

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 2, 2001
University Place Conference Center, Room 137
1:30-4:30 P.M.

Agenda

1. Presiding Officer's Business
(President Myles Brand)
2. Agenda Committee Business
(Professors Paul Galanti and Robert Eno)
3. Question / Comment Period
(President Myles Brand, Professors Galanti and Eno)
4. Policy on Release of Student Information
(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels, Educational Policies Committee)
(Circular U3-2002)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/01-02/U3-2002.htm>
5. Update on Inter-Campus Transfer Policy Implementation
(Professor Robert Eno, Educational Policies Committee)
(Circular U5-2001_
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U5-2001.htm>
6. Convening of Committees

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Simon Atkinson; James Baldwin; Abhijit Basu; Gerald Bepko; Henry Besch; Chris Bjornson; Julie Bobay; Myles Brand; Richard Carr; Geoffrey Conrad; Dan Drew; Robert Eno; Michael Foos; Paul Galanti; Ann Gellis; Marilyn Kintzele; Anna McDaniel; Ruth Person; Mary Popp; Rebecca Porter; Cynthia Roy; Barry Rubin; Al Ruesink; William Schneider; Suzi Shapiro; Martin Spechler; Cheryl Truesdell; Kizhanipuram Vinodgopal; David Vollrath; Richard Ward; Enid Zwirn

Members Absent: Zameer Bade; Bruce Bergland; Polly Boruff-Jones; Sharon Brehm; Carolyn Calloway-Thomas; Jeffrey Dean; Paul Eisenberg; Brian Fife; Janice Froehlich; David Fulton; Laura Ginger; Paul Joray; Jackie Landess; Joseph Miller; Mark Myers; Jacob Oakman; Kenneth Perrin; F.C. Richardson; John Ross; Moira Smith; Sarita Soni; James Tolhuizen; Frank Wadsworth; Michael Wartell; Jeffrey Watt; Jeff Wuslich; Nanci Yokom

Visitors: Hasan Akay; Erwin Boschmann; Andre DeTienne; Paul Eisenberg; Mary L. Fisher; Jennifer Hehman; Marvin Needler; Judith Palmer; Ken Rennels; Bob Sandy; Gail Williamson; Robert Yost

AGENDA ITEM #1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS
(President Myles Brand)

BRAND: Welcome Chancellors Bepko and Person. There are just one or two things I might mention. In general, our campuses all responded well to the difficult circumstances that we all faced following the September 11 terrorist attack. The campuses have shown a respectful and supportive view towards students, faculty, and staff of all ethnicities and national origins. I have had more opportunities in Bloomington than on the other campuses to talk to the students, and they are pretty comfortable with where we are. There were lots of forums on all the campuses which gave an opportunity to the students to meet with each other and faculty. Following the events, a number of faculty took the opportunity to discuss these issues with their students as they saw fit, and that has worked marvelously as well. I commend the faculty and indeed the entire institution for rising to the difficult occasion. I assume that, if you are like me, you know there is going to be more. We don't know what that is going to be. It could be serious military incursions; it could be more terrorist attacks. We should be prepared for that. I think we have to continue to be supportive of our international students, faculty, and staff. I think we have to be prepared to withhold inadvertent academic punishment from those who are called to service. Each campus has procedures by which people who are reservists that are called up are treated, and we must follow those as well. I have sent out an email to faculty, and I hope all of you have received it, because I think that there is a real opportunity for faculty to provide leadership as they see appropriate to our community and beyond. That is what a good university does; provide intellectual leadership in a situation like this. I hope you will agree with the sentiment.

The second issue to which I want to alert you is the state's deteriorating budget situation. The national economy is facing some difficulties, of course, but the State of Indiana is facing those difficulties and more because we are in a set of industries which tend to be hurt in these recessionary times. We will see additional students over the next year or two coming to school as a result of the downturn in the economy, particularly at the regional campuses and here at IUPUI, and while this is good in terms of tuition revenues, there is a negative in the difficulty the state faces in supporting us. Until the state manages its way out of this financial situation, it will continue to be difficult for us to make serious progress. I wouldn't be surprised if there is tax restructuring, maybe not this year but in a year or two, including property taxes, which is a result of reassessment, and including other structural problems that the state will have to deal with. I do not know when they will deal with it or in which way they deal with it, but the state really does need to do some work in that direction, and the economy needs to pick up for our state support to advance as well. Those are my two comments, and I am happy to answer any questions on that or other matters that you might have.

