider sort of a discussion document that Tom Gieryn wrote to help think about having an entirely different kind and form of policy governing this. And I'll let Tom introduce it here in just a minute but I can say that right now the Agenda Committee would like to thank the chairs of the Merger, Reorganization, and Elimination Committee, John Carini who's here with us today and Elizabeth Johnson, for the work they have done in working on

one draft that we aren't circulating of the revised policy and hopefully their continued wisdom contributing to a new policy that is perhaps in a different kind of form. But they're really the only people who have, you know, direct experience at IU right now in trying to think about how faculty governance should interact with programs that are reorganizing. And the intention of the Agenda Committee at this point is to right now basically convene a group consisting of people from the MRE, Tom, myself, and a couple of other people probably drawn from Faculty Affairs or from people with some administrative experience to talk about how to make a policy that is going to do what we need it to do in protecting faculty rights and the integrity of academic programs but also be easy to use and useful in a whole variety of possible scenarios. So Tom would you like to – and we're just kind of kicking this around here to see what people think are priorities.

GIERYN: Well kick around this, the existing policy is six pages long and the proposed replacement barely makes it on to two. I think that's a significant improvement no matter what the pages actually say. This is a proposal to replace an existing policy that dates back to the 1980's with an entirely new policy. Circumstances were different then that policy reflected concerns of the BFC at a time that we can only barely remember, some of us. I, too, would like to acknowledge the work of John Carini, who's there, and Elizabeth Johnson. This document, the short version, which is as Erika says just a beginning to get some ideas going. This document owes a lot to conversations that John and Elizabeth and I had through much of last year through the dealings with the possibilities of restructuring HPER. There are two triggers for this replacement policy. One of them is not just HPER but several other instances recently of academic restructuring. The HPER case which involved the plans for the transition to the School of Public Health which involved the creation of new departments, the collapsing of other departments, this experience where we actually tried to make use of this behemoth of a policy showed its weaknesses. It was cumbersome. It was difficult to follow. It was difficult to know exactly what was expected of deans and of the MRE Committee that John and Elizabeth chaired. In a word "cumbersome," six pages and it really afforded nobody a real opportunity to know that was involved and to know what the stakes were in the reorganization of HPER. Also last year we considered a possibility of forming a School of Communication, you remember the discussion in this body those of you who were here. We took that as another example of how to respond to restructuring, thought that the response was much more nimble, that it gave opportunity for faculty input, but without the wait of the various committees and procedures outlined in the existing MRE policy. So in considering this short document, that case of how restructuring was handled actually emerged as a better source of lessons learned. The third example of restructuring goes back a couple of years and that is with the new School of Informatics and Computing which formed a set of what they call "divisions," which are not exactly like departments but in many ways function like departments. This was a case where the existing policy perhaps because of its size was simply ignored. And I think that was a

mistake. I think that what went on in the School of Informatics and Computing really did deserve to be considered a case of academic restructuring and we needed a policy that outlined the principles of faculty rights that need to be defended in such instances. So that's all one trigger, all of these examples coming down the pike. The other trigger is we're going to see more of this. The New Academic Directions Task Force formed by President McRobbie will be issuing its report later this month. Inevitably there will be recommendations, not explicit calls for, but recommendations to consider various kinds of academic restructuring. Simply put, we need to have a succinct workable policy that protects faculty rights prior to the release of that Task Force Report. If that Task Force Report is released and this document, the big one, is in effect I guarantee either that things will get so bottled up that nothing will happen – maybe that's a good outcome I don't know – but more likely this policy will be ignored and certain efforts at restructuring will go on without the protections that I think the faculty deserves. So to be brief there are four differences, apart from length, between the two policies and again the short one is simply a set of ideas to think about for a new policy.

The first difference, there is a whole discussion in the original policy that pertains to – it's section three if you are looking – “Faculty Participation in Campus-Level Budget Decisions on Financial Difficulties.” I think that belongs in a separate policy. I think it's a double-barrel policy, the one we've got, this has to do with faculty rights really in terms of dealing with the possibility that the University could go under or that we simply would not have the revenues needed to support, in a big sense, what we do. I think that policy, that section, needs to be considered separately. I didn't deal with it in any of the revisions. I think it's a completely different set of issues and I would like to recommend to the Agenda Committee that they or possibly the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the BFC consider that section as a separate initiative. Secondly, the existing policy seems to presume that most academic restructuring will come at the initiative of the dean – a dean wants to do something, collapse departments, create new departments – and that these choices by the dean for his or her school could have impact on another school or all the rest of the campus and that was the premise for why the BFC would get involved to kind of watch out for faculty interests because something going on in this school could affect the rest of us. I think we need to relax that assumption and generalize the whole process of academic restructuring. It's not going to come from the dean's next time, okay? The New Academic Direction Committee – or the Task Force – is a presidential-level committee and it is going to make recommendations for schools as well as departments within schools so that the new policy sort of sets aside who is calling for the restructuring and simply emphasizes the principles that should govern how faculty are protected during these restructurings. Third, John and Elizabeth's committee that worked so hard the new policy makes no mention of a committee. I don't think we need an MRE Committee. If – as we'll get into the proposed policy in just a second – if we have proper faculty consultation and opportunities for faculty response it's possible that a committee would be formed to hear about the restructuring or complaints

