

**Indiana University  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL  
September 3, 2013  
Indiana Memorial Union – Georgian Room  
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Abhijit Basu, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Gracia Clark, Claude Clegg, Mike Conway, Carrie Docherty, Nathan Ensmenger, Alyce Fly, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Krista Glazewski, Margaret Gray, Dennis Groth, Vivian Halloran, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Timothy Hoch, Gretchen Horlacher, Jason Baird Jackson, Cheng Kao, Jennifer Laherty, Karma Lochrie, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Joseph Miller, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Olivia Rios, Lauren Robel, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, Herbert Terry, Mikel Tiller, Julie Van Voorhis, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, Nona Watt

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone), William Swanson (Doug Horner)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Joelle Bahloul, David Baxter, Ying Ding, Marion Frank-Wilson, Bradley Heim, Christopher Kauffman, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Bradley Levinson, Michael McRobbie, Sherri Michaels, Jose Mitjavila, Jeff Nelsen, Lisa Sideris, Adam Szczepaniak, Kelly Thacker, Peggy Thoits, James Wimbush, Rega Wood

**GUESTS:** Alan Bender, (Biology), David Daleke (University Graduate School), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Lauren Hodge (Faculty Council Office), Bob Kravchuk (BAC co-chair), Mark McConahay (Registrar), MaryFrances McCourt (CFO), Ted Miller (Emeritus - SPEA), Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/12-13/04.16.13.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for John McKinley and James Werner Halporn

John McKinley: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B4-2014.pdf>

James Werner Halporn: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B5-2014.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Herb Terry)

Circular B1-2014: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B1-2014.pdf>

Circular B2-2014: *Pending*

Circular B3-2014: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B3-2014.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

5. Update on the Strategic Planning Process (20 minutes)

(Provost Lauren Robel) [DISCUSSION]

5. Question / Comment Period<sup>1</sup>

6. SB 182 Update and Status of the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (20 minutes)

(Professor Dennis Groth, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.in.gov/legislative/bills/2013/SB/SB0182.1.html>

NOTE: Adjournment prior to 5:30 p.m. is anticipated so that members of the Council who have not yet joined at least one BFC Committee can, working with Chief of Staff Craig Dethloff, be assigned. Please check with Dr. Dethloff after adjournment if you received an e-mail notifying you that you do not yet have a committee assignment.

## Minutes

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ROBEL:** ...fell silent right on cue. [Laughs] Welcome everybody I have met most of you although not all of you. I'm Lauren Robel and I hope to have met all of you before the meeting is out or in the immediate period after the meeting. But welcome back to the new year, and we'll start out by just asking for a motion to approve the minutes. [Silence].

**MCMANUS:** So moved.

**ROBEL:** Thank you, and a second?

**BRONSTEIN:** Second.

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Terry should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcOFF@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcOFF@indiana.edu)

**ROBEL:** Thank you. All in favor? [Aye]. Sounds good. At this point we'll turn to Tom Gieryn for the memorial resolutions.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: Memorial Resolutions for John McKinley and James Werner Halpor**

**GIERYN:** John McKinley, noted Professor of Adult Education at Indiana University, was a native Hoosier, born May 31, 1921, in Knox County, Indiana, to Lester and Emma Caroline Meir McKinley. John attended Wheatland High School, where his father was principal and later superintendent of schools for Knox County.

Following in his father's footsteps, John would become a lifelong educator and scholar. John attended Hanover College prior to World War II, and then entered the service and served as an infantryman in France and Germany during the war. John honed his writing skills as a journalist for *Stars and Stripes* in the Army and participated in the Allies' victory in the Battle of the Bulge. During the war, John received letters from a Monroe City, Indiana woman he had never met, Maxine Shake. Maxine wrote to John as part of a writing initiative to encourage servicemen during World War II. After returning from the war in 1944, John met Maxine, fell in love, and married her.

After the war, John also returned to college, and in 1947 he completed his bachelor's degree at Indiana State Teachers University. He received a master's degree in English in 1949 and a doctorate in Adult Education from Indiana University in 1960. He joined the faculty at Indiana University in 1952, became Director of the Bureau of Studies of Adult Education, and taught at Indiana University for more than thirty years, retiring as Professor Emeritus in 1983.

John's career was devoted to teaching and the application of knowledge, particularly in the areas of group dynamics and team-based learning. John was ahead of his time because he had a special interest in service learning and worked extensively with community education, churches, and the military. He helped create the first medical education program at Bloomington Hospital, in Bloomington, Indiana, and his design was used by a protégé in the development of the medical education program at Methodist Hospital in Indianapolis.

John utilized his journalistic skills and wrote several textbooks and numerous journal articles in the adult education field. His books include: *Design for Education in the Church* (with Paul Bergevin, 1958), *Creative Methods for Adult Classes* (1960), and *Adult Education for the Church* (with Paul Bergevin, 1970). He is best known for his work in group dynamics and the design of learning activities for adult learners. He, along with his colleague at Indiana University, Professor Paul Begevin, wrote the influential book titled *Participation Training in Adult Education* (1965). This book is a classic in the field of adult education. He followed that book with *Group Development through Participation Training* (1980), a book also acknowledged as a major contribution to the professional field of adult education.

John is particularly known for the Participation Training Design and, with Paul Bergevin, co-authored the "Indiana Plan," which became a national model for religious adult education in

the church to assist denominations in planning adult education. The Plan is a flexible approach to addressing some of the problems of adult education in local churches. The Episcopal Church used the Participation Training model to train lay board leaders in their congregations across the country to increase understanding of and participation in the worship, the work, and the witness of the church. Participation Training has been used extensively in North America and in different parts of the world such as Japan, Australia and Denmark.

John was a valuable contributor to his profession and was the founding father of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, which is the professional leadership group of Adult Education. He was also named one of the nine living educators who made major contributions to the field of adult education in North America by the National Education Research Council in 1974. In 1975, he received the Outstanding Adult Educator of the Year Award from the Adult Education Association of the USA (now the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, or AAACE) for his many significant contributions to adult education. John's writings and correspondence are now in the archives of Syracuse University's Charter Library, the leading repository of adult education materials in the country, thanks to the efforts of Dr. Marje Treff and Dr. Lee McKinley.

John was truly a renaissance man. Not only was he a scholar, but a family man, an avid reader of history and philosophy and a man of many interests and talents. His love for learning and his love for his family were intertwined throughout his life. He encouraged his wife, Maxine, to return to her lifelong love of art, specifically painting. She received a degree in Fine Art when she was fifty years old from Indiana University, where she studied under Rudy Pozzatti. Before her death in 2007, Maxine and John were married for sixty-three years and had the joy of giving birth to four children. Their first daughter, Ann, died at age three of leukemia; the three other children, Lee, Nancy, and Allen, all survived. Dr. Lee McKinley, doctor of internal medicine, resides in Bloomington, Indiana, with his wife, Maria. They have three children, Susan, Ryan, and Adam. Nancy Davis, John and Maxine's surviving daughter, is a nurse practitioner in reproductive medicine who resides in Los Angeles, California, with her husband Scott. John and Maxine's youngest child, Allen, and his wife, Paula, reside in Des Moines, Iowa, where Allen is the city budget director. They have three children, Nick, Mallory and Katie.

John was intimately involved with his family and even helped his son Lee attain Eagle Scout rank by assisting him with his citizenship merit badge. He took Lee to meet the Bloomington Mayor and the Commissioner of Health to learn about government and citizenship and helped arranged for Lee to spend a day as acting Mayor of Bloomington. Each year John drove his entire family in a tent trailer during the month of August to Civil War battle sites, where they studied and re-created Civil War battles. John loved writing poetry, and along with his son Lee, and grandson, Adam, published a book of poetry entitled *A Nod to My Father: Three Generations of Poetry*. John also had a sense of humor and loved collecting, reciting and sharing bawdy limericks as well as humorous quotes from Mark Twain and O. Henry. In addition, John loved music and was a self-taught fiddler by way of the country fingering tradition; he also played the mandolin. John had a little extra musical help by spending a week with Earl Scrubbs, who met and befriended John at one of the numerous competitions John attended for fiddle

and mandolin in Galax, Virginia. John had actually once performed with a group called “Pop Corn and the Kernels” in some local speakeasies during the Great Depression.

John’s work and character touched the lives of many people. What colleagues and students remember is how he treated them with dignity and respect. He was happy to spend time talking with students and developing long-term friendships. He was a person who epitomized the traits of genuineness, warmth, and empathy when he taught. John was continually identified in surveys of adult education graduates as being a faculty member who was kind and compassionate, who truly cared about his students, and who had a major impact on their lives. Dr. Steve Earnest, a former doctoral student, wrote, “It was his sharing and enthusiasm that fueled my success in the doctoral program and has influenced my teaching ever since”.

A kind, humble, and genuine man who disliked ceremonies, before his death on November 8, 2011, John had requested that his family have no funeral. Rather, at his memorial service, friends and family recalled all the things that they loved and admired about John. This time of remembrance was enlivened by Irish folk music, and those there recalled many humorous and fond stories about John. John knew about the importance of life and wrote in his poem “Monuments”:

We are the monuments that celebrate the dreams  
Of those who strove to live beyond their time.

While appreciating the importance of life, John lived his life with both joy and humor. His short poem “Stones”, says a lot about John’s philosophy:

Small stones click in my pocket;  
Unrelated, you say, to human life?  
We both are made of atoms  
And our bodies share the dust  
As a common end.

The pace of their decline  
Is slower than mine,  
So time is on their side.  
But I can taste the bacon  
In the morning.

Those who loved and respected John McKinley know and are glad that John lived his life in a way that let him “taste the bacon”, and we also know that the way he lived his life ensures that he will be “a monument who lives beyond his time.”

Jim Halporn was born in New York City, grew up on Long Island and carried his accent from there for his whole life — much of it spent far from there. His mother Louisa taught English in the public schools. His father Robert brought much of the influence of his Gymnasium

education and Viennese values to educating his son. (Much later, in retirement, Robert moved to Bloomington, where he took a number of Latin and Greek classes with his son's Indiana University colleagues.)

After a year at St. John's College, Jim entered Columbia College with the full intention of becoming a chemist, despite his strong interest in literature — from childhood he was a constant reader of anything at hand. That interest, the year at St. John's, and the first-year humanities courses at Columbia influenced his decision by his senior year to major in classics rather than chemistry. He then concentrated on Latin and started Greek in order to prepare for the Masters degree program at Columbia; following that, he earned his PhD at Cornell. His previous scientific training and inclination gave him a discipline and focus that was an asset to his linguistic and philological future. While at Columbia, he was coxswain for the junior varsity crew. Chosen for his very lightweight physique, his winter training consisted of smoking and playing cards while the oarsmen worked out. He was bemused to have earned a letter in the sport.

Jim's experiences — both as a student and as a teacher of the Columbia humanities core — informed his teaching style and expectations throughout his career. He liked to talk, and he liked to provoke or elicit discussion from his students. Jim had studied under Gilbert Highet, that gifted teacher and scholar of the classics, and thought he had his best lessons in how to teach from him. One of his undergraduate students says, "He was an amusing and very engaging teacher — unsentimental, shrewdly critical, and just. He took pleasure in his students' peculiarities, and never pressed us into a conventional mold."

When Jim entered the field of classics his interests were more philological than literary, and he edited the text of Cassiodorus' treatise *De Anima* for his dissertation. This set him on the course of study of early Church Fathers and late antiquity that dominated his research activity. He often strayed into other areas of classics, however, during a distinguished career as a Latin scholar. He taught at Indiana University from 1960 to 1993 and served as chair from 1985 to 1993.

As scholar, Jim made significant contributions in three areas: editions and translations of works by Cassiodorus; Latin meter; and Roman comedy. His edition of *De Anima* by Cassiodorus is still the standard edition, quoted by everyone who has occasion to mention Cassiodorus and the remarkable age of Theoderic. In retirement he completed his translation of Cassiodorus' *Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning* and *On the Soul*. Two months before his death he submitted a detailed and positive review of a work on Cassiodorus to a grateful university press editor. It must have given him satisfaction to be recognized as the reigning expert in this area, and to feel that with that report he was passing the torch to a worthy scholar of the next generation.

Of his work on metrics, the best known to several generations of grateful students at all levels is the clear and succinct co-authored handbook *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. The contributions of Jim and Martin Oswald to that work were translated into German in

1962 as *Lateinische Metrik*; the rubric beneath the title — *Berechtigte Übersetzung aus dem Amerikanischen* — must have amused Jim as a linguist.

Jim's interest in Roman comedy may have been inspired in part by his maternal grandfather, a Yiddish playwright, who played scenes with him as a young child. Jim passed his expertise in that area down to the graduate students whom he taught, including Sander Goldberg — Jim supervised his special author work on Terence and his dissertation on Menander. Jim left deep impressions on other graduate students he taught and supervised. John Wright, another of his PhD students, credits Jim with turning him into a scholar — "it's all thanks to him." From his experiences as an MA student, Brent Froberg recalls that Jim "gave our written work the kind of sandpapering that it needed so that we could write clear, persuasive prose." While that "sandpapering" sometimes drew blood, metaphorically, both in the heavily red-penned results and in battered egos, those who persevered emerged with polished work, which led in turn to jobs, publications, and successful careers.

In the mainframe era of computers (1960s), Jim explored their use in the humanities but was often critical of some of the early applications, which he considered too crude for the useful analysis of literary texts. He was, however, quite impressed by the sophisticated digital tools that now support classical scholarship. At the last American Philological Association meeting he attended, he discovered electronic devices on display among the publishers' exhibits. He heard Virgil being read on an iPod and bought one immediately after returning home. Following that, he embraced all things "i" and loaded his devices with apps.

After retiring from Indiana University, Jim moved with his wife Barbara to Cambridge, Massachusetts, where she was head of the Widener Library's Collection Development Department. He was actively involved with the Harvard Classics Department as an adjunct professor for almost twenty years, attending talks and conferences, serving on the committee of at least one doctoral student, participating faithfully in a number of graduate seminars, catching up with journals in the Smyth Classical Library, and attending monthly faculty-student lunches, including the one in October, weeks before his death.

A voracious reader since childhood, a haunter of large research libraries since college — how fitting that he was able in retirement to spend so many pleasant and satisfying days in the Widener stacks!

**ROBEL:** Thank you for that beautiful... memories. And may we all please stand for a moment of silence [all stand] for our colleagues. [Silence]. Thank you. [All sit]. I turn it over now to our new and old president Herb Terry. [laughter]

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**TERRY:** Thank you. First of all I would like to in a way add to the memorial resolutions just a moment. I want to express my condolences, and I hope that of the Council, to Ruth and Angie Fiege, the parents of the young student, the incoming freshman who died during

welcome week. We'll figure out later if there are implications of her death for alcohol and campus safety and the important thing now is just sort of pause and express our condolences to the family and our heartfelt good wishes for their futures, so I hope you will join me in doing that.

That said, let me welcome first of all, everyone to the Council's first meeting. The Council is the central unit of campus-level shared governance and I'm grateful for all of you for stepping up and being willing to serve on this body this year. For some of you that's a continuing obligation. As Lauren noted it seems to be a continuing obligation beyond retirement in my case, but uh, for others it is new. So the first thing I would like to ask is if you are new to this Council, never served on it before, please sort of waive your hand for a moment so we can welcome you all and get an idea of who you are [Applause] and thank you! There has been substantial concern including concern by the Long Range Planning Committee in its reports to this group last year about the vitality of the Council, and part of the vitality of the Council comes from new blood and new ideas. And so I am very grateful that you have agreed to join. I would like to welcome a couple, I think, of new administrators who weren't members of the Council officially before. Or although I think you've been on it haven't you, Dennis?

**GROTH:** Yes.

**TERRY:** Dennis Groth is the Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. He's on the agenda, on the hot seat later today and I'm very happy to have Dennis. Dennis and I had some useful conversations over the summer about undergraduate education issues. So welcome to that. I think all of the others administrators are -

**ROBEL:** [Inaudible].

**TERRY:** Oh yes- you're here. Michael? No. Martin... McCrory, yes.

**ROBEL:** Vice president for educational inclus – or vice provost for educational inclusion and diversity, and associate vice president of diversity, equity and multicultural affairs.  
[Laughter].

**TERRY:** And that person and his title [laughter] raises another issue I was going to address later, but I'll address it now. I think the Executive Committee will be taking a look at the bylaws that constitute the members of the Council. We have some changes in administrative structure and new vice provosts and that sort of thing, and we will consider whether we need to changes our bylaws and membership or find some way in which their continuing representation is welcomed. So, welcome. That's it, I think, okay?

I wanted to say a few things on behalf – or welcome to the student members and non, other non-faculty members. Jose, are you here, president of IUSA? He's not – is Christopher here? Neither one. Okay. Jose Mitjavila is the student body president. He's majoring in neuroscience and I've had a meeting with him already. Haven't met Christopher Kauffman,



the chief of staff, who's a major in accounting and finance but hopefully they will both be at the next meeting. The GPSO, I think they're here. Brad – Bradley? Brady? Brady Harman from IU Maurer School of Law. Is Kelly here? Your RPS type – not Kelly, Pat! Pat Thomas, your vice president?

**HARMAN:** Last year.

**TERRY:** Last year, last year, then the list of members of the BFC is wrong. Professor, yes go ahead.

**ROBEL:** No, no, no.

**TERRY:** Well, Kelly Thacker, of professional staff council. Is Kelly here? Okay. Ed, I saw you. Ed Vasquez, the president of local 4750 of CWA, and Ed I have not forgotten that the Council last year had an extended discussion of how to represent staff on this Council given that CWA is not the only group that represents staff members and I can assure you the Executive Committee will get back to that discussion promptly. Okay. I'd also like to especially welcome all new members of the Executive Committee. I think all of them are determined now aren't they, Craig? Some get their Executive Committee office by accepting chairmanships of committees. We're close.

**DETHLOFF:** Yeah, we're very close.

**TERRY:** If you know you are on the Executive Committee, or certainly think you are, please also raise your hand for a moment so that the Council members can see who you are. Carolyn Calloway-Thomas the outgoing, former president, Don Gjerdingen our parliamentarian again, Jim Sherman, president-elect, and Maresa. Maresa Murray I welcome as a precedent. We have not had a non-tenure-track faculty member elected to the Executive Committee or agenda committee of the Council. She is the first one to be elected. I'm glad to have her on the group – [Applause]

**MURRAY:** – Thank you. –

**TERRY:** – and welcome her. Okay. It being the end of the summer, I'll report on my summer activities. [Laughter]. I took office July 1, one of the first thing that hit my desk was some of the fall out for student employees largely of the Affordable Care Act. Fortunately, I can tell you that partly because of President Obama's delay in implementing the employee mandate, employer mandate, we have a little time to figure out – to work out some of the implications of that act that I think weren't as clear before the deadline hit as they became once it hit. We had a number of units, both science labs and others, that had arranged summer employment for students. It pushed the students over the 29.5 hour limit that the university has for, at which point, it wants to take into account the implications Affordable Care Act. I think that Dan Rives and others are now well aware of that. And as far as I know the

problems that I heard of July 1 seem to have been at least temporarily been resolved, satisfactorily.

I should tell you that compared to the time when I did this the last time, which was some years ago, I have already received more business for the Faculty Board of Review and other sort of bodies related to faculty disputes with administrators about their conditions of employment. We are getting along in forming those bodies and I expect that those will move forward quickly.

During the summer, I tried to meet with all the vice provosts and academic deans of IU Bloomington. I made it through most of them. One meeting had to be cancelled because of a change in my schedule, and others we just couldn't find a common time. But I have met with most of the deans, and I think all of, all but one, our newest vice provost. I have met with those folks, shared with them some of the things that I think are likely to come up in the Council this year, and more importantly I think, asked them for suggestions and tried to make sure the door is open for them to reach out to me and to this Council and to have a good working relationship with them.

Last year Carolyn took some new efforts to reach out to the policy committees and budgetary affairs committees of the Bloomington schools. And I will continue that as soon as those committees are kind of up and running which, doesn't tend to happen until the academic year is in progress. We are also trying to assemble a catalogue, a union list, of all the members of those committees, so that if we have something to say to them we can do it easily and to keep them informed of the Council's business and activities.

I was fortunate, I think – well I was. I was fortunate to attend a couple of events since we last met pertaining to the broad future of the university. The president continued to invite me and Jack Windsor, my counterpart at IUPUI, to the annual presidential retreat. I think both of us keep enough, keep up enough, with the issues affecting the university that we had heard much of the information that was presented at the retreat, but it was very useful to spend time with some of the administrators at the university level. Some administrators from IU Bloomington were also there, and get a good overview of the issues that confront the university; what's doing well, what are its challenges from that perspective. Remember that the head, at least traditionally – we still have to have a vote – this may not be the way it comes out, but traditionally the heads of the Bloomington and IUPUI faculty councils are the co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council, that's how we got invited to that. The provost will have more to say later about her strategic planning initiative, but I'm grateful that she invited me to the kick off for that. Fortunately, basically, her take on the issues that confront the university seems to be the same as the president's take on the issues that confront the university, and I'll probably say more about the strategic planning process after she makes her presentation.

It's been tradition, in fact it is almost required, that the co-Secretaries of the UFC attend the meetings of the board of trustees. We actually have a seat near, not quite at the table of the

trustees, but near, and when called upon we move to the table and we give a report to the trustees from the perspective of the faculty. I'll report very briefly on the last trustees' meeting. In many ways it was devoted to briefing the new trustees of Indiana University. The governor appointed Randall Tobias who is the retired CEO of Eli Lilly, and appointed or to some extent, reappointed Jim Morris of Pacers Entertainment. Jim was member of the board of trustees a few years ago but I believe for a little while chairman of the board. Tobias will become chair of the finance and audit committee, which is obviously an important committee in dealing with the budget of the University, and Morris will take over the chair of university relations. The new student trustee, also appointed by the governor, has IUB connections, some of you in Biology might even know her, she's Janice Farlow. She was here as a Wells Scholar and she completed a BS in biology, and a BA in the individualized major program in the College of Arts and Sciences. Janice appears to be, like all of the appointees actually, a very highly qualified appointment on the part of the governor. Derica Rice the CFO of Eli Lilly was also reappointed by the governor. Other trustees continue. There is a change in the leadership of the trustees. Tom Reilly, a retired businessman has been on a gubernatorial appointee for two terms, was appointed, was selected by the board to be its chair. Tom is a dedicated trustee, a provocative one from time to time, pushes hard for his perspectives. I respect Tom a great deal. I'm glad he's a member of the board. He will be the chair of the benefits and compensation committee. So Tom's perspective on various things related to salary and health and that sort of thing will matter. MaryEllen Bishop, an elected trustee by alums becomes the vice chair and it was announced at this trustees meeting that she will coordinate a project of the trustees to rationalize and reconcile their policies. In other words, they are going through their policies and trying to look for contradictions between them. It is not entirely clear to me what the scope of their review is. I think that Jack and I will both pay attention to what would matter a lot to this Council, and that is that many of their trustees start policies, started out as our policies, and they were policies that went through faculty governance, often went through the BFC, then went to the UFC and got approved by the UFC and then were endorsed or affirmed by the board of trustees. I am going to be meeting with John Applegate sometime in the next couple of weeks and I'll learn more about what that process may be like, and it may affect some of our business this year.

I want to comment a bit on the status of the recommendations for the Long Range Planning Committee. The Long Range Planning Committee made a report to this Council in March of last year. Let me just comment on their recommendations. They recommended an internal self-study and then an external review of faculty governance at IU. I think they meant IUB. We have not specifically moved on that, but I can tell you that part of the process of the provost's strategic planning is to identify and study leadership questions and issues and some of that may come in there. We'll find out how that's going to be handled in the strategic planning process, and I'll urge the Executive Committee to perhaps conduct some kind of internal or external study if it looks like that's not going to be a major focus of some part of the strategic planning process. They asked for a review of the potential benefits and means to do so of providing tangible incentives for those that could contribute to faculty governance and serve on the BFC. Again, I think that may be part of the strategic process which is looking at how you generate and promote leadership. Reconstitute the MRE committee – Merger,

Reorganization, Elimination Committee – and clearly identify its role. There were some changes in that policy last year. I'm going to frankly take a look at that recommendation further because we do have reorganizations coming with the school of communications, journalism, media, whatever it is. That's on my agenda. Develop, formalize, regular lines of communication between the administration, faculty and the BFC. We are working on that. We continue to have productive relationships with the provost and my going to see the vice provosts and seeing the deans this summer was part of a response to that. They have suggested town halls for faculty or staff convocations or conventions. I proposed to the Executive Committee last Thursday but we didn't get to discuss the idea that the BFC might sponsor a couple of those forums this year, and we'll continue to work on that.

Streamline information sharing; make it more accessible and convenient. That is a problem. Faculty are hard to communicate with. I think Lauren would agree with that. It's difficult to get the word out. I think actually while streamlining information is important, promoting a sense of community in which people want to know about what's going on is equally important, and I think that's an important part of the strategic planning process. Look at the unintended and intended outcomes of the decision to eliminate the dean of faculties' office. I actually assumed that a little bit of that will be a part of Tom's upcoming review next year. It's a good opportunity to look at an office that, he is the first holder of this particular office. Examining productivity and teaching accomplishments of post-tenure faculties, to see if a post-tenure review policy is needed, is indeed needed on this campus. We have one, it's called the faculty misconduct policy. [Laughter] There's a reason for that. Somewhere else in our guidelines there is a statement of the reasons for which tenure can be conceivably revoked, and one of the phrases used in there is "misconduct." So this policy that does call for – gives or creates a mechanism – where deans can notify the Council of faculty members that they think are severely underperforming for a long period of time was called the faculty academic misconduct policy to make it consistent with the other policy. We may conduct that review of that policy this year, and that's what I'll say on it. I'm not sure we have a pressing need to do so right now.

Study the roll and contributions of NTT faculty. That's probably something that will be a major part of the academic, of the strategic plan, and I'll let Lauren say more about that, or Tom later. Reconstitute the External Relations Committee and distribute minutes. I have not actually done that yet, but I will. Take necessary steps to restore a 'sense of community' on the campus as opposed to a place where faculty and staff go to work. I don't know that Lauren reviewed that phrase before she came up with her strategic plan, but creating a sense of community, creating a sense of this campus that's distinctive and where people are engaged is in, I think, everybody's efforts. So there has been some response to that. I expect to distribute at the next Faculty Council meeting several things that are still to some extent in the works. We'll start working on our committee composition. Everything sort of fell behind this year. The completion of the election of the Council was late, that meant the selection of the Executive Committee was late, it meant that forming committees lapsed into the summer. I do plan to charge the Nominations Committee with taking a look at how we can better get people to serve on our committees. Often in the past, the Nominations

Committee has sort of met, gone through lists of faculty, responded frankly to people they knew and tried to draft people. I would like to see us try and create a more proactive mechanism in which we would try to get indications of willingness to serve that we can draw upon rather than try and bring them about when we actually have a need. We should complete the roster of the Executive Committee, the roster members of committees and their chairs by the next faculty meeting – next Faculty Council meeting certainly – and we'll distribute that. And I apologize that it's late. I intend to try and do everything I can to make sure that process is accelerated next year, and that Jim knows earlier who the members of the various committees are and that sort of thing. I also expect to distribute some kind of an overview of the issues that the Executive Committee hopes that each committee of the Council will take on this year. I had a draft of that that I gave to the Executive Committee Thursday. We have not completed our discussion of it. But, in the past we have often just reminded the committees of what their duties are and not often given them specific charges, to look at specific issues. And I hope that the Executive Committee will do that and if they do I will share that with you, but also with the campus administrations, with the deans and others so they can see what we are planning to work on. It's an exciting year. The provost will soon outline her strategic planning process and that makes its exciting, as do really, the circumstances that press us to engage in a strategic plan. We're under a lot of pressure for change, but it's good change for the most part. It will make us a better institution; it will make us effective, and I am looking forward to working on that this year. Any context? At your tables, there's something that Carolyn, acting on recommendation from Bill Wheeler, started last year and I think it's worth continuing. On your tables is the campus – IUB campus – mission statement. The trustees, I hope, think of this as their policy. They endorsed it, but it came from us. It was this Council that eventually wrote, as a part of a process a number of years ago called mission differentiation, wrote the mission statement for this campus that the trustees imposed. Approved, I shouldn't say "imposed." We created it. And at the start of the year I think it's useful to just look at that and remind ourselves of what the mission of this campus is because that's also the mission, advancing this is the mission of this Council. I think Carolyn asked people to stand. That sounds like the pledge of allegiance or something and I'm not going to do that, but I will read it and urge you to think about it not just today but throughout the year.

Bloomington is the flagship residential, doctoral-extensive campus of Indiana University. Its mission is to create, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge. It does so through its commitments to cutting-edge research, scholarship, arts, and creative activity; to challenging and inspired undergraduate, graduate, professional, and lifelong education; to culturally diverse and international educational programs and communities; to first-rate library and museum collections; to economic development in the state and region; and to meaningful experiences outside the classroom. The Bloomington campus is committed to full diversity, academic freedom, and meeting the changing educational and research needs of the state, the nation, and the world.

And with that welcome to yet another year of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT**

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much President Terry. I want to start out by thanking everyone as well. It is so critical to the functioning of the campus and for assuring that we are engaged in thoughtful processes at the campus level to have a Bloomington Faculty Council that is also renewed and engaged every year and I want to just offer my gratitude and thanks to all of you for your willingness to serve on this Council, your willingness to run for the positions and to give us the time to help assure that the campus operates in the way it should. That we're taking into consideration the views of everyone on the campus when the campus goes in, or takes on new directions, and that the values that animate our campus mission statement are fully aired and discussed around any important decision we make on this campus. So thank you for your service. That's what Bloomington Faculty Council does.

I too, I will follow the president in noting some important things that happened over the course of the summer. But before I do so, I want to introduce Hannah Alani. Hannah is here today on behalf of the IDS. She is the reporter for the campus for the administrative aspects of the campus and those of you who read the H-T know that Hannah also is not – while she is new to journalism on this campus and she's a freshman in the school of journalism, she is not new to journalism – because she has been writing a column for the H-T for some time and quite a wonderful one. So welcome Hannah. Over the course of the summer there were quite a few things to report on at the beginning of the year as it turns out. I want to start by thanking MaryFrances McCourt for coming. MaryFrances was appointed not that long ago as CFO, and I'm just delighted to have her with us. She has come today because we had a question about – that came to the Council about parking privatization discussions. So I thought it would be helpful if she was able to do it, for her to come and in a minute we will turn to that. But thank you very much MaryFrances, and congratulations on your appointment.

We also have sa – we saw some turnover in the Office of Diversity, Equity and Multicultural Affairs. Ed Marshall retired after a long and wonderful career with Indiana University that spanned forty-two years and every time I see Ed these days I ask him if his boat is out now. And just the last week he actually had it out, so we can hope, wish Ed every best wish as he goes into retirement. And welcome James Wimbush into the position of Vice President for DEMA. James has a wonderful career himself in administration on this campus – faculty member with the Kelley School of Business and dean of the University Graduate School. He will remain as dean of the University Graduate School, but he also will take over the university aspects of the DEMA. Martin McCrory has joined my office as vice provost for educational inclusion and diversity. And Martin is also a faculty member at the Kelley School of Business, head of their honors program, and has been the soul of energy for the last several months working his way around the campus talking to people about the needs of the campus in this area. So I wanted to be sure to introduce him to you and to urge all of you to get to know him soon. A couple of other things that I'd like to just mention before I turn to MaryFrances to answer the – or to talk about where we are with parking, over the summer I also received a report from the Faculty Advisory Group that was looking at scholarly publishing. Ruth Stone who is with us today headed up that group and Jason Jackson was also on it. It is a terrific report it will help guide

the development of the strategic plan for the Office of Scholarly Publishing within which the IU press now sits and that report will be available, if it is not already, on my website sometime in the next several days.

I wanted to mention as well the implications of the Affordable Care Act. We realized actually fairly early that the Affordable Care Act was going to have – was going to present some challenges for the academic side of the house. It – the act itself noted that particularly with respect to adjunct faculty members there were some difficult issues to try to work out in inferring exactly how the work of those faculty members fit within the general language of the act. The reprieve that we got around the implementation of the act was not actually around the implementation of the act, but actually simply the penalties that would hit the university or any other employer if implementation didn't happen. So we went forward with implementing the ACA in the best way we could with the sure knowledge that there would be wrinkles that we weren't able to anticipate and that we could use this time that we have to try to hear from the faculty and from the departments and schools about what issues they're facing in ACA implementation so that we can slowly work them out. John Applegate, I think, is heading up the committee that is working on ACA implementation. Tom, are you?

**GIERYN:** Associate Vice President Anne Massey is.

**ROBEL:** Anne Massey! Okay, is heading this up and Tom you're...?

**GIERYN:** I'm on it.

**ROBEL:** ...on the committee so as you face particular issues please feel free to get in touch with Tom or get in touch with Anne Massey directly. How about, there are plenty of other things to report on but most of my time is strategic planning these days so why don't I turn to MaryFrances, if I can, just to get an update on where we are with the parking privatization discussion.

**MCCOURT:** Should I just stand here...?

**ROBEL:** Or come on over...

**MCCOURT:** I'd rather look at faces rather than the backs of heads. So, as you probably notice, the conversation has been light over the summer on parking and I would say we listened and intentionally the conversation was light over the summer. We are very well aware of the student population decline in the summer and the changes in some faculty, although not all, not many faculty are still here. We absolutely did not want to further those conversations without very important members of the constituent groups here. I'd say internally we didn't slow down the due diligence work that predominately Stew Cobine, who's the assistant treasurer and I did, and that is I would say with everything we do – first of all always an open door so never hesitate to ask questions but with everything we do we try to take nothing at face value and sit in every chair and look at everything from every chair. And I'd say we are

maybe like investigators in trying to uncover any loopholes in information or flaws in assumptions of data. So what we did over the summer is take everything that we had received from various consultants and, as many of you know, we've had many working on this to try and br – you know, have a fiduciary parking consultant and the actual consultant for a deal if we were to do a deal. We took nothing at face value we went into every single assumption made from the revenue increase assumptions to how much they are charging for credit cards, to how many how much efficiency someone could get out of an operation because if they assumed, you know "x" percent efficiency a year going up like that and pretty soon you have no operating expenses left. I mean we went through every single thing down to what assumptions were made on a deal if we were to do something and we were to invest the proceeds – what assumptions were made there? At the same time we looked internally at both of the operations on the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. Very different kinds of parking operations on those two campuses, an urban setting a non-urban setting, very different types of parking even within those operations and then when you look at different ways that people account for things within the university what was included or not included on each of those campuses financial statements is extremely different, so getting those similar and then comparing them to the outside world took a lot of work. It doesn't sound like much, but it took a lot of work. And so after getting through all of that the key question, and your assumptions are only as good as assumptions are, but you try to make them as realistic as possible and then do sensitivity around them. I will say I'm looking around the room because we also worked with Matt Billett, at Kelley who was kind of checking our work to make sure we were looking at things appropriately. He has a lot of experience in this area. At the end of the day what you're looking at is what is the value of what you could get externally versus what is the value of what you can do internally. The two big differences in this parking deal that we're looking at, just in case anyone is, has not heard any of the history is: you're either going to take fifty years of cash flow and get it up front which is the kind of deal we were looking at in this parking deal. That's not how all of them would be structured, that's what we were looking at, versus getting an income stream ongoing for fifty years from our own operation. And so what is the net present value of each of those? Inside of that also we know how we invest in our capital here, we wanted to make sure the investment in capital – the assumptions were the same there. And so what we have today are our best take at what the differences of those two deals would be. I'm not going to give those answers today because the next step is tomorrow we are meeting with the steering committee that's comprised of both faculty, staff and students across both campuses. It's a smaller group and we're going to talk through this with them. Then the next day we are meeting with a working committee on the Bloomington campus which is a much larger group comprised of all those constituencies. And then in the afternoon on the IUPUI campus what we're going to do is talk through our findings with them. I have my observations. We're going to ask their observations. When you look at these two things what would be the recommended course of action? And I think there's some exciting things on both sides. If we were to say, 'You know what? The value of the deal is not compelling enough to monetize this asset for the next fifty years,' you know, a lot of people say let's do it ourselves. I think the exciting part of that is we could show people we could do this ourselves. But that doesn't mean to President Terry's comment a few minutes ago or at the start of the meeting, that does not mean doing things the same we are doing them today. That means change. But if we want to



be able to change and show people we can change, this is a great thing to do. How can we look at our parking operations and look for ways to drive some efficiency and give back to the university? And if the committee recommends monetizing this, whatever we do we're going to work as a committee to then substantiate those points with the thought of sharing this with the board of trustees, not for a final decision, but for here is now our position on what we do with all of the work that's been done over the last year and get their feedback. And then I think the next step would be making a final decision. So I think in a very high level summary, that's where we stand but I would open it up for any questions.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, when you talk about the two possibilities, that is taking fifty years of money upfront or having it flow over the fifty years from our control...

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Can you please speak up?

**ROBEL:** Or just-

**MCCOURT:** Okay.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, when you talk about the two options of taking the fifty years' money upfront or taking it across the fifty years and maintaining control that's basically the fiscal/financial part of the picture. Have you given equal kinds of considerations to effectiveness, the cost to faculty and staff, the quality of changes and quality of life which are somewhat outside of the –

**MCCOURT:** Yeah.

**SHERMAN:** – pure financial considerations?

**MCCOURT:** Yeah, thanks for bringing that up. We have a lot of non-financial considerations that we've discussed and where those – we've outlined much of that – all of that work has been done in the committee setting. Some of those things, all of them would be addressed if we were to do a deal like that in what would be called the operating agreement where you lay that out. For instance, the revenue, the rate increase, the rate increase you would cap that in an operating agreement and I point that out because the rate increase wouldn't be any different internal or external. We know we are under the median so the rate increase is probably going to be at least equal internally if we keep it in house. The non-financial pieces of that, like where people park, hours of park, how enforcement works, all of those kinds of things have been talked about in these meetings as well. How employees are handled, all of that, hours of operation. The other point I just want to make and then I'll go to the next questions is if money were to come in upfront it would go into a restricted endowment, so it's not like you just take money upfront and spend it. So we have tried to hit all of the major items of what those non-financial pieces would be, but if we were to walk down this path further, a lot more work there.

**SHERMAN:** Thanks.

**MCCOURT:** Yeah?

**CLARK:** One of the differences in what you've described is the amount of flexibility that would remain if it was –

**MCCOURT:** –Absolutely. –

**CLARK:** – if it was an operating agreement we wouldn't be in a position to change it depending on – you know we would have to abide by it just as they would have to abide by it in the future of those fifty years –

**MCCOURT:** –Yep. –

**CLARK:** – whereas if we had it under our – in house we would be able to change it if it appeared to be beneficial to do so in the future. Is that correct?

**MCCOURT:** So, right, and let me just read, I am just going to read a couple of my observations on the deal. So my three key benefits of keeping an internal model: control of one of the few unrestricted revenue streams; control of access over the long term, including flexibility of future use; and participation in any upside of operating efficiencies if we were to do this ourselves. So those are absolutely, I think very, very important. And then the key benefits of monetization, some of the key benefits: accelerate cash flow for future upfront payment to fund endowment; annual endowment distributions to fund strategic initiatives; and transfer of operational capital risk. And very – I mean I feel very strongly about those key issues on the internal side. They're a big deal and a lot of those are subjective.

**CLARK:** My question was since you are not giving us the report findings at this point, at what point will the BFC become involved in the decision making process?

**MCCOURT:** Well if we –

**CLARK:** Will it be after the trustees have spoken?

**MCCOURT:** I was going to say the trustee – and so the trustees aren't making a decision – so we, as there are faculty members on the operations committee and let me just say for the faculty members that have been on the operations committee, the findings are no different. The numbers haven't changed over the summer; they're still the same numbers. And so they'll make their recommendation. We'll bring it to the board as an information item. We may get a strong reaction one way or another. And then a final vote isn't at that time. Then we'll probably bring it back. If we were to ever move forward with this, we have said from day one, and we will do this, we will have an open forum or two on each campus and come back to the meeting. Yeah, come back here.

**MCCOURT:** Yeah.

**CLARK:** So there won't be any specific role for the Faculty Council as such?

**MCCOURT:** I don't think a specific vote, no. A say through your representatives on the committees, yes.

**ROBEL:** I'm not supposed to be recognizing people who aren't on the Council. So you can ask.

**ANDREWS:** Oh, um yes. Hi. [Laughter].

**ROBEL:** Anything else from the Council members? [Silence]. Thank you so much for coming MaryFrances. Alright, I also had been getting periodic questions about other kinds of parking issues and these having to do with the library parking lot being closed for the construction and I'm not sure, is Elizabeth Andrews still here?

**ANDREWS:** Still here.

**ROBEL:** Still here, okay. Elizabeth, could you tell people where to go to find information about the parking plan?

**ANDREWS:** Yeah. Hi, I'm Elizabeth and I'm Lauren's communication specialist and parking girl, and you can find on [parking.indiana.edu](http://parking.indiana.edu) information on where those spaces are being replaced. I can pull it up if you like, or you can find that, but on the transportation website we've put a map that shows the parking lot that's closed and where else you can go. And we're finding that Jordan lot is filling up about 10:30. So long as you are getting there before 10:30, you're fine. There's plenty of space around 11:50. I'm happy to answer people's questions. We're amending the plan as we go. So looking to see how things shake out over the next couple of weeks. Any more on that?

**ROBEL:** Yep, you have a question right there.

**LAHERTY:** I'm from the libraries and we have a website news item pretty front and center on our homepage that explains how to access the building by whatever means during the construction.

**ANDREWS:** And the other thing I can say is that you'll soon have more –

**LAHERTY:** – Yeah, there are –

**ANDREWS:** – in service available –

**LAHERTY:** – Yeah –

**ANDREWS:** – in a week or so.

**ROBEL:** John?

**WALBRIDGE:** Could there be some very short-term parking places by the library? Because I don't mind walking to the library if I'm going to spend the afternoon there, but a lot of the time I'm walking there to pick up a book from circulation, so...

**ANDREWS:** We did add more visitor parking spaces right behind the IU Art Museum. So there are more meters there, yeah.

**CLARK:** I appreciate that they've left the section for handicap parking available. Is there any plan to restore some of the more normal parking spaces once the construction is completed?

**ANDREWS:** At this point, not that I am aware of. Yeah, so instead it's going to be a lot north of 10<sup>th</sup> street and then we did expand A and C in the Jordan garage.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: UPDATE ON THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS**

**ROBEL:** Thank you. Thanks, Elizabeth. Can I talk a little bit about the strategic planning process for the campus this fall, and I'm sorry if – can you see it over on that side because if not please scrunch – scrunch together. The question that I have put in front of the various groups that are involved in strategic planning this fall and the one that I think is important for us to answer as a campus is really the question at the top here. What is the most compelling case for the mission that we, that Herb Terry read at the beginning of the meeting? And particularly, what is the most compelling case we can make for a residential research intensive campus in 2020? And the reason, and Elizabeth is going to kill me for not having fixed the typos, but... [Laughter]. The reason that that question has become top of mine is probably apparent to all of you when you read the *Chronicle* or you read the *New York Times* or you read any national publication about higher education right now which seems to be consumed with questions that have to do with the cost to students of their education, the ways in which students can avoid being here for very long, can get through our experience more quick – quicker, or can avoid it altogether by going online. And I think we have a fairly compelling story to tell about why, what we do on this campus is an important piece of the broader infrastructure, eco-system, of higher education in this country, and particularly as a public, residential, research intensive campus. I think we face more pressures on the mission that we articulate than about any other place in the ecosystem of higher education in the country. And so I think for all of the reasons that many of you will, if not all of you know, this is a question that we can't, the answer to which we can't take for granted. And it's a question we have to be able to answer to internal and external constituencies in a particularly compelling way at this time. And then of course how do we, how does Bloomington make that case for us, for what we do? And how it is special and distinctive within the part of the higher education eco-system we inhabit? I also think that it's important for us to think about what the campus is. You know, what is the campus at this point in our history in Bloomington?

We're just a few years away from the – you know, our bicentennial. Whatever we dream and envision right now will take us into Bloomington's third century. And so we really should take a little bit of time to take stock of what it is that makes us distinctive. And what makes us distinctive at the campus level? How the campus can be particularly important in supporting what all of you do in your work. I think as I said to – at the kick-off, I think that people often when think of the campus, they think of compliance. They think that the campus is the place that tells them what they're supposed – what they can't do; what you can't do with respect to policies, what you can't do with respect to P&T, what you can't do with respect to – I mean just name a few things. Please don't, because that's... [Laughter]. But what I really want to think about is how can the campus, how can my office, how can the vice provost's office, how can we – how can we all facilitate the highest and best vision of who we are. How can we be those facilitators? And how can we be a community at the campus level as well as being a community in all the obvious spaces where we're communities? You know, we're all communities within our own disciplines, in our schools, in our departments, in our organizations, but we are a part of a campus that can be powerful, too, or at least that's my belief. We can be powerful as a campus if we work together towards broader goals. So the context for this, I know that's awful, but it is the general principles of excellence that the board has adopted for the entire university. And really when we think about this campus we think about it in the context of the broader principles of excellence which are to be one of the great research universities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century; be the pre-eminent institution of higher education in Indiana. The former governor threw down a marker on that day before yesterday in the press. We - I'm willing to take him up on it. [Laughter]. And to put this in further context we've been through, we're still living with and working with New Academic Directions which was a comprehensive roadmap for a whole set of academic reorganizations very much focused at the level of programs. And this – this has been a – in many ways – an exciting process but one that I know has involved the campus at different levels of engagement.

This process I'd like to see involve the entire campus at a fairly high level of engagement. We do – we work in the context of school specific strategic plans- every school has a strategic plan. Those plans are at various points in their life cycle. Some of them are quite old and some of them are relatively recent. This is not intended to displace those plans. We do it in the context of the study I mentioned earlier – the report on scholarly publishing. Where we know the ways in which we disseminate our research have changed and are in the process of changing even more, and even more quickly. We do it in the context in which the past year I've been trying to work with various offices around campus to help develop some infrastructure for understanding some – some things about who we are. Some analytics tools that allow us to think about our external funding for instance in different kinds of comparative ways. Or to understand a little bit more about how our students work their way through our institution and how we can help them be more successful. I'm working with the vice provost right now on co-locating some of the institutional research resources that are on this campus but in a variety of different offices so that we can have the opportunity to put the institutional research capacity of the campus behind some of the questions that we will be asking in this process. Then, for the past year since I became provost I've been talking to the deans and the vice provosts, just to get a sense of what their challenges are in each of the areas that they are responsible for in

each of the schools and then the College. What are the biggest challenges you think you're facing right now. In order to have a context from the leadership about what it thought it was facing in terms of challenges. My goals through this process are to compel – or to create a compelling statement of the value of what we do for each of our constituencies and audiences. One that expresses our values in a deep way and does it with integrity so that we can speak as best an institution like this can ever speak with one voice – that we can speak with one voice about why what we do is important to the world. I'd like to use this as an opportunity to sharpen the mission of each of the campus offices that support the academic mission on the campus.

President Terry mentioned that there'd been – there has been – a fair amount of reorganization in the past couple of years around the campus level offices. Todd Gieryn's office was reorganized. The office that Dennis Groth is heading up was created. There's a vice provost for strategic initiatives now. The position that Martin McCrory has come into is a little bit like one that existed several years ago, but perhaps a little bit different, too, so how can we take those campus offices and really sharpen their missions in support of the strategic plan that we come up with? I really would love to see this be a process that lets us identify leadership for this campus that we haven't identified before – that is a way to engage in some generational renewal around leadership processes on the campus so that I tried to bring into this process people from all of the academic ranks at all of the points in their careers and people from the professional staff and from the student body. I'm particularly interested in faculty leadership because it's so critical. I think this is an opportunity for us not only to have a – inform the campus about the political and national environment of higher education but have a conversation collectively about what that national conversation means for us – how we react to it, what we think about the ideas that are being discussed at the national level. I can tell you as the former dean of the law school when the president of the United States says law school should be two years, I notice! [Laughter]. And I think I need a response, or the next people need a response. I think that we have worked in many ways on this campus and in many spaces to develop what I think of as connective tissue around interdisciplinarity. But there are lots of lessons that we ought to be drawing from that – those experiences so that we can try to think are there ways the campus can inflect interdisciplinarity? Things that we do at the campus level can support it, that might allow us to span some of the divisions that are reflexive and natural on the campus around schools or departments. And finally, we will be at some point in another capital campaign. And my own experience in the past has always been that you're stronger and better going out to your constituencies that support you if you have a very clear vision about why they should be supporting you and what you think you need. And so I'd like to connect this whole process to that campaign.

The process itself involves a very broad team structure. A lot of it is around campus functions. So faculty development which has been headed up by our intrepid Vice Provost Tom Gieryn, the undergraduate experience writ-large which is being headed up by Dennis Groth and the Dean of Students, Pete Goldsmith. International programs and students, Venkat is heading up international programs. Hilary Kahn is heading up international students. I think those – both of those – need some sustained thinking at the campus level as well as at university level.

David Daleke is heading up the graduate education group. Sarita Soni is heading up the research excellence group. And I have asked specifically that diversity be a part of every single group's portfolio, so when the recommendations come back in I need, I personally believe I would ask each of these groups to have been thoughtful around diversity implications and what they're recommending. There are also a number of interdisciplinary groups. Some of them got going before the strategic planning process and some of them are just getting off the ground. At least one of them is – has roots in the New Academic Directions report, and that's the one that is involved with design. It got a – it got started back in the spring semester. Kate Rowold is heading that one up and they've been meeting for some time. There's a group on STIM initiatives for undergraduate education. I'm really sorry about being idiosyncratic about this but since we don't have an engineering school I continue to put informatics there instead of engineering. The – that one started meeting in the spring as well, and Bob Sherwood from the School of Education is heading that one up. The humanities, arts and humanities group, is being headed up by Jonathan Elmer and I've asked it to take a special look at the report that was issued in May by the triple-AS [American Academy of Arts & Sciences] is I think who issued it. But it's a national report on the state of the humanities. And then the health sciences, the health sciences right now on this campus have been very much organized towards Indianapolis for very obvious reasons. Most of the health sciences on this campus are that – they're programs – with the exception of optometry and speech and hearing. Nursing is a program of Indianapolis, medical science is a program here, social work is a program here. But we have some opportunities right now in these areas, or at least we could. The hospital is thinking about a new hospital which might present some clinical openings for students in the Bloomington area. The programs themselves are engaged in kind of comprehensive planning and so that's an area where I think we need as a campus to understand or think about what we think our future is, and what we might be able to do to more comprehensively.

I mentioned that the membership of the groups is intentionally inter-generational. I want to apologize to anybody I didn't get an invitation to. There came a point – and here I'm looking at Alyce – Alyce Fly – who's on the Long Range Planning Committee. There came a point where we were, I was communicating back and forth with Craig and I appointed many members of last year's Long Range Planning Committee to these groups, and I've appointed several members of this year's Long Range Planning Committee but I got the actual membership kind of late in the process and so I'll try to do my very best to just keep this group as engaged and informed as I possibly can. And I know several of you were also members of committees and thank you for that. There are over a hundred faculty members involved in one way or another in this process. We had a kick-off on August 14<sup>th</sup>, I think you'd ordinarily call this in the strategic planning process an environmental scan, you know, and it was essentially bringing a lot of people to campus in one fashion or another to talk about the national conversations. So one of the editors of the *Chronicle* came to talk generally about the political context. We had someone from Education Advisory Board, which is a group we work with fairly regularly that does a lot of research – independent research – for higher education speak about undergraduate education particularly with trends and hype cycles, I guess you would say, around online education. Kerry Ann Rockquemore, who many of you may be familiar with because she has come to campus a couple of times now and is the head of the National Center for Faculty Development and

Diversity, working with a lot of our untenured faculty members and graduate students on faculty development issues came and spoke to this, to the kick-off. Caroline Whitacre who's the vice president for research over at Ohio State spoke about the national research funding picture. Dan Smith came and talked about aligning planning with philanthropy and then Brad talked brass tacks about how you put a plan like this together. There are pieces of the national picture that obviously aren't being reflected here and – but all of these presentations are available for you to see if you are interested on my website. I'll talk in the near future about communication. The teams are working this fall. I hope to be able to share the outcomes of their work with the campus in the early spring. I'd like to get a draft ready before spring break. We'll see if that's too ambitious. And the timeline we're thinking about is a planning horizon that takes us to the next century of our campus to our third century. You can find lots of information including all of the members of the planning committees at [plan.indiana.edu](http://plan.indiana.edu). You can find the kick-off presentations there, the committee lists there, meeting summaries there of the committees as they meet, and some other more contextual documents. So wish us luck, and please stay involved. My hope is that all of you will be communicating fairly regularly with people, to people you know on those advisory groups – that this should be a very porous process in terms of discussions and it should be a process that engages everyone who – everyone – everyone should be interested, but anyone who is interested. Alright, questions?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**TERRY:** Lauren, could I just start out with a comment? There probably may be people who formulate questions as they go along. Now that you've seen the scope of this project you can see that it has to be coordinated with what I plan to do with the Council this year. Many of the things that I hope the Council would look at are things that these groups will look at. I worked with Lauren and others over the summer to make sure that we don't work at cross purposes, that our concerns are transmitted to her teams, that her teams – they were going to be already – are transparent and people around campus will know what they're considering and what information they are receiving. I think that this is unlike the New Academic Directions process, which could be described as a bit top down. This is, while initiated by the provost, one that is very inclusive of faculty. I did go to the kick-off. I saw the hundred plus faculty members and others who were there. I was impressed – but then she may have a little more power to do it then I do – at her ability to draft people who have said no to other aspects of faculty governance to say yes to this. So it's a good group of people and I think it will be very, very useful. You forgot to mention the school of public health, that is certainly another reason why health is –

**ROBEL:** – Yes, of course! –

**TERRY:** – a very important thing going on on this campus –

**ROBEL:** Thank you!



**TERRY:** – to help motivate that. My perspective is that this is a high level strategic plan. I know there will be some faculty who will be concerned that it's going to be detailed and implemented quickly without faculty input. I don't expect that at all. I think this is a plan that is going to come back with high-level recommendations which will work their level way down. And I am confident that when recommendations of this process impinges upon the authority of the faculty under the Constitution of the Faculty that that will be respected, and that there will be plenty of opportunity for comment. I'm going to take a risk. I know that some of you out there are on these teams. I had you waive hands earlier. If you're on one of the teams would you raise your hands? [Hands rise] So there are a decent number of members of this Council who are on those teams, and I think you probably spread out looking at you over many of them. So I'm, you know, very, very supportive of this process. It will be coordinated with the activities of the Council. I think the need for it is reflected in the Long Range Planning Committee's report last year. I urge you to also get involved with it, given the accelerated schedule. Given the accelerated schedule I urge you to not delay in getting involved with it.

**ROBEL:** Other questions or comments? Yes?

**CLARK:** I guess my overall concern is with the, what we find in the investigation of the incentive structure of the university, or the campus in general. That, for instance, in interdisciplinarity we're encouraged to have interdisciplinary programs, as you say that the connective tissue should be there but in fact, the resources of the university and the budget, for example, is based on departmental enrollment. And so it is sort of like having the carrot and the stick both in front of the horse, you know, it doesn't know which way to go because the budgetary incentives say, you know, the unit is everything, and yet the ideological incentive is that the interdisciplinarity is the way of the future. So it would be nice to have a little more harmonization of that. And the same thing goes for faculty governance. In that we're exhorted to participate, and certainly these working groups seem to be a very great step forward and yet, the Faculty Council, for example, as an elected body is not being directly involved. The people that are on these groups have been invited rather than selected by the groups as a constituency, and so that if someone wants to get involved unless they've been invited by the administration, it's difficult for them to take the initiative and get involved in any meaningful sense because the decisions are made by this nominated representation.

**ROBEL:** Thanks for those comments and maybe I can work through them one by one. On the RCM question, I think that's a real question, but I also think that RCM is, as you said, a budgeting system. It's not an ideology. It's not a way of life.

**CLARK:** As an anthropologist, I don't see those things as completely disconnected. [Laughter]

**ROBEL:** But the nice thing about budgeting systems is that budgeting systems accommodate, or should be made to accommodate, human activity and values and not the other way around. And so to the extent that we have implementation issues we'll face those when we get to them, but I start from the belief that we can always make our budgeting system support the activities that we want to engage in. And that's been my experience. On the question, there was a

middle question that I think I've lost, but on the last one that had to do with the way in which people were chosen. I did talk to lots and lots of people. I wanted specifically to get some people who would be living with this plan, you know, for the rest of their careers and have their careers be something that I hope would be forty more years with Indiana University. And so I really wanted to see – find a way to involve both the BFC and groups beyond the BFC who for one reason or another were not going to be easily represented here. And so I tried to hit a compromise there by having several members of the Long Range Planning Committee on these groups, and also have several members of the Council on these groups. And my hope is that we'll just have a very open, transparent process and good conversations with everybody about where we end up.

**TERRY:** I'd like to add one comment to that. First of all, Lauren did reach out to the Faculty Council for suggestions of people that she could have on – serve on these task forces. And she appointed some of them, and not appointed others. As I've indicated, I've sort of been accumulating a running list of younger faculty that I have hoped to bring into faculty governance. She has a lot of those people on this task force – these task forces, and I think that will give it the perspective of the people – unlike me, I'll be gone in two years – people unlike me who will live with this into the future, and that's what it's really planning for. And I'm encouraged by the recruitment efforts that she has made to achieve that.

**ROBEL:** And if all of you could support those untenured faculty members as they do this, I did really encourage them, and I have tried to speak to the people, to their department chairs and also their – others to assure that this service is recognized as important service to the campus, because I think it really is important service to the campus. I think to the extent our faculty are engaged in this process and invested in it, that is as much a retention effort on our part as campus as anything we do in our departments because it's allowing our faculty to shape, in a very real way, their futures. And so I'm optimistic. We'll see where we'll be by the end of the year. Yeah, Jason?

**JACKSON:** If I could just add a word of encouragement for Gracia in light of Gracia's comments and questions, those groups who were outlined earlier in this membership you can read about on the provost's website. They're soliciting inputs already, so that if you have something that you'd like to share with any of those committees they're open for business now. And so certainly BFC members are particularly well positioned to offer campus wide views, and further encouragement perhaps for Gracia's concerns of the committee that I sit on spent at least forty minutes talking about the very same issues met this morning and began its work by raising the same issues that Gracia expressed as concerns. So I am hopeful about the process.

**CLARK:** I'm actually very encouraged by some of the more positive stuff. I would be even more encouraged when I see their findings actually being implemented.

**ROBEL:** Terrific. Well, thank you and I look forward to many conversations with you about this during the course of the year. And I'd like to turn to, I think we've addressed the questions that were sent in ahead of time, so I'll – if I can – I turn to Dennis Groth to talk about SB 182.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6: SB 182 UPDATE AND STATUS OF OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

**GROTH:** Thank you Provost Robel, and thank you President Terry for inviting me today. I was asked, actually asked, to present on two different topics: Senate Bill 182 and an update on the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and I'm going to take them in reverse order. So I'm going to talk about undergraduate education office first, and then leave more time at the end for opportunity for the information I'll provide on Senate Bill 182 to perhaps lead to a rich discussion instead of questions on the issues that we might be faced with there. I want to thank President Terry for some e-mail over the weekend where I asked him actually a really simple question: What would the BFC like to know about the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education? And rather than a very narrow answer, he said you should tell me what you think faculty should know about what is happening in OVPUE. And so for anyone that knows me or works with me, the risk of giving me a microphone is that I won't give it up. We don't talk about undergraduate education enough on the campus and the undergraduate experience, so while I have the microphone I appreciate the opportunity to bring you up to speed. Many of you may not even know about the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and so I thought I would start with a description of what we're responsible for. OVPUE is responsible for programs and initiatives in support of outstanding academic experiences for IU Bloomington undergraduate students. OVPUE provides advising, testing, and enrichment experiences for undergraduate students at all stages from pre-college to adult continuing education and from all backgrounds. The OVPUE also oversees many programs for instructors that support and improve undergraduate teaching and learning. We have a mission. The mission of OVPUE at IU Bloomington is to lead campus wide programs and initiatives, including General Education, in support of outstanding academic experiences for all undergraduates, pre-college students and those engaged in continuing education. Just a note about General Education in October there's a mandated report on the status of General Education so I'm not going to talk about that much more today. So there will be an opportunity at a future meeting to hear more about that.

Second point of the mission: to provide leadership on campus wide undergraduate curricular policies and offer encouragement and support for innovation in the curriculum and for other activities that facilitate undergraduate student achievement; to work collaboratively with school deans on initiatives that enhance undergraduate education, ensuring the highest quality of teaching and learning led by active research and scholarship; to promote the expansion of opportunities for undergraduates to work with faculty on research and to participate in internships and other community based learning and leadership activities; to provide a broad range of activities that support innovation and enrichment in the curriculum, activities that help faculty to develop enhanced teaching strategies that offer classroom support services and academic support to students and that promote research on teaching, learning, and assessment; finally, to work with other IU campuses and institutions as well as the Indiana Commission on Higher Education on cross-institutional curricular issues including articulation and transfer agreements, and it's this last point why I am here to talk about Senate Bill 182.

So a partial list of current activities that I believe are relevant for faculty and already I know I'm going to have left off very important things here, and so with all respect to my colleagues in OVPUE and across the campus that we work with I mean no disrespect if an important initiative has been left off here, I'm just trying to keep it short. First, we're in the process of implementing the system for online course questionnaires. We purchased a license for a system called eXplorance Blue after a detailed review and analysis following recommendation of an RFP review committee, which was merely unanimous, 12 out of 13 members, selected this product. The thirteenth member actually missed the presentation and so had ranked it number two. So I'd never seen actually universal support of a system like this. The system was chosen due to its flexible features, detailed reporting, and our assessment that we would be able to empower departments with control over the implementation. So we will provide centralized support but enable departments to actually control how this works, at least that's our intent. This summer we completed the first full new student orientation cycle using online placement exams for foreign languages this include Spanish, German, French, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Latin, and Hebrew. The exams were constructed over the past several years through the creative efforts of many faculty and graduate students in the language departments. The technical implementation occurred through efforts of KEEP and OVPUE through its best office. This summer we also implemented a pilot for online placement examinations in mathematics. The data of which is being analyzed by our colleagues in the math department as we speak. All of these activities are aimed at eliminating placement examinations during the on campus orientation program for students, freeing it up for a more enriching experience and perhaps opportunity to address academics in a richer way. We purchased a license of iRubric, now I should say I'm a faculty member from Informatics and all these things kind of sound like I'm a UITs person as I'm going through here, but technology is driving many of the innovations that we're doing. We purchased a license of iRubric for the campus. iRubric integrates, following a detailed review and recommendation from the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee which is called GEMS. iRubric is a software to help with assessment. It integrates with Oncourse today, and before someone says, 'But isn't Oncourse going away?' we took that into consideration and the software adheres to standards supporting integration with future learning management systems. Software has already been used extensively for assessment of the English composition component of General Education. And faculty workshops are being planned in conjunction with planned assessment of world cultures and languages and natural and mathematical sciences this year. Beyond assessment it's available for all faculty to use in their teaching and learning – I can't say "immediately." It's in the process of being configured.

The Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning which is a partnership between OVPUE and UITs is actively engaged with the College and other schools in supporting internal program reviews. And I know many of people in the College know about this already but it's an activity that's going to be very valuable. We're working on a pilot of a new system to support student success. It's from the Education Advisory Board. It's called the Student Success Collaborative. There are about sixty university members participating in the Collaborative. It's a software based on learning analytics and it will use historical data to identify progress markers and risk indicators for students. Advisors then use this system and they'll be able to have a meaningful

dialogue backed by data, on how to balance work and achieve success for students. The basic idea, and I could speak for an hour at least on this alone, is that the system models student performance according to how a student has performed in the past compared to other students over the last fifteen years that have taken similar classes to them. And so it makes an assessment of whether they are at a high, medium, or low level of risk with respect to their planned curriculum. It also identifies classes that are if not taken at a particular point in the curriculum will potentially negatively impact their completion – either completion at all or completion time. We continue to support the use of FLAGS, the Fostering Learning and Graduation Success, as a mechanism for engaging and intervening with programs to support students based on indicators provided by faculty. We are delighted to have participated with our colleagues in UITS, the registrar, IU space planning, and the architect's office on the renovation and opening of the new collaborative classroom. One of many new spaces for teaching and learning that have opened over the last few years in the student building. If you haven't seen it, check it out. What's more important is the faculty learning community has been established for faculty that are using the classroom to share their experiences and best practices, and this year we'll also be formulating a plan for really an in-depth assessment of how these new learning spaces, and the investments that the campus has made are actually making a difference or not. In another long-term collaboration with UITS and our colleagues across the IU system we are pleased that the new course search capabilities have been introduced in the academic planner and in the schedule of classes. Now why this is relevant for faculty is that the course search takes full advantage of the detailed descriptions faculty can enter through the faculty center of Onestart. So if you've been to faculty center there's a little link that says "Enter Class Descriptions," and that allows you to go in and enter more information than might be contained in the Bulletin, a link to your syllabus for example, and tags. And because you can enter that information students can find your class more easily now. In fact, it has more or less a Google-type interface where you can go and enter 'Jim Sherman' and it will find everything that Jim Sherman teaches. Maybe there is more than one Jim Sherman I don't know.

**SHERMAN:** I hope not. [Laughter].

**GROTH:** What's coming next, and there's a rapid release of these things out to students, is a scheduling wizard that will suggest appropriate course sections based on data a student can supply concerning, perhaps their work schedule, their practice schedule, or preferred time schedule. The wizard will not suggest courses students will take but will take the courses that the student knows that they need to take to stay on track and will provide a selection of available schedules that the student can pick from. So rather than painstakingly going back and forth to the schedule to classes it's going to make a suggestion that they can then adjust. We are working to analyze the results of new student orientation, primarily with regards to course availability, or lack thereof. I know there's been a lot of gaps there, especially for international and late orientation students. So I don't have a report there, but I know it's something that I'd like to know more about to help inform the schools about how to improve student success there. We are going through some reorganization in University Division, which is the academic advising home for exploratory students and students that have not certified into the school.

We are in the process of searching for a new professional leader for University Division and it's a national search and we hope to have the position filled by January. Oh, we're also working on an update to the HLC reaccreditation report that's due at the end of the month. So I know I've left many things off, but just to keep it brief, just an idea of the high level things that the OVPUE is working on that have some relevance for faculty. I don't know if you want me to take any questions on any of these now – I'm happy to – or move on to Senate Bill 182.

**ROBEL:** I think the important thing for those of you who are new to the Council and maybe not as familiar with OVPUE, is that OVPUE has both an internal and external function. You know, on the internal side, many, many of the things that Dennis has just described support teaching and learning and there is a lot more. But there's also an external side, the connection to the Indiana Commission on Higher Education. The – our connection to our creditor the HLC, those are important functions as well for that office. And so he's here today really to talk about the external side and will be back next month to talk about the internal side. Thank you, Dennis.

**GROTH:** Yeah, thank you. I have to say though, even the external side wants to know about assessment and so the internal side is becoming particularly important for the external side very, very rapidly.

**SHERMAN:** I just have one quick comment. For a long time I believed that it would be cheaper for the university, and perhaps better to hire a full-time person for each undergraduate as their advisor [Laughter] instead of investing all the money in technology and new software. But now that I hear all the things that are being done I think I'm changing my mind.

**GROTH:** Thank you, Jim. I think it's very exciting and I have to say from a financial standpoint, all of these things have cost money, but we have done it without raising the budget within the resources that we have. Not on the cheap, but on the efficient... Yes?

**TERRY:** I just wanted to add one comment and encouragement to people. Sometimes this university looks very siloed, this looks like the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and it is, but it occurred to me when Dennis made his presentation that it actually unknowingly put one of his new resources to use for something far outside of undergraduate education. I'm hosting a Fulbright scholar in order to try and find faculty that she should talk to and identify with, I used your new search technique and she's actually a faculty member at a Russian university, she's going to go back and design a curriculum to do something. And the use of that technique not related to choosing undergraduate courses is also, that service is also a thing that I hope people will come to do.

**GROTH:** It's great to have an unintended consequence that adds value. Okay, onto what everyone came for – Senate Bill 182 – the 2013 version of it, not to be confused with the 2012 version, which introduced the Statewide General Educational Core, or STGEC. So you've been provided a copy of Senate Bill 182 and I'm just going to hit the high points. I've also been provided a couple of questions in advance that were provided through the EPC and through President Terry and I'm going to address those and then we'll open it up for other questions. So

what is Senate Bill 182 about? Well this, what we're working on right now, pertains to credit and articulation agreements, and it's clear that these will – this effort will replace pre-existing articulation agreements with what are called "single articulation pathways." Maybe, I just did the air quotes on that so that would get into the minutes.

**MURRAY:** Got it.

**GROTH:** Great. Through this mandate students pursue a common associates degree curriculum for which a pathway has been developed, which when completed results in first, articulation at all four-year state education institutions that offer the corresponding baccalaureate degree and two, all credits earned towards the associates degree will transfer so that the student will begin the baccalaureate with junior standing. So in a nutshell this is a one-size-fits-all for the corresponding two halves of the pathways for a two-plus-two articulation agreement. The previous year's 182 bill mandated General Education transfer requirements which resulted in the Statewide General Education Core and so of course students that finish the first half of the pathway and are accepted to a four-year college will have satisfied General Education, will have it waived at whatever institution will come in. Students will still need to apply for admission and be accepted to the four-year institution and also follow normal application processes for school admission and certification. I'm just going to stop here for a second and note that as we move forward with this I actually believe that we'll have to take a look at the admission of transfer students as a result of the pathways, not that we should not admit them, but that their admission – should they be admitted then things will happen but they have to stay with the second half of the pathway. We'll get to that as we go through there.

The students in the pathways will need to complete major, school, and total credit requirements, although some of these clearly will be have satisfied in the first half of the pathway. Ten pathways have been identified, and these were identified based upon volume of students. The first is nursing, and I'll make this list available so you can get this and also some of these actually have multiple parts; so B, business administration including accounting if it's not part of business administration; education, elementary education, secondary education, and special education; pre-engineering; liberal arts; human social services – thank you – and social work; social justice/law enforcement; engineering technology; information technology and early childhood education. These are the ten that are being ramped up to be worked on this year, and I can't say whether there won't be more in the future. There may be, but we will just have to wait until that occurs. Now, there's a process for participating in the determining of the pathways that's been determined. It's been worked on with the Commission on Higher Education and the other institutions in the state. First, that we must identify faculty for each panel from each campus. This task was due on September 1<sup>st</sup> and we met the deadline, so I thank everybody on campus who agreed to be on a panel and especially colleagues in the schools that went out to find those faculty members. Some core schools might have one representative and I will get to why that is in a second. The panels are scheduled to begin in the fall, or intend to be scheduled to begin in the fall, and there is a statewide leadership team made up of high level leaders at each institution and from IU there's a representative from IUB which is me, one from IUPUI and one representing all of the regional campuses. The way that

I've stressed with my colleagues on campus, where the direction we need to take with this is that we need to take a look at this from the four-year intuitions, identifying the competencies that our students are required to have at the end of two years, whether they transferred to us or whether they were matriculated in the normal fashion. We can't put ourselves in a position, or we must try and avoid putting ourselves in a position where the community college system says, 'Here's where our students will be after two years take it from here and finish them in two more.' They have to be based upon the competencies and learning outcomes determined by the panels which should be driven by the four-year institutions. Now, as part of that, because in my role on the leadership team, I want to be able to advocate not based on my particular view of these things, although I'll certainly have when I am a faculty member, but based upon the strength of the support of the faculty – all the faculty – involved in these pathway constructions. And so rather than just relying upon a single faculty member that has agreed to serve on a pathway we've collected information from each school on their internal process for vetting the pathways to ensure that they have taken the steps necessary to engage their local faculty governance process in reviewing these as they move forward. In a nutshell, I don't want to go to the state meeting unless I know for sure that the School of Business has agreed to this or not. Not just the faculty member on that particular panel. So their job is to take it – is to work with the panel – but take it back to their local governance, talk through the issues, develop a recommendation of their own, act on it and pass that on up the board. So far we've collected how each school's process intends to handle this, so I'm very pleased at that. There were two questions that were provided before the meeting, both I think from Alan Bender who I see, I see Alan over there. So these might have been changed along the way I don't know, but I think they're relevant. I'm going to try and paraphrase them a little bit because one of them has a lot of information. First one is stated: 'Obviously articulation agreements deal with 100 and 200 level requirements specific to one's major as well as to the campus' General Education Common Ground requirements. What's less clear is whether articulation agreements will also be expected to include College/school specific 100 and 200 level requirements for example, the Critical Approaches to the Arts and Sciences requirement to name one of a number of such requirements of the College.' The answer to this is, I think, it is up to the academic units to determine what students need to be prepared for when they transfer. And so if the academic unit says students need to be – to have a certain amount of mastery over a Breadth of Inquiry for example, then that should be on the table and should be what the program pushes for to be part of the pathway. There was a suggestion in the question that the pathways legislation would not provide permission for an articulation agreement to require students to take any of these classes at IU. This is not true. It's up to the faculty and the panels to determine what students should be required to have mastered before they come to IU and what they might be expected to complete when they get to IU.

There was sort of a worst case scenario within this question of being forced to take as many as 71 credits. The law doesn't say you – the law says you'll take all the credits that the student used to satisfy their associates degree and we already at Bloomington have two different policies, or at IU two different policies, to address community college transfer. One of them is UFC policy which mandates no more than 64 credits, and then the IUB policy on that is no more than 60. The good news is at the same time that a previous law went into effect that limited



bachelor's degrees to no more than 120 credit hours, that was a previous law, there was one which mandated that associates degrees would not exceed 60 credits. So I think we're really looking here at accepting 60 credits if a student were to transfer and not any more than that. And also I think it is important, much like the Statewide General Education Core, that we're looking at competencies and not necessarily course articulations. So the programs would say students need to know and demonstrate these ten things, it's up to then the community college system to say here is how they would satisfy those ten things. It could be through fifteen classes, twenty classes, I don't know but it's really going to be up to the pathways to determine that.

The second question is: 'Does Senate Bill 182 ask for additional courses to be put specifically into the core transfer library?' So you're learning a lot about undergraduate education. The core transfer library, there's a website for this, you can go to it at [transferin.net](http://transferin.net). And it's a – it is exactly what it sounds like. It's a listing of courses that if a student takes them it shows how they transfer to other institutions, other public institutions, within the state and if a class is in the core transfer library then it must be – count in the same way at all the other institutions if that class is something that is offered. So the heart of this question, though, is will the single articulation pathways – does it anticipate the creation of more classes in the core transfer library and this I believe and in discussions I've already had with the Commission on Higher Education is an orthogonal issue. The approach that we anticipate taking with the single articulation pathways is based upon demonstrated learning outcomes and competencies, and not that this class will count for this class et cetera, et cetera. It may be that when the student transfers in, much like with the Statewide General Education Core, that theoretically a student who satisfies the Statewide General Education Core may have no classes, zero classes that actually articulate. They actually could show up, this is very unlikely, with thirty credits of undistributed credit and a waiver on General Education. So theoretically this could come through as thirty credits of General Education and thirty credits of other education and then the programs themselves are waiving the requirements rather than specifying individual one by one course articulations. I can't really predict how this is going to hap– what's really going to happen because it is up to the faculty and the programs to determine this. But I have to say that there's no – the mandate doesn't specify that classes that are in the pathways must be in the core transfer library. And then there was a follow on question: 'What are the categories are the core transfer library?' And that's straightforward. It's on the website; behavioral sciences and humanities, communications, English and literature, fine arts, health and physical education, life sciences, mathematicses ("mathematicses," very articulate, Dennis), physical sciences, professional and occupational and world languages. One last thing before I open it up to other questions. There are two pathways engineering and engineering technology that probably people at Bloomington just can say, 'Wait, we don't do engineering here.' In fact we don't accept engineering credit for satisfying an IUB degree in general. These are ones that we're actually not intending to participate on because we have no faculty in those programs but they are pathways we will continue to monitor because we want to make sure we are aware of what is happening in all of the pathways that have mandated by the state. I don't want to be caught unaware of decisions that are being made. And with that everybody is now up to date on Senate Bill 182 and I am happy to answer any questions about it.

**ROBEL:** Basu?

**BASU:** Do you envision any limit for online courses in Gen Ed? Can Gen Ed courses be all online?

**ROBEL:** A limit in General Education?

**GROTH:** Can they? Well, because a student might satisfy a General Education at another institution and transfer it in here, they might all be online. So can I envision it? Yes, I think.

**BASU:** At this point I'm just curious.

**GROTH:** Yes, I think that is a possibility and I think online education is an area for the Bloomington faculty to be engaged in the discussion and dialogue on it in a number of different ways.

**ROBEL:** Gracia?

**CLARK:** So did you – did I understand you correctly when you said this would be integrated with other forms of assessment such as the placement process in various subject areas that we just heard about at the entry level? Would there be a similar competency placement/screen at the two-year level?

**GROTH:** I think that would be up to the programs to determine how they construct the pathway. But I believe the approach that we've been suggesting is that they should be trying to understand what students are capable of doing by the time they get to the beginning of their junior year, and that then would work back to the determination of what kinds of courses they would go for. But there's no plan on an overarching assessment or a test or anything like that on this.

**CLARK:** But – how – well, then what's the interaction between the number of credits transferred and the amount of competencies the student actually has achieved?

**GROTH:** The credits are determined by the law.

**CLARK:** Yeah.

**GROTH:** They're defined. They'll get sixty credits. They have to be junior standing and the competencies are defined by the faculty. Just much like faculty today I would imagine if you were creating a new degree you would say what do I want our students to be able to demonstrate at the end of the first year, second year, third year and fourth year. And then how it maps into individual school requirements is again a separate issue but it's up to the academic units to take a look at that.

**ROBEL:** I think that this development, like the one that preceded it is a very, very difficult development for us as a campus, and it's part of the reason why I think it's so important that we go through the strategic planning process, because as you can imagine, that it – you may have seen a *Bloomberg* news article recently called, "High School in Two Years, College in Two Years, Law School in Two Years, What's the Rush?" The national agenda, and this is coming from the executive branch of the federal government, it's coming from the executive branch of the state government, it's coming from the legislative branch of the state government and it may well be coming to a Congress near you, although I am not as worried about that for obvious reasons. This is – this pushing of completion through moving credits through the system is the method that's being used most right now and it is a huge concern to us for a whole variety of reasons. So we – there's no – the first thing I want to say is that Dennis will be back to report on a variety of these mandates in the future and you should always think when you see him, 'don't kill the messenger.' He is not in the state legislature and he is not on the Indiana Commission of Higher Education, so please just start with, you know, he is the messenger. He's also our advocate in these fora, and as am I and the university generally, and we're working very, very hard to try to assure that these processes play out with the academic – to the extent that they occur – they play out with the academic integrity of our degrees in mind. So with that, I know Herb wanted another...

**TERRY:** I have two brief admonitions to you. Number one, somewhere in this room among the elected faculty members of the Bloomington Faculty Council this year is next year's president-elect. I am urging all of you to start thinking now about assuming the leadership responsibilities. I will be open to anyone who's interested. I am going to pay attention and reach out to some of you and try and encourage you so that as we get to the spring semester and we hold those elections it should not be a surprise that you're invited to serve and I hope we'll have more than one person stepping up to do that. I'm also going to try to start doing something else, give you a foreshadowing of the next meeting. The next meeting will include a presentation by the vice provost for enrollment management. If you have questions about the undergraduate student population, about how we recruit students and things like that. You can ask them then, you can also send them to me now because I'm meeting with him Thursday to start strategizing for that meeting. So when we can anticipate things that are coming up I'm going to try and find some way to let you know what they are and not just come and sort of having received the agenda and thought about it for a day or two, but instead having had some idea of things to think about. Please send me questions if you have any.

**ROBEL:** With that I believe we are adjourned.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:33PM**