RUBIN: Myles, you mentioned that we should be receptive to those of our students that would be called up in the reserves. Have you or the university in any way established procedures for handing that? Obviously, the standard withdrawal practices tend to penalize students in that position. Are there some special procedures set up for that? I had one student come up to me last week and tell me that they had been notified. He was very apologetic and concerned, and I told him not to worry about it. He had no idea what financial implications it would have.

BRAND: I believe we have policies in place to deal with that. Those involve absolutely no academic sanctions, university-wide. I believe there are rebate provisions in that as well. Jerry, do you know about this in detail?

BEPKO: I think the Department of Education has just taken steps to protect students who have loans through the departments that won't or can't avoid having a student caught because they

have to involuntarily suspend their studies. I think that the university policies are along the same lines. There are various provisions dealing with payments and other things.

BRAND: We probably need to make people more aware of it. The general principle, as you can imagine, is to protect those students both academically and financially. That has been our long-term policy and will continue to be our policy.

SPECHLER: Myles, I heard that as a result of your speech last week, someone on the Higher Education Commission indicated that they were willing to reconsider the application of money to the various campuses of the state's universities. That is a good result. Can you confirm or amplify that?

BRAND: The discussion is beginning, but it is really at the beginning. No concrete proposals are on the table. The discussion is beginning to take better account of the role of the three research campuses in this state for economic development and related issues, such as quality of life, and to somehow adjust how application formulae such as plant expansion monies are levied. It is more expensive to run buildings on research campuses than for generic classroom space that might be built on other campuses. This is something that has particularly hurt the IUPUI campus. It used to be different, but the commission has backed off the difference in that area. That is an example that would be a direct assistance to the IUPUI campus, and it recognizes the different missions of the campuses. That is one small example beginning to be discussed. There is going to be a series of those kinds of issues that will emerge as discussion items to better position the three research campuses to work with the state, and to recognize in particular that they conduct research. The key point is, though every university conducts research, these three have been more research-intensive, and need to be such. That takes money, and the state has not recognized this, and has provided funding to the various universities and campuses on the basis of enrollment alone. Once you can account for research as a criterion in that equation, maybe some difference will emerge.

SPECHLER: As a representative of IUPUI, I welcome that kind of definition. Relative to other general education schools around the state, the School of Liberal Arts has been severely hurt by the application of the equation about which you spoke. Sometimes the Commission has taken the view that the School of Liberal Arts and the School of Science are not a part of the research element of IUPUI. You know that a great deal of research is done in these two schools, and we need to assure them that the problem is throughout IUPUI.

BRAND: I agree with you, Martin. I tried to signal that in my speech, and I assume they picked up on it. You are certainly correct. I'll ask Paul and Bob if they have Agenda Committee business to bring forward.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS (Professors Paul Galanti and Robert Eno)

GALANTI: Today's business could be labeled "housekeeping." Actually, we didn't do it at our first meeting, though we should have. I would like to introduce Michael Foos, our Parliamentarian. For those who are wondering who Michael is, you will see on the list of members that he is from the East campus, but he has served as Parliamentarian for a number of years. Fortunately, we don't have that many parliamentary points of order, but if we do, Michael is the one to whom we will turn. I'll also mention that at the end of this meeting, when we break

to committees, all committees but one will meet in this room. We will manage somehow. The Finances and Facilities Committee will be meeting in room 138.

The last housekeeping point is to remind everyone that our November meeting will be on the East campus. Suzy Shapiro assured me that it's very easy to find, and only about an hour and fifteen minutes from here, dependent of course on how near to the speed limit you drive. Hopefully we will have a good turnout. There are some space problems, but we will see what happens. Please remind everyone that the meeting on November 13th is at IU East.

ENO: I think that is all for Agenda Committee business

AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD
(President Myles Brand, Professors Galanti and Eno)

BRAND: Before we go to the substantive part of the agenda, are there any other questions or comments?

GALANTI: Myles, I had one. At one point, you mentioned that there has been communication with the government about offering the services of IU and perhaps the AAU to the government. Has there been a response to that?

BRAND: No. Vice President for Research George Walker sent a short email saying that we have expert faculty in various areas and we stand ready to provide context and background information. We never got a response to that. I worked with the Association of American Universities to make that statement on behalf of all the universities, not just IU. This nation has absolutely wonderful scholars in these areas, and as decision makers and policymakers go forward I think it would serve the populace well to have them informed and given background as appropriate by those who want to contribute. We have heard nothing about that. The offer has been made, but there have not been any takers. I think it is a shame, frankly. I do think that we have a lot of expertise, not just at IU, but nationally, and that could be called upon.

AGENDA ITEM #4: POLICY ON RELEASE OF STUDENT INFORMATION
(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/01-02/U3-2002.htm>

BRAND: Next, we'll move to discussion on policy on release of student information. Bob and Ken, if you would?

ENO: I'm going to introduce this, if I could. This is something that comes out of the Educational Policies Committee. It is in your packet of materials as fax page number nine, circular U3-2002. This is actually the penultimate draft. There are a couple of changes which will have to be made to this as well.

The reason we are considering this is because the UFC policy on release of student information no longer satisfactorily complies with Federal law. For this reason, the Registrar's Office came initially to the Bloomington Faculty Council's Educational Policies Committee, recommending certain changes to the policy on release of student information. Ultimately, our Bloomington-based committee went through this, and spent several meetings on it. It went through a question and answer period with the Registrar's Office to clarify aspects of policy, elaborated its own additions to the policy, and was ready to pass the policy when we realized that this was a University Faculty Council policy and we shouldn't have been working on this at all! We

forwarded this to the University Faculty Council Educational Policies Committee last year. All the information was distributed to the members of the Educational Policies Committee, but it got lost in the mass of inter-campus transfer issues last year.

The common thread between these two misadventures on both the Bloomington campus and University Faculty Council EPCs was the common chair of the two committees, which was me. That delayed this process for about a year and a half. I have heard repeatedly now from the University Counsel's office that we need to pass something quickly to put us into conformity with Federal regulations or we will be subject to lawsuits. I went back to the UFC EPC this year and they were extremely cooperative. Through email, we managed a conversation on these issues, were able to clarify the points of modifying the policy, and are able to bring the recommendation to the council today. There were a couple of things which were left out of our discussion by inadvertence, which are the amendments to the amendment which you have in front of you.

The background policy is on a white handout that you have in front of you, titled "Release of Student Information Policy," and is three pages long. The only areas of this document that are up for amendment are those that have numbers written in next to them in the margins, on pages one and two, and the one other boldface or highlighted area in section E. What I'm going to do is read through the proposed amendments. I'll do this briefly. I think this is pretty straightforward, technical stuff that we basically need to pass our eyes over to see if there are any flaws or disagreements. The proposal is to take this as an action item today and vote on it.

The first area of amendment is on page one of the Release of Student Information Policy, in section A2. It has a number six written on the side. It is a minor change. "Educational records" is a rephrasing: the old word "files" is considered too ambiguous, and the word "records" is being substituted for "files." The second point of change is in the subsequent section, A3, and is a substantive change. In that case, on the first line, a list of types of student information that are public, that is, are released without student permission or are released unless students specifically fill out a form saying that this information shouldn't be released, has been modified to add "email address." You'll notice that the line after that is modified to add "class schedule without time and location." The Bloomington EPC did not recommend incorporating that. The proposal before you is only to add "email address" to publicly released information. Students can still have this withheld, but they will need to fill out a form. The third proposed modification is in A4, and it is to include electronic media among the list of formats in which a record may be stored, along with handwritten documents, print, and so forth.

Section B is modified by the elimination of a parenthetical sentence. "Public information which cannot be restricted includes name, enrollment status, degrees, and date of attendance." This does not conform with Federal law. Students must be able, upon request, to restrict this kind of information. It is also not consistent with long-term administrative practice. We have been violating our own policy in this regard, allowing students to have this information restricted if they so request. One change which is not on the circular, but which the Registrar's Office has suggested we make is in section E, where in boldface you will see "Campus Card" is added to the list of locations where students may have records. This is just a partial inventory of major places where student records are located. The addresses that are listed on the right hand side, in the case of Campus Card Services is Ashton Center Director, are the university locations for where these records are held. Most of them are in Bloomington. There are exceptions, as in the case of the School of Nursing. The proposed amendment is to add Campus Card Services and the Ashton Center Director to section E.

The most substantive of the changes proposed is in section K. Section K replaces, in its discussion of who has access to student records, reference to “faculty and staff,” which was considered too vague and restrictive, with the words “school officials.” You see it in the introductory statement of K, “student records are open to school officials,” rather than “members of faculty and staff.” The second amendment is a little later in the same sentence: “who have a legitimate educational interest in their contents.” The term “school official” replaces “faculty and staff” in order that it can be defined clearly in a new section, K1, which defines the term “school official.”

“A ‘school official’ is a person employed by the university in an administrative, supervisory, academic, research, or support staff position, including law enforcement, unit personnel, and health staff, a person or company with whom the university has contracted, such as an attorney, auditor, or collection agent, a person serving on the Board of Trustees, or a student serving on an official committee such as a disciplinary or grievance committee, or assisting another school official in performing his or her tasks.” It is actually that last clause which gave rise to this entire change. We had complaints that were raised by students who discovered that aspects of their files were open to student members of faculty committees, a long-standing practice on our committees, but which was not incorporated into our Release of Student Information Policy.

The next amendment is to section K2, which replaces the phrase “need to know” with “educational interest” in the phrase “legitimate educational interest”. One further amendment, not listed on your sheet, is that at the end of section 2, the word “is” should be changed to “are” because that is how English grammar works. (laughter) I’ll stop there and see if there are any questions.

BRAND: That is the complete list of changes?

ENO: That is the complete list.

BRAND: This is a committee report and needs no second.

ENO: It does, however, have the amendments not shown on your sheets still outstanding.

BRAND: Any discussion?

GALANTI: Bob, the records in item C seem to be completely at Bloomington offices.

ENO: I can’t answer your implicit question because we didn’t query it down in Bloomington. I’m not sure why there is only one office that is explicitly at IUPUI from the combined lists from both C and E. I can query that and find out more about it, but it doesn’t really relate to the proposal at hand. It does puzzle me.

BRAND: That’s already in the standing policy, prior to these changes. Perhaps, Paul, you want to add an amendment that in principle those addresses will be reviewed to make sure that they are up to date. That could be a friendly amendment.

PORTER: How essential is it to have those addresses in this policy?

ENO: I have no idea. We didn’t address that question when it came to us. We focused on the requested revisions from the Registrar’s Office.

PORTER: If we listed these places as keeping records but do not provide addresses, it could be assumed that every campus with the same offices could provide those records. As we move more toward the Enrollment Services integration, I suppose we are going to have some migration of physical locations for those records.

BRAND: Let me again interpret that as a friendly amendment. Further work will be done on this to indicate the particular types of offices independently of campus.

ENO: I think rather than build that into an amendment, since we are amending the policy itself, we should initiate a query, wait until the changes with student information that are ongoing are in a state where we can anticipate the final result, and then update this policy at that time.

BALDWIN: This is obviously a Bloomington document.

ENO: It sure is.

BALDWIN: It's somewhat misleading. If somebody looked at this as saying their Nursing records are in Bloomington, somebody could drive down from Kokomo to look at their records, which are probably at IUPUI. I think it could be simplified by referring records to the schools rather than a physical address.

GALANTI: Why don't we move on with this and keep this as a movement for a later time?

ENO: I'll be happy to query the Registrar, find out what would be acceptable language, and bring it back quickly, perhaps not even through the committee if it is clear-cut and simple.

SPECHLER: I would like to question why we are releasing email addresses as public information. There are a couple of reasons to question that. The first reason is that all of us receive too much email. By releasing those addresses wholesale, we are exposing our students to a similar wave of inconsequential messages. That is the first thing. Secondly, if we have a file of email addresses, as we do, personally I would like to see us sell that information rather than give it away. We give out entirely too much free of charge, including use of our bulletin boards to commercial interests on this university. Email addresses of students are very valuable. I don't see why we shouldn't recoup some of that information by selling it to the credit card companies and other who would like to contact our students.

ENO: I'll respond briefly to the first part, of why we should include email. The general policy that the Registrar's Office informs me is followed by at universities in general is to make as much information publicly available as possible; to be as open with information as possible. Students can always close their record or ask that any section of their record not be made public information. The default that most universities follow is to make information public unless the students request it be kept private.

SPECHLER: I don't object to giving the address. I do think that it will open our students up to endless solicitation, like the ones you and I receive all the time. I think that is not doing the students a favor. I don't see any positive reason for this.

ENO: I'm not sure I see the distinction between an email address in 2001 and a street or dorm address.

SPECHLER: It costs thirty-four cents to reach you via your address.

BRAND: Martin, if you would like to make an amendment to the proposal on the floor by deleting the words “email address,” you are free to do so.

SPECHLER: Let’s see what others think.

SHAPIRO: I think that part of the reason has to do with FERPA issues and also with some of the technology security issues. For example, if you have a class roster that has Social Security Numbers of students, you should not be keeping that on your hard drive on your office computer. That is not secure. You can keep it on a floppy disk in a locked drawer and that is secure. Something like email addresses are likely to be on an Outlook file or something similar. We might have a sheet of paper on our desk that has email addresses. We might want to transmit information to a club or an organization. If this document suggests that email addresses are the equivalent of Social Security Numbers for grades, in other words, they need to be kept private, we are going to end up with problems like you won’t imagine.

BRAND: That is a response to Martin?

RUBIN: I would add that the benefits of having email addresses public far outweighs the benefits of making them private. The Bloomington student Outlook system, which records most of the student email addresses, is heavily used by both faculty and students for contacting their colleagues, particularly in the case of many of the Active Learning Group projects. There is a great benefit to having those email addresses public at this point in time. I would hate to see them removed from that venue with the idea of protecting people from receiving unsolicited mail.

BRAND: Any other comments on this document? When you vote, you will be voting on the document as-is, including the addresses contained in item C, though Bob is going to bring that back at a future date for another revision.

GALANTI: A point of order: is “class schedule without time and location” in or out?

ENO: It is out. It is not a recommendation we forwarded. I should have crossed it out on this Xerox.

BRAND: In A3, “class schedule” and the parenthetical remark afterwards, “without time and location,” has been deleted.

ENO: We are actually going to voting on the document U3-2002, not the Xerox document. That document does not include “class schedule.”

RUBIN: I don’t want to belabor the discussion in this, but there is one concern that I have, which I think is lacking in the general policy and I think at some time we will need to come back to. That is, this deals with the authorized release of student information. One of the problems we are facing at the university is the unauthorized release of this information, and a document such as this would benefit greatly from some statement that says that all offices which are responsible for the data should take all appropriate actions to secure the data as well as possible, consistent with standard security procedures at the university. At some point in the future, I would like to see us come back to that, especially student information that was inadvertently released through hacking incident last year.

BRAND: I would welcome that addition. Bob, when you come back with the changes of address, could you also see if there is agreement on this.

ENO: There may already be language in this document to that effect. We have also received assurances that the information on this issue is given to offices that deal with student records throughout the university.

BRAND: There is a policy to that regard, no doubt, but it might be outdated at this point.

RUBIN: That is what I am referring to. In this policy, having that stated explicitly might be helpful.

BRAND: Other comments? I think we are ready for a vote. All in favor of the amended document listed circular U3-2002, please say "Aye."

[voice vote: motion passed]

Thank you. Let's move on to item five. Bob?

ENO: Actually, I would like to ask Becky to make a statement to us on a related matter.

PORTER: Since we just focused on what exactly is public information, we want to let you know that the Family Policy and Compliance Office of the Department of Education has decided that since we are in an unusual situation, where the FBI and other law enforcement agencies are investigating terrorist activities, there are some exemptions that have been made. Within FERPA, there is an emergency disclosure provision, meaning that there are instances where there are requests being made by law enforcement officers for information beyond what is listed here as public information. The protocol that has been established by IU is that we will comply with those requests; however, you should notify your campus law enforcement agency and university council before providing that information. The policy is that we will comply and comply in a timely manner, but in order to protect both yourself and the student, you need to consult with the campus police office and the campus council to make sure that this is a legitimate request, that it has been appropriately cleared, and that we provide only the information that was asked for.

BRAND: That is for every campus?

ZWIRN: Have we had many such requests?

PORTER: I don't know if you could quantify it that way, but both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses have had some requests.

BRAND: Thank you, Becky.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: UPDATE ON INTER-CAMPUS
TRANSFER POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**
(Professor Robert Eno, Educational Policies Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U5-2001.htm>

BRAND: Let's move on, then, to Bob's report on transfer policy.

ENO: Inter-campus transfer. There is a document in your packets, U5-2001, which the UFC passed last year. It is included here for your information for those of you who are new to the UFC. Those of you who aren't new to the UFC will remember that we have been dealing with the policy of inter-campus transfer for the last couple of years, and we have developed a somewhat Baroque policy to try to address some problems that we had in this area prior to that time that continued in some degree. I presume everyone is aware that last year we went through a very quick process to try to review our 100 and 200 level courses on all campuses, focusing on review of those courses that were offered with identical numbers on more than one campus, to ensure that the courses were comparable enough that they could be applied identically toward degree requirements on all campuses; thus if a student transferred from campus A to campus B with 100 and 200 level courses of certain numbers from campus A, they would be honored at campus B exactly the same way as they would have been honored at campus A if the student had gone on there. The process was done very rapidly, and basically what we were doing was focusing on cases which would turn into real problems for transfer students if we implemented a newly mandated policy that, as of the beginning of this term, considered identical for all purposes and on all campuses all courses with the same school and number code. No campus can now say that if course S101 comes from another campus they will not recognize the original campus's course. In this way, campuses are now system-wide in their numbering.

This has been applied at the 100 and 200 level. We are done at that level. There was only one substantive instance where there was an issue of whether or not there was comparability among courses. We found 8 campuses were teaching the course, which is very important and highly enrolled. One campus's syllabus was significantly different from the other campuses. When this process drew this to the attention of those involved, that campus determined that it would alter its syllabus to bring it in line with the other campuses and see if that worked. If it turns out not to work for the student body on that campus, then we may have to consider changing the number of the course on that one campus so the courses, which would then in fact not be comparable, would not automatically be treated as comparable.

This year, we are reviewing 300 and 400 level courses. The reason I am giving you a survey of this is to make sure that all of you are aware that the review of 300 and 400 level course comparability for identically numbered courses taught on multiple campuses is now beginning. The materials have been sent to all of the campuses, and they should be reaching the academic units shortly, if they have not already. I have been informed by the person who is in charge of distributing these -- and she has sworn this via email -- that the last batch will go out no later than tomorrow. Those of you who were on the council last year will remember how empty a statement like that which I made turned out to be later on, but nevertheless, faith springs eternal; I make it again. If you are in a unit, and you ask whether or not the curriculum officer for your unit has received these materials and the answer is "no," please let me know. It's very important to track whether or not those materials reached the curricular offices they were supposed to reach. What's supposed to happen is that every program receives a packet of materials listing all of the courses that that program teaches that are also taught on other campuses. The list will include bulletin-level course descriptions. By November 1, each unit has the opportunity to make a judgment that the unit is not satisfied that, from bulletin descriptions, it can determine enough comparability to serve for identical degree requirement purposes, and it can request further information, which would be syllabi. If it desires, the unit makes that request to the office that is coordinating this, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Vice-President Brehm's office. They will make the request to that office, and that office is responsible for collecting syllabi and distributing the syllabi to all the campuses where that course is taught so that all the campuses can review whether there is accurate comparability.

If it appears that there is not adequate comparability, that the courses are importantly different from one another such that the students would be disadvantaged in moving from one course to another, the hope is that the departments involved would be able to come to a decision about renumbering the courses so that they are no longer identically numbered. One campus or set of campuses will volunteer to alter the number. If no agreement can be reached in that regard, then by February 1, one campus involved needs to alert the office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs that they need adjudication on how to handle this apparent non-comparability among courses. There is a University Faculty Council committee that has been set up to deal with those adjudication matters which represents all campuses. We set this committee up last year; the members of this committee have never been contacted again. I have no doubt that none of them are still on the committee, and so that committee will have to be reformed by the spring term.

The two things I am asking you to do are see whether or not you can find out if the materials are spreading on your campuses, so that by next week your unit has received the materials, and keep alert for tracking these issues as they come to the November 1 deadline for asking for further information for courses, and the February 1 deadline for making a request for adjudication. Last year this all went unbelievably smoothly. That was chiefly because we left people with no time to do anything. This year, we are trying to do it right.

End of side A, tape one. Some conversation was lost.

ENO: We are very much interested in heading off problems and minimizing the amount of work involved in this.

BRAND: That's a good description of the activity.

WARD: One clarification. On the course description for 300 and 400 level courses, there is a listing for prerequisites. That really doesn't affect the substance of the course, but rather how that course is administered. Is this going to be a problem?

ENO: The Educational Policies Committee that drafted the original document thought that different prerequisites were *prima facie* evidence of a probability of non-comparability. That was a good place to ask for more information, to go into the syllabi. In fact, if students are required to have a certain prerequisite at the target campus to which they are moving, and it turns out that the course they took, though somewhat comparable in content, did not force them to engage certain skills, and therefore they discover that they were lacking skills that would be necessary for sequenced courses on campus B, they would be seriously disadvantaged. We want to look at those areas and make sure that although the prerequisite may not be specified, the course functions comparably enough to serve the degree requirements.

One thing to bear in mind is that some courses can be very different and still be comparable enough because the degree requirement is cast very broadly. Other courses are in sequences where the comparability needs to be narrow.

WARD: Would that decision be made by the campus that owned the course?

ENO: This does not envision campus ownership of the course. Both campuses are currently teaching the course; both campuses fully own the course. That is why we need a period of negotiation among units for the courses of identical number which may not be comparable to figure out how to best handle it. No committee in this body can figure out to best handle courses within a discipline. It's up to the people in the discipline across the multiple campuses. We are

hoping that, on the record of last year, very important differences can be resolved. People in a single discipline have a single goal: to educate students as best they can.

KINTZELE: The courses that are listed in the catalog have a description. Is that the description you are handing out to the campuses?

ENO: Yes, the very brief description.

KINTZELE: Okay. With that description in the course catalog, there are prerequisites listed for that course. Is there supposed to be a standard prerequisite to any course at Indiana University, listed in the catalog?

ENO: I assume you are talking about the Master Course Inventory?

KINTZELE: Yes.

ENO: We got these descriptions from the bulletins rather than the Master Course Inventory because we discovered that courses do in fact have variant prerequisites in their bulletins, indicators of campus practice, even though we would assume that since they are coming off the Master Course Inventory, which does list prerequisites; they should have identical prerequisites. We are going according to practice, rather than theory, which has been previously disregarded. It is probably wise to let this group know that later this year we will have to revisit the issue of how to reform the compilation and administration of the Master Course Inventory, because the way that the Master Course Inventory, which is simply an inventory of all courses across all eight campuses, is now administered is such that it would undermine all that we are now doing in this process to get our courses aligned over eight campuses. Last April, this group approved a *plan* to reform the Master Course Inventory, rather than a *policy*. The original ICT policy said we would pass a policy by last April. We passed a plan instead, because although the plan was carefully thought out by the Educational Policies Committee, on one count we did not know whether it was technically feasible, because of uncertainty of conversion to the PeopleSoft software. Secondly, if you read through the plan itself, it is just a parody. We want to try again to get a more reasonable document.

BRAND: You will come back to that after the 300 and 400 levels are reviewed?

ENO: We will come back to it at that time. The group should understand that this is not the end of the ICT issue. It will move on to the Master Course Inventory.

KINTZELE: I want one clarification. I haven't seen anything on my campus relative to these course descriptions. Who made up these descriptions? Did they take a particular campus's description and use that, along with their prerequisites?

ENO: Yes.

KINTZELE: So, some selection process was undertaken at the time that you were making up these lists. When these go out to all of the campuses, they are trying to see if they can conform to what is on your list, in terms of how you describe that course and the prerequisites and so on.

ENO: All of the information on this list comes directly out of the campus's own bulletin copy.

KINTZELE: Every campus's description is on there?

ENO: Exactly.

KINTZELE: Thank you.

SHAPIRO: You were talking about asking for syllabi if you think there might be a discrepancy. What if you don't think there is a discrepancy, but you'd like to know what people are doing on another campus, to see if there is reason to make changes?

ENO: I think it would be great if you called your colleagues rather than send in the request. It is possible that we will be overloaded with requests. We really only have about half of one staff person for this. Part of the impetus of all of this is to get the campuses talking to one another.

BRAND: Other questions? I have a feeling we'll hear more about this later.

ENO: I'm afraid so.

BRAND: Now we will break into committees. Bob, do you have any instructions?

ENO: Let's take a ten minute break as some committee members are coming in, and we can use that break to reconfigure the room.

BRAND: We are then adjourned.

*Meeting adjourned 2:30 PM
Bob Eno, Co-Secretary*