about restructuring from faculty but I don't think it is a requirement. We certainly don't need the cumbersome committee structure that the original policy setup. And finally, there was language in the original policy about the university providing retraining of faculty who were moved from one unit to another where they did not have adequate expertise. I took that out because that should never happen in the first place. Never happen. So take a look at the new replacement policy. I just want to call attention to a couple of things. It starts out in the preamble paragraph with some of the reasons why restructuring might take place it's not just for academic – I'm sorry, Jeff – not just for reasons of financial exigency. New directions in scholarship, new expectations for our students entering various careers, and so forth, administrative inefficiencies, declining performance or quality, there are a lot of different reasons why somebody would want to restructure the academic units of this campus not just financial. And towards the end of that paragraph you actually get a sense of what academic restructuring means when translated into impact on faculty. It really means reallocation of financial resources and reassignment of faculty members and librarians to new academic homes. When we talk about academic units, there are two ways to look at that. One is to talk about the structure of schools and departments. You might throw in programs and centers but that's probably a completely different matter or, and/or, whether or not it includes degree programs and curricular matters. Now the latter category is well protected and although the discussion we just had suggests that it may not be thoroughly protected, matters of curriculum belong to the faculty and this body should decide matters of curriculum. The replacement policy is really targeted at the restructuring of academic units in the sense of departments and schools where there are reallocations of money, and reassignment of faculty. Those are the circumstances we're talking about and yes, if you want to put specific labels on that restructuring it involves merging units, eliminating units, or drastically reducing units. What I tried to do is go through the long policy and ask what's really important in it. That is, what are the faculty rights that need to be protected? And I got it down almost to a half dozen, seven. First, faculty consultation the faculty governing bodies and the faculty as a whole need to be appraised of what is going on early and often. Secondly, there needs to be sufficient time for the faculty to not only hear about what is going on but to respond, and I emphasize that the concerns of the faculty should be collated and summarized somehow, either through this body or an ad hoc committee and presented to relevant deans, provost, and president before the changes take place. So – just if you are looking ahead – when the New Academic Directions Task Force releases its report it seems to me that a whole lot of things should begin not end and what should begin is this process of consultation and faculty response. Third, we need to protect tenure again setting aside the situation that the AAUP talks about in terms of financial exigency, tenure must be protected. No tenure line should be sacrificed during these academic restructurings. Forth, those people who are hired into tenure track positions should be given assurances that the expectations for their tenure decision will not dramatically change as a

result of academic restructuring. It strikes me as totally unfair to tell an assistant professor, 'Oh your unit has just been eliminated and your expectations for tenure have dramatically changed.' There's going to be kinks in this and problems but I think that that safeguard is something we would all agree on. Fifth, the reassignments to new homes, this is a difficult one. Deans do have the right to say, 'Well, you know what we don't need this faculty. We don't necessarily want these faculty.' Faculty in units can say and vote on whether they want to welcome a faculty member who has been displaced from a unit that no longer exists. What this particular point wants to say is this: you can't force faculty members to accept a position. It should be a negotiation. There should be an opportunity for a faculty member who is displaced from their existing unit to find a new home that makes sense in terms of their intellectual, scholarly, scientific, artistic work. Not to say it's always going to work out beautifully, but we want to avoid a circumstance where someone, a dean, simply reappoints faculty members to a new unit without any recourse or response possible from the faculty member. Sixth, certain aspects of compensation, no loss of pay and no loss of sabbatical eligibility should result from the reorganization. That opens up a whole set of questions about benefits and what not. And finally grievances at the individual level should not go through any committee like the poor MRE Committee that had to deal with the HPER circumstance. We have a grievance structure. If faculty feel that procedurally they have been victimized in an unfair way they can take their procedural grievance to the mechanisms, either mediation or more likely Faculty Board of Review. I'm not sure this is a complete list of the rights that we need to protect. I think it's got the important ones down. I think we should have a frank conversation about whether these are adequate. This is a first reading and really nothing more than that, but I welcome your questions and I'm sure John might want to chip in too.

D'AMICO: What happens to graduate students in departments that are merged or eliminated?

GIERYN: There are categories of people that are not addressed in this replacement because they weren't addressed in the original policy. It's a very important question whether they should be addressed. For example, graduate students are not mentioned in this policy. It's not for me to decide, it's for us to think about what should be the rights of graduate students. The other group that is visibly absent from reference is contingent non-tenure-track faculty.

DOWELL: John?

CARNIE: Yeah, it was addressed in the [indistinct comment] students would continue [indistinct comment]. Thank you.

D'AMICO: What happens like you're given a contact? You're admitted to a program you're as an SAA told well, you'll be given five years of funding contingent upon normal progress to complete your degree. Your department's eliminated in year three, you're reassigned, you're

given the opportunity to be reassigned to a new department do you still get two years of funding? Do you lose that funding? When are you told about this decision? Are you told in the middle of a year after applications to other programs have passed?

GIERYN: That was also covered in the previous policy.

D'AMICO: This policy?

GIERYN: No.

DOWELL: The current policy, the one that exists now. Alright, obviously that's a gap that we can certainly take under consideration for carrying forward.

GIERYN: As with contracts of non-tenure track appointees, they'd have to be.

DOWELL: Did you have a follow-up on...

JIMENEZ: Yeah, I was wondering about the continued authority of the BFC because in the old one it says, you know, that the Faculty Council's influence on those kinds of decisions is because the body is made up of faculty, students, etc... In the new one it doesn't – to me anyway – express that same clarity where the fact that the BFC is consulted is because it's made up of all of us. It seems in the new one where they mention, you know, ad hoc committees and such that there is possibilities for no student representation to go into the decision-making processes in the new one.

GIERYN: Again, this is exactly what this discussion is intended to do...

DOWELL: Yeah.

GIERYN: So let's continue, I'm making notes.

DOWELL: Yes. Herb?

GIERYN: Valued comments.

TERRY: My very quick comment is one that has already been discussed in part. Number one, I certainly would not favor using this to replace the existing policy for the reason that Tom talked about. The existing policy, as far as I can tell, is the only place we deal with financial exigency and with a subcategory of that, financial crisis. So if you go down this path I would hope that we would, in a short time, would replace part four of this long document – and maybe some other parts – but let's keep something in place on financial exigency because that or financial crisis may be worth having a policy about. Number two, I was head of the Council when the Informatics thing came up and I don't think it was ignored. I think the policy just didn't apply

because it was so focused on reorganizations that affected the entire campus and they cunningly designed that so it affected only them and their faculty they thought. So I agree with that thrust of trying to broaden it. I would in your first paragraph, to the list of the people who might decide that reorganization would be a good idea add faculty. We occasionally also have some new ideas on reorganization I would hope, maybe in reacting to this report. NTT faculty, I think we need to say something about them. We are the Bloomington Faculty Council and they have no other representation and whether it's just that long-term contracts that they may already have are transferred, I think they should have some say in a reassignment to a new academic home if they have a contract. And finally I note that the original policy contains no "should"s. Tom is a very nice, gentle polite fellow and his policy is full of "should"s. Deans love "should"s, because it leaves them choices to should or should not something. The appropriate substitutes in the old policy are "must"s and "shall"s and I would recommend we just sort of do a global search for the "should"s and substitute "must"s and "shall"s. [laughter]

DOWELL: Tony, did you...?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Is it must or shall?

FARGO: I wasn't listening when you said earlier, Tom. I just wanted to ask you about is it – from what I hear from Herb – there's some disagreement about this – but if the policy was, as you've suggested, ignored during the Informatics debate, then does it really matter whether the policy is two pages or six pages or whatever? If it can just be sidestepped or ignored, what makes this and what we're trying to do here any better in that regard to what we have?

GIERYN: Yeah, that's... and Herb pointed I think to the critical thing. The original policy was treating reorganization in a very narrow sense. The reason, the circumstances, that would invoke the policy involve changes going on within a school that might have impact on other schools, and therefore the need for some, in a sense, campus-wide faculty remonstrance of those changes. What we're doing here is shifting the focus away from merely being focused on the implications for the rest of the campus to rights of various groups, and if we could say faculty academic appointments, students, during the period of restructuring, so it's an expansion of the concern.

DOWELL: Bob?

ARNOVE: One important change is that faculty may not involuntarily be assigned to the unit, whereas the other one says that they shall be reassigned. But when it comes to grievances, because a department does not have to accept the faculty member, and a grievance goes before the Faculty Board of Review, what happens when the Board of Review says this person should be assigned to this unit? Does the unit then have to accept that person or what? I mean that's a really problematic matter.

GIERYN: Yeah, and I... Some draft may have to address that. I couldn't settle that one and indeed the point number five as a whole is simply slippery. I mean I think we got to deal with reassignment. We've had complaints in recent reorganizations of faculty who were put in units that they didn't want to be put into, and so the concern was that we should somehow be able to prevent that circumstance but at the same time we don't want to restrict the rights of faculty and academic units to decide who their colleagues will be. But I don't have any easy answer.

ARNOVE: I mean you happen to have a great scholar who's just controversial and difficult to deal with... [laughter]

GIERYN: Yeah.

ARNOVE: But deserves to be, you know, otherwise the person is homeless.

GIERYN: That's right.

DOWELL: Herb?

TERRY: If there are no...? Based on some recent experiences, I would say that your paragraph on compensation and other benefits might have to say something about agreements that faculty have, sometimes in written from one dean, when they get over – organized into another one I mean, it can be all kinds of things – but that often it seems to me that the disputes we hear even with shifts within departments or something is that, 'I had a deal with the dean, I regarded it as part of my understanding.' I can imagine if you shift that to another school that could be very important to some of our faculty. Sometimes it's part of a hiring agreement, sometimes as part of retention agreements.

GIERYN: That could involve research funds, teaching loads...

TERRY: Yeah, all kinds of things.

GIERYN: Yeah, that's right, that's absolutely right.

DOWELL: John?

CARINI: [indistinct] the UFC discussion, but obviously many of these issues go beyond this campus, the schools, or something, I don't think there is any body [indistinct] any committee, certainly not at the university level, maybe not at the [indistinct] of the campus [indistinct]

GIERYN: They're UFC discussions. There is no...you should speak to them.

DOWELL: Right, there is no UFC policy, that's correct. There's certainly no UFC body. The one campus that we know of that has some kind of similar policy to ours is IUPUI has a section. I

haven't read it completely, but I think it might be even longer than our current policy. Not that it's better or worse, but definitely pages, it's closer to fourteen. And the UFC discussion was short, there was certainly an interest in should there be a university-level policy? It certainly has got – we kind of sent it back to the campuses to talk about whether their campus needs something. I think the idea, the thought, is that it's probably, I mean, it's very ambitious for us to hope to revise this policy and agree on something in a very short period of weeks. And we figure it's probably impossible at the university level to come up with something, although there is in our faculty, the Indiana University faculty kind of constitution, sort of the nugget of this kind of interest and authority that campus-level policy is certainly kind of paying off to expand in a certain way. So, that's kind of the status of where it's at at the university level but you're right, the idea of intra-campus, inter-campus reorganizations is kind of hanging out there, too.

TERRY: I would think, however, it might be hard to get the UFC to adopt a policy but I'm certainly thinking that adopting a general resolution in advance of the report of the task force...

DOWELL: Mmhm.

TERRY: Saying that many of the principles that Tom at least has identified here should apply. You know this policy in 1984 or even in 2009, well not 2009, in 1984 was written before we had core schools, let alone a committee saying that we should look at whether or not Bloomington and IUPUI are doing the right things. I can imagine a program based on that being transferred from Bloomington to IUPUI or back here. Since we have tenure as a campus-specific [indistinct] some key folks told me around School of Medicine has a campus-specific things and you'd have to address some very interesting tenure questions, if you propose something like that. I would hope the UFC would try to get some statement out there saying...

DOWELL: Well, it's an idea.

TERRY: 'Here are the values I think should be reflected, we are working on the policy.'

DOWELL: Yes, David?

ESTELL: Yeah, I'm just advocating for something that happens on the UFC because the School of Education is one of the core campus programs, so any reorganization we have may be transferring programs between us and IUPUI, since our dean is technically their dean and by extension Columbus' dean and if we say we want to reorganize this and IUPUI says no, whose policy wins, you know? So I think that at some point there does have to be some coordination especially in core campus programs, because there may be a variety of other programs like the School of Nursing thing we talked about earlier is the same issue, because what if they want to

reorganize Nursing and have a program that's universal to the entire university but, you know, whose policy governs that whole organization and at some point –

DOWELL: – Right –

ESTELL: – I mean really you can't have a single policy for the entire university but at least some guidelines you could use for those kinds of issues.

DOWELL: Sure.

GIERYN: The decision was made in the interest of trying to get something going reasonably quickly and it was felt if we started at the UFC level it would be a slower process which is why I took the initiative for Bloomington and also because we had the existing policy that was a Bloomington-only policy.

DOWELL: Mmhm.

GIERYN: And I do believe it may be worthwhile for us to continue to work on a BFC policy and if the UFC decides 'Okay, we'll piggyback,' or pass a resolution that endorses the Bloomington policy so much the better. But it would be a risk of bogging down if we were to turn it loose in the UFC.

DOWELL: All right, we've reached our mandatory adjournment time, thank you everyone and be sure, if you have comments email me, email Tom, grab one of us we can certainly hear more on this topic.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM