

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 19, 2010
Kelley School of Business – CG 1034
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS: Randy Arnold, Robert Arnové, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Geoffrey Brown, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Joyce Byrer, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Jennifer Chaffin, Michael Coleman, Angela Courtney, Nick D’Amico, Erika Dowell, Tony Fargo, Tom Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Neil Kelty, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manring, Eugene McGregor, Jane McLeod, Sherri Michaels, Robert Noel, Michael Ogden, Mary Popp, Elizabeth Raff, John Raglin, Diane Reilly, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Debora Shaw, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, Joey Tartell, Herb Terry, Maxine Watson, Sue Whiston, Tony White

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Laura Smothers (Edwin Jimenez), Sarita Soni (Ruth M. Stone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arthur Bradley, Andrea Ciccarelli, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, Frank Di Silvestro, David Estell, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Don Gjerdingen, Mary Gray, Ranu Samantrai, Richard Shockley, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Neil Theobald, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Alan Bender (Biology), Michael Carroll (Sr. Associate Registrar), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost’s Office), Roland Coté (Registrar), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Michael Lundell (OVPU), Jocelyn Karlan (Faculty Council Office), Barrett Tenbarge (IUSA), Katie Tetrick (IUSA), Jim Sherman (Psychology), Munirpallam Venkataramanan (Business), Claire Wiseman (IDS)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

September 21, 2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/09.21.10.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Lynton Keith Caldwell and Otto Pflanze

Lynton Keith Caldwell: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B11-2011.pdf>

Otto Pflanze: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B12-2011.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

B13-2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B13-2011.pdf>
B14-2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B14-2011.pdf>
B15-2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B15-2011.pdf>
BFC Ad hoc Subcommittee on Indiana University's Health Engagement Program Initiative
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/Hepicom.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

6. EPC Proposal on Academic Programs in Residential Programs and Services (RPS) (30 minutes)
(Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee) [FIRST READING]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B17-2011.pdf>

7. General Education Committee Report (30 minutes)
(Professor Sonya Stephens, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Professor
Munirpallam Venkataramanan, Co-Chairs of the General Education Committee) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B16-2011.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/B25-2009.2010rev.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/GEMS.pdf>

8. Proposal to Revise the Bloomington Campus Calendar (30 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B10-2011.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HANSON: I think people may still be finding their way over here but we need to begin because we have a very full agenda. The first item of business is the approval of minutes from September 7th. Is there a motion on that?

COLEMAN: I move to approve the minutes from September 7th.

HANSON: Thank you Michael! Is there a second?

TERRY: Second.

HANSON: Thank you Herb. All in favor? [Aye]

HANSON: Opposed? Abstaining? Alright, thank you. Next we have two memorial resolutions from Tom Gieryn.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR LYNTON KEITH CALDWELL AND OTTO PFLANZE

GIERYN: Service to the environment was the hallmark of Lynton Keith Caldwell's professional and private life. He will be remembered best as the leading contributor to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a law that opened the floodgates of important environmental legislation and that continues to share responsibility for protecting America's environmental legacy with the results: the Clear Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act. But NEPA was only the best known of Professor Caldwell's undertakings.

Lynton Keith Caldwell was born in Iowa on November 21, 1913. He received a BA from the University of Chicago and an AM from Harvard University. Upon completion of the AM, he joined the faculty at Indiana University for the first time in 1938. Five years later, he completed his doctorate in political science at the University of Chicago. He returned to Indiana University in 1956, retiring in 1984, but remaining active well into the 1990s.

At Indiana University, Keith was instrumental in founding the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Appointed by IU President John Ryan in 1971 to serve on a committee (with first SPEA dean Charles Bonser) to consider the formation of a school of public affairs he advocated strongly for the inclusion of an environmental focus in the curriculum and in the name of the new school. When SPEA opened in 1972, Professor Caldwell was a member of the new faculty.

In his early scholarship, Professor Caldwell concentrated primarily on public administration. Not until the 1960s, after two decades of national and international scholarship in that area, did he turn his considerable skills to the question of bringing an environmental awareness to the legal and political arenas. He was to speak, later, of having had a "revelation" concerning the importance of understanding the relationships between humans and the environment. Probing those relationships and the question of human responsibility for environmental impacts would occupy the remainder of his long professional life. But his largest impact, NEPA, would come about before the end of the decade.

As a political scientist bent on fomenting environmental policy, Keith Caldwell was one of only a few thinkers in what was then a vast emptiness. The nation was only just beginning to turn its attention to matters of the environment, and no thought had yet been given to how that attention might be translated into the working machinery of government. His 1963 article *Environment: A New Focus for Public Policy* was groundbreaking. He saw, early on, that the environment was a large, integrated complexity that could not be addressed through reductionism, but rather required a holistic definition, however difficult that might be to encompass.

As Congress was struggling to craft a law that would begin to provide accountability for environmental impacts, Professor Caldwell was asked to serve as an advisor and later a consultant to the proceedings. He would eventually author much of the Act. In sweeping language, the law laid out a national policy of responsible environmental use, provided a means to ensure transparency in government actions that affect the environment, and formed a

Council on Environmental Quality to assist the President in formulating environmental policy and to review governmental programs that affect the environment.

In the years following NEPA, Professor Caldwell was both a champion of the Act's potential and an enumerator of its shortfalls. He recognized the immense importance of environmental impact statements – the instrument by which the government reports to the public the potential environmental effects of its proposed actions. But he mourned the unfulfilled possibilities of the Act's broad description of national responsibility toward the environment and blamed the courts, particularly the Supreme Court, for failing to support the Congressional intent embodied in those parts of the Act. He also saw the unrealized power of the Council of Environmental Quality, stymied repeatedly by many administrations. His last book, *The National Environmental Policy Act: An Agenda for the Future*, published in 1998, makes these points and emphasizes the untapped strength of the Act, not only for domestic but also for international environmental policy.

The excellence and importance of Professor Caldwell's work was recognized repeatedly. He held the Arthur F. Bentley Chair in Political Science at IU. He was named to the United Nations Global 500 Laureate Roll of Honor for service to the environment. Additional awards were conferred by the American Society for Public Administration and the Natural Resources Council. In recognition of his achievements, the American Political Science Association annually gives the Lynton Keith Caldwell Award to the best book of the previous three years in the area of environmental politics and policy.

Despite the volume of his publications and the depth and breadth of his service to environmental policy, or perhaps to balance it, Keith Caldwell also brought his passion for the environment to local affairs. He supported the foundation of the Indiana chapter of the Nature Conservancy. In 1990, he helped to start the Sycamore Land Trust, a land conservation organization active in the south-central Indiana landscape he loved. The house he shared with his wife Helen became a small monument to that love, seated at the edge of a restored prairie, against a backdrop of hardwood forest.

Lynton Keith Caldwell leaves behind a legacy of scholarship; a law that has served as the foundation for countless similar laws of environmental protection at the local, national, and international level; strong local environmental institutions; as well as his wife Helen, his son Edwin, and his daughter, Emma. His passion will be missed.

Upon learning of the appointment of Otto Pflanze to the faculty of the Department of History, one of his new Indiana University colleagues scribbled a passionate letter to an acquaintance. "I really feel great about the Pflanze appointment," the missive, dated February 12, 1976, asserted. "He can *turn around* our image in European history." Indeed, during his ten years of employment at IU, Pflanze, a specialist in modern German history, helped the History department become a prominent center for the study of Europe.

Otto Pflanze was born in Maryville, Tennessee, in 1918. He earned a bachelor's degree in history from Maryville College in 1940 and enrolled in the graduate program at Yale University the following year. During World War II, Pflanze served in the United States Army, rising to the

rank of first lieutenant. Following the conflict, he completed his degree work at Yale, graduating with a doctorate in history in 1950. Although he had served as a historian with the U.S. State Department during 1948-1949, Pflanze's first academic appointment was New York University, where he was employed as an instructor from 1950-1951. The following year, he accepted a position as an assistant professor at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, where he remained until 1958. Notwithstanding his East Coast roots, most of Pflanze's academic career was spent in the Midwest. Following three years of employment at the University of Illinois (1958-1961), he served fifteen years on the history faculty of the University of Minnesota, achieving the rank of professor.

Pflanze began his membership on the IU History faculty in 1977. His appointment was at the rank of full professor, but also carried the responsibility of editing the prestigious *American Historical Review*. Pflanze brought a great deal of energy and intellectual gravitas to the journal, which helped further establish its reputation as the leading academic periodical in the discipline. While the *AHR* editorship was nearly a full-time job in itself, Pflanze regularly taught courses in German and European history, worked with graduate students, attended scholarly conferences, and contributed to the service mission of the department. Many of his pupils affectionately refer to him as "O.P.," often expressing gratitude for his intellectual guidance.

Among his many publications, Pflanze is best known for his studies on German nationalism and unification. Specifically, his three-volume work on the subject. The first book, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: The Period of Unification, 1815-71* (Princeton UP) appeared in 1963. Two subsequent volumes, with the subtitles *The Period of Consolidation, 1871-1880* and *The Period of Fortification, 1880-1898*, were published in 1990 under the Princeton UP imprimatur. Writing for the *New York Times*, a reviewer of the first volume praised Pflanze's "superb mastery of the vast Bismarck literature" and his ability to skillfully navigate "many of the ideological controversies which have hitherto obscured rather than illuminated Bismarck." At a time when much of the published scholarship on Bismarck was overshadowed by assessments of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi period, Pflanze humanized his subject by placing him within his nineteenth-century context and deeply probing the historical evolution of German nationalism and political identity.

In addition to his Bismarck biography and work at the *AHR*, Pflanze was engaged in several other intellectual pursuits during his career. IN 1969, he edited a volume entitled *The Unification of Germany, 1848-1871* and co-authored a textbook (*A History of the Western World*) the following year. Moreover, he produced an admirable corpus of article-length publications during his academic life, successfully placing them in respectable periodicals such as the *Journal of Modern History* and *Review of Politics*. Complementing his service as *AHR* editor, Pflanze served as a member of the Board of Editors of *Central European History* (1972-1974), as secretary-treasurer of the Conference Group for Central European History (1962-1964), and as an officer of the American Historical Association. He lectured as an invited guest at a wide array of institutions, including the University of California at Berkeley, Johns Hopkins University, the University of North Carolina, and Stanford University. Given the quality of his research, Pflanze's career was accented with a number of distinctions and honors, ranging from a Fulbright Fellowship (Germany, 1955-1957) to a Guggenheim award (Germany, 1966-1967).

During his decade of employment at Indiana University, he received a number of research awards which facilitated his work on German history.

In 1987, Pflanze left Indiana University for an endowed appointment at Bard College in Hudson, New York, where he remained until retirement in 1992. In his later years, Pflanze enjoyed traveling, especially through the German Alps, but would later return to Bloomington where he died at the age of eighty-eight in 2007. He is survived by his wife, Hertha, of Bridgeville, Pennsylvania; sons Charles, of St. Paul, and Stephen, of Lake Forest, California; a sister Eleanore Graham, of Winter Haven, Florida; and two grandsons.

HANSON: I ask you to stand and observe a moment of silence. Thank you. Agenda Committee Business?

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: Alright, Agenda Committee Business. On your agenda you see there are a number of circulars listed under this item, the first three you don't have in your packets because it would probably be a waste of paper and a waste of effort to include them, but you may wish to pay some attention to them they are related to the upcoming nominations and election cycle. The first one is a list of all faculty eligible to vote and to be nominated to serve on the Council and we welcome any corrections that you might have to offer. We do our best along with Tom's office to make sure that those lists are right, but errors are always possible. The following lists include a list of all of us currently serving, and whether we are in the middle of a term, whether we're ineligible because we are finishing off our term limit, or whether we're eligible for reelection. And so if you notice any errors there, as one person has already noted, please let Craig know. And of course as these things happen we do encourage you to encourage people to nominate folks to serve and to vote. The fourth circular listed under the "Agenda Committee Business" is a copy of the charge to the ad hoc committee to look at the new Health Engagement Program Initiative. This gives you an outline of what we've asked them to do, I've given you some sense of this before but now you have a hard copy along with a timeline which they'll do the best they can to try to work with. The committee composition is listed also on that with the exception that we will also be adding a representative from CWA and one from the PA Council and their names just haven't been added yet. At least one of them was able to meet with the committee when they kicked off their business on Monday. Jim Sherman is chairing the group, but Bill McGregor who is also chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee is here today over there in the back as well as Diane Henshel over here and, is there anyone else I'm forgetting who is actually present whose on that committee? I don't think so. They are interested in hearing what you have to say, certainly everybody who has sent me an email with concerns, questions, anger, frustration [Jim Sherman enters room]— there you are! – about the committee I've passed on all of those to the group but if you have more that you would like to say or things that haven't made it to the Agenda Committee yet you can email them to Jim Sherman (sherman@indiana.edu) and Jim would you like to say something about the group?

SHERMAN: Just that the committee meet for the first time yesterday and I think it's going to be a good and an efficient committee on a really fast track because they are going to rollout all of

the issues and requirements for the second year in January so we've got to finish up by the end of this semester and have any recommendations. And I would just encourage anyone who has any comments about it email it to me and I will make sure I post it for the rest of the committee. You know, problems that you've had, philosophical issues that you have, specific problems that you had getting on, getting off, feedback that you've gotten that seemed irrelevant, false measures it might have taken, but also, you know, kind of good things that you have seen from it and help that you might have gotten by taking the survey and even if you know that someone else has sent something similar send it, duplicate it. You know if it comes from one person it's not as effective as if it comes from ten people and the committee will try to separate perception from reality. I think a lot of the complaints and concerns are real and I think some of them are based a little bit on a lack of information or a misperception of what the goals are. So we'll try to separate all that and make recommendations and hope that they're followed which I can't guarantee.

DOWELL: Thank you.

SHERMAN: And I had a hell of a time finding this joint. (laughter)

DOWELL: Well you swooped in just in time.

BUCUR-DECKARD: You're in psychology –

HANSON: – That's what I was just thinking, it's right next door!

SHERMAN: It's a step up from the way we used to be. Two steps – I guess you had the Georgian Room in between – I'm old school back in Ballantine when they cleared out the coffee drinking.

DOWELL: Well, we're not over here all the time but that's what makes it even worse is that we are back and forth between here and the Union. Thank you Jim, and I also want to remind people that next week there is a meeting about this program at which Dan Rives and Neil Theobald will be there and a representative from the committee that drew up the guidelines, a faculty member at the medical school, will also be present in the Georgian Room on – this is just where my notes fail me –

HANSON: –Isn't it the 25th?

DOWELL: The 25th in the afternoon, 3:00 – 4:30PM I think.

SHERMAN: No, I think it's 2:30. We feel like we are at a disadvantage already, they're the blue ribbon committee and we're the ad hoc committee. So I don't know what that says.

DOWELL: Well, we'll keep that in mind next time. At any rate there is a meeting next week you should have had an email about it attached to a letter from Dan Rives about two weeks ago and it's in the Georgian Room and maybe by the end of the meeting will have figured out exactly when it is because I bet it's in here in this thing somewhere. So I encourage people to fill that room up and let people know what they are concerned about. Craig has the info.

DETHLOFF: 2:00-3:30PM on Monday.

DOWELL: 2:00-3:30pm on Monday in Georgian Room in the IMU. Thank you.

HANSON: Could I just ask a question about that? Your timeline is very short, but is it short enough? (laughter) Have you conferred with Dan and Neil about whether or not you can still have an impact?

SHERMAN: Yes, we can and where the Fringe Benefit Committee is meeting tomorrow afternoon and Dan Rives will be there. I don't know if Neil might be there, but they know of the committee and they are looking forward to input. And they've said all along that, you know, nothing is final until January when they will try to put closure on it.

HANSON: But materials will presumably come out to everybody in November as always, won't they?

DOWELL: Yeah, they actually are already out.

SHERMAN: That will just be for selecting an option.

DOWELL: I got one. And I think that the process—I mean, I think that years two and three in the process—won't necessarily be finalized in January but they'll start working on it in January was my perception. But the committee, most importantly the ad hoc committee, will be working along in the process, communicating with Dan and with Neil in an on-going kind of fashion also.

HANSON: Thanks.

BUCUR-DECKARD: And they will communicate with you.

SHERMAN: Excuse me?

BUCUR-DECKARD: And they will communicate with you, too, hopefully.

SHERMAN: Yes.

BIELASIAK: Can I ask a question? There is a faculty and staff petition, as we know, circulating with the latest count is about 300 signatures and many comments included from that site and I think that might be useful source of information.

SHERMAN: Yeah, I think they will send it to me with those.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Jim, I can send it to you tomorrow morning—the link. You want me to?

SHERMAN: You mean – ?

BUCUR-DECKARD: You want me to? The link to the petition? I can send it to you tomorrow morning.

SHERMAN: I know what a copy of the petition looks like, if there were comments associated with it...

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's on the petition itself, each signature has the possibility to add a comment and there's a lot of comments on it.

SHERMAN: If you could do that that would be really helpful. Thank you.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah, okay.

HANSON: Any other comments or questions on that or...?

SHERMAN: Okay, thank you all!

DOWELL: Thank you, Jim.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

HANSON: Thanks. We have a very full agenda today so I don't have much of a report. The only thing I want to underscore is that that New Academic Direction Committee is meeting or it's had one meeting – on the issue of short timelines for committees now – what can seem like, you know, in the world outside academe it may seem like a long timeline but a semester is a very short timeline, and you really need to have input from as many people as possible. There is an email address to which people can send comments. I think even as we speak an email is going out to everybody on the faculty inviting comments and giving a clickable address with a copy of the charge to that committee. All the deans of the schools were asked to ask all of their departments or divisions to try to have conversations about the charge to that committee, but so far I actually haven't seen anything come rolling back in. So I just want to underscore that's a very short timeline. I hope people will pay attention to it and offer whatever comments, thoughts, or reactions that they have. Questions?

DOWELL: I just want to add to that we – at Karen's request – we did also ask every committee of the BFC to look at those questions and to talk about it in a meeting and to send back whatever they felt were issues related to their committee's perspective on the New Academic Directions charge and questions.

TERRY: Actually as a committee chair I got that email and shared it with the Budgetary Affairs Committee who are meeting on that, but I think what you're likely to get from us is maybe two sets of comments, one where people are speaking – if they can agree on anything – on behalf of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and focusing on budgetary issues. I can tell from what I've begun to get back from faculty that the other summary may be more hodgepodge-ish as this is a subset of the faculty.

HANSON: That's fine!

TERRY: And I will be making an effort trying to distinguish those two things.

HANSON: Don't work overly hard on that. That was something else I just wanted to underscore. I've said this to a group of students, too, who all had leaders of various student organizations to try to get the word out to all the student organizations, and I just said you don't need to compose anything with the thought that it really matters what form it's in. Any thoughts that

they want to send back quickly – I mean they should be thoughtful – but they don't need to be polished and the hodgepodge is fine.

TERRY: I think my follow-up question on that would be though how are we going to know as the committee formulates recommendations, or whatever it is, what those are so that there may be something more concrete than the questions to respond to?

HANSON: The email that is being sent to you right now, which comes from both me and Charles Bantz at first, I think, promised regular draft proposals. I actually think that if you really look at this timeline that is not doable, but I think questions can be sent out at regular intervals and there are supposed to be places for posting this. Kelly Kish from the President's Office was supposed to be handling that aspect of the two-way communications. The email receptacle site has only recently been setup, so I'm hoping this sort of moves into faster gear now but we hope there can be some – *some* – indication of direction so that people can comment on it and I also think it's fair to say that when the initial report is due January 31st when we reconvene after the winter break there will be time to bring something back to this body and to some other bodies to say, 'this looks like the direction in which it's going,' and I really shouldn't say this out loud but I wonder if that January 31st date is really firm. I just wonder!

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

So any questions or comments on that or actually anything else? For either me or Erika? Okay! Should we move into the next business, the Proposal to Revise the Bloomington Campus Calendar?

DOWELL: Oops! Wait we have a revised version, EPC Proposal.

HANSON: EPC first!

DOWELL: We rearranged.

HANSON: Sorry.

DOWELL: That's okay.

AGENDA ITEM 6: EPC PROPOSAL ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES (RPS)

KENNEY: This proposal you have before you arose from within the EPC out of the question of what is the relationship between departments, schools, and colleges and the teaching that goes on within the living and learning community. There are new living and learning communities being created – not all the time – but one was created last year and another created a few years earlier and we wondered how the schools and colleges related to them precisely. What we discovered was there really is no policy at all on the academic programs within Residential Programs and Services and felt that it would be a good idea to create some policy. The three points of this proposal for the most part – well I guess maybe I should say in part make clear things which are already happening so, for example, there already is a fair amount of oversight

from the colleges or schools and the RPS programs, the LLCs, that is, that they set up. However, that varies or the level of that oversight varies. And so, for example, formal program reviews of these—after all—academic programs does not, for the most part, take place. You will recall that the last thing I presented to this body was on sort of institutionalizing or regularizing program review and in the context of that we began to think about why are there not program reviews of programs which have curricula, which have instructors, and so on. So while there is already oversight, making that oversight clearer and more formal was what we one sought to do. The second point, not all of the LLCs are lead by older instructional academic appointment. My own sense is really that there should be a tenure-track faculty member, but this doesn't say that. If you feel strongly that it should then we can change it, but instructional academic appointments seems to handle it. The "should" means that we are not calling for people who do not have such appointments to be let go or moved to a different position. This is a guideline which we hope will be taken into account in the future. And then the final point, I think is the most straight forward one, about the courses being taught by people who have academic appointments that include instruction. So again a mix of things that are already being done but not in a formalized way according to some policy and some things that aren't now being done, but seem to us to be entirely compatible with the mission of the LLCs in RPS. I would be happy to answer any questions.

ARNOVE: A graduate student develops a course for the Collins Living Learning Center, gets approval of the students living in the center, and has some faculty member of that unit sort of working with the graduate student, is that sufficient or...?

KENNEY: Yes the graduate student has an AI.

ARNOVE: And that's troubling?

TERRY: I'm not sure that the grad student always does have an AI. For the background of everyone I was the founding director of the College of Arts and Sciences sponsored Global Village Living and Learning Center in Foster. Many of the graduate students that we employed – and I think this is still the case – were people who, for example, might have received as much support as they were going to get from their academic program and their AI-ship could no longer be continued they needed another year to finish their dissertation or something like that, and they submit a proposal with us for a course and they would teach it. I think it's a matter of the language in three, that was the way that many of us who were in programs often had outsiders teach courses, some faculty member is the instructor of record or something and you have an opportunity to bring in community expert or someone else, we do that in Telecommunications from time to time with professionals. They teach the course but the instructor of record is an appointed faculty member, that may not even necessarily exist in some RPSs smaller living learning communities although it probably is the case with the director of the Global Village who is an instructional appointee in Slavic Language and Literature and the head of Collins is a faculty member in several faculty departments. But three seems to me, from what I know at least a few years ago of RPS, to be relatively problematic in the sense that many of what they would call learning communities which is different than a living learning center in their parlance but sometimes contains some academic courses, are directed by graduate

students who are basically RAs for those things. I'm wondering I guess what RPSs reaction to this was. Does this match their structure? Their learning communities and – they would claim – the LLCs sponsored by the College and Business and HPER, are ultimately under the direction of a staff employee within Academic Initiatives and Services in RPS who I don't think has an academic appointment.

KENNEY: So a couple things. The last point, we consulted on this at every step with RPS and I have the support of Diana Jacobs who is in charge of that wing of RPS. And I guess I would say that you highlighted precisely the problem that concerned them. So let's take the example of a graduate student, we can imagine a situation where there's a graduate student who, you know, has run out of support is finishing dissertation and, well, here's a home and that's a good idea. Now we can imagine another situation where the dissertation doesn't get done and ten years later that person is still, you know sort of out of the goodness of that LLCs heart, is still teaching over there – which might be a great thing there are lots of excellent people who never finish their PhD's – but that person has now sort of moved out of the orbit of the department and might not be getting the review of his or her teaching and curriculum that he or she would have gotten when they were still within the orbit of that department. And again there might be really good reasons for someone who never finished his PhD to find a home in an LLC, and that's a good reason to have programs like this, but if it's not formalized there is a real concern that these bodies out in the Kuiper Belt or whatever – are, you know, at the very edges of our solar system – no one would be aware that they are there anymore. I mean, I think the same thing would go for community people, and again, you know, we can all think of great examples of people out there in the community that we would want to be working with us, who have, PhD's, who work in a different world but have a great deal to offer, but if that is not formalized, if there is not a formal relationship of that instructor – at least at some kind of review level – with a school, college, department, then there is a possibility for it to be someone really maybe not as good at teaching as they are good in what they do in employment. So, you know, there's no question that those kind of things happen and can happen and should but with something formal.

TERRY: When we consider this the next time I hope the Council would invite the directors of the LLCs that are formally sponsored by the College of Arts and Sciences or by other schools that they be here as guests because I am several years removed from active involvement with RPS and their structures and that sort of thing. But I think some of this may be more problematic than she may have if we do away with the ways they are currently do things.

HANSON: Tom?

GIERYN: If the desire is to make sure that instructors at LLCs are engaged in and reviewed by academic programs maybe it's more important to emphasis that rather than the rank they hold. One could imagine the crafting of a memorandum of understanding at the point they are hired that would specify with the agreement of an academic unit and the hired instructor that they will be reviewed by that academic program for as long as they teach in the LLC. This could address the problem that Herb is getting at. We have adjuncts who are brought in from the community with a wide variety of degrees, or lack of, who teach and often teach effectively and

are reviewed by the pertinent academic unit. There's no reason why that couldn't be worked out, I think, in this situation.

BROWN: Well, the thing I'm a little stuck on is it says in the Academic Handbook that this is the policy so either we're talking about an exception to the policy or we're talking about changing the policy or enforcing the policy and those are the three choices there. I mean, where does this policy come from and who is responsible [some remarks inaudible]? I'm kind of in favor of the way you've worded it, but I'm stuck on the fact that we are discussing an exception to it by not enforcing academic rank of some sort and I don't understand how we hold these two things simultaneously.

KENNEY: Umm...yeah.

GIERYN: What I was doing was trying to suggest that rather than focus on the issue of rank – though I see that's in the policy itself – that the issue be whether this person is regularly reviewed by an academic unit. If the rank problem is solved these folks could be appointed as an adjunct if they don't have any other academic appointment and we have people – many – teaching throughout the campus as adjuncts.

BROWN: Right, that would imply some oversight when somebody was appointed as an adjunct. There is a connection there, that's a connection.

GIERYN: Yeah, I guess it would I'm hoping we could put more specification into that because academic units in agreeing that somebody who is adjunct may or may not take seriously the review obligation. If this policy were to go forward as such I'd like to see wording in there that would say as a matter of course those people will be reviewed regularly by the academic unit.

WHISTON: I have a question because I'm only dealing inside the graduate level and so I really don't have knowledge of the living and learning communities. Who makes the selection of who teaches these courses?

KENNEY: The directors of the LLCs.

WHISTON: LLCs. And those hold faculty rank?

KENNEY: Not all of them, no.

HANSON: I mean, at least in Collins, the Curriculum Committee of faculty there –

KENNEY: Yes, we always come back to Collins. I do want to emphasize that Collins is an exemplary program. Every single conversation I've had about this always starts with 'Well, in Collins...'

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.

HANSON: But it isn't the director of that –

KENNEY: Right but – exactly. Collins is kind of a special case. You know, it is an exemplary program. Global Village is right up there.

WHISTON: So how many are there?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Who doesn't make that list?

KENNEY: That's kind of hard for us to define.

TERRY: They vary.

HANSON: Sonya?

STEPHENS: I mean, there are a number of these and they come in different categories as has already been pointed out, and it isn't only Collins that has academic oversight. I mean, Kelly has a new one, a very successful one. Global Village has a faculty advisory committee that reviews the proposals, but there are some out there in which there is no such review and I think what the EPC has been discussing is overall the lack of oversight in the academic programs and so there are some cases where academic credit is being given over which there is no faculty oversight. Which may well be – well, which probably should be a concern for this Council.
(laughter)

WHISTON: That's exactly my question. So there is academic credit that is being given, correct?

STEPHENS: Correct.

KENNEY: Yes, all of these give academic credit.

WHISTON: But yet they're not necessarily associated with the academic unit?

KENNEY: All of them are nominally connected. All of them have some nominal connection with a school or college.

STEPHENS: Well, they're also located in a particular unit.

KENNEY: But there is not necessarily any faculty oversight.

WHISTON: Hmm...

KENNEY: Yes! (laughter) And you know there is really no point in sort of naming [remarks indistinct]

WHISTON: No, no, I mean –

KENNEY: Right, sufficient to say – which to be honest – is one reason why I don't think it would be a particularly good idea to, sort of, you know, like in a Senate subcommittee bring in the nine directors. So I strongly argue against Herb's suggestion, because I don't want to get into who's who and which one works and so on. But, yeah, there are some where there's attention and oversight [remarks indistinct]

HANSON: Yes?

KELTY: With respect to number two – and this may be ignorance as a student – what is this changing about the current director appointments of the various LLCs? Is this requiring additional degrees or qualifications? Would any of the directors be, I guess, unqualified under this new policy?

KENNEY: I'd rather not say, I guess that would be rather specific, but again some do not have such an appointment and they could be given such an appointment. But then that would then assume some kind of oversight or the school or college could at some point – either, you know, immediately or at some point when it becomes time to nominate a new director – take this policy into account.

KELTY: Okay. I mean, my sole concern here is that, I mean, turning these directorships into, I guess, academic positions, which if you really look at these LLCs that these need to be more than academic positions. They need to be academic and res life. I used to be an RA in McNutt and I would have worked in the LLC this year had we not been elected. So I think we need to keep that in mind that some of these LLC directorships need to be more than just academic appointments or, I guess, academically focused.

KENNEY: That's a really good point which we talked about some. You know, in the end is this something that is best done by somebody who's an expert in residential life issues, but when we got to the three points, two of which already exist; one, that a curriculum is being designed under the supervision of a director; two, that instructors are being hired – and to some extent supervised – under the supervision of this director, and then the third new thing that we would be asking is that such a director to be involved in program review. Well, those things should be done by faculty.

KELTY: So are you changing this directorship from a full-time staff director to a faculty member?

KENNEY: Again, in most cases they are faculty who are also – just as there are plenty of faculty working in administration – there are some faculty who have the desire and the ability to work in a residential life position such as directing an LLC. Not everybody can do that but someone who is directing an LLC which this policy says should have – again I'm not saying faculty here – should have an instructional academic appointment. So there's room for, you know, somebody who is not a tenured faculty member. But yes, I mean, when you think of those particular tasks, I mean, that is really what faculty do and it's something that we shouldn't be ceding to someone else.

HANSON: Any comments or questions?

UNKNOWN FEMALE VOICE: Is this brought as a proposal?

KENNEY: Right. This is a first reading. There are some useful comments. We will discuss it at our next meeting, and I expect we will bring it back to the next BFC meeting.

HANSON: Thank you. Alright, then with the new agenda we're moving to the report on the General Education Committee. Sonya?

AGENDA ITEM 7: GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

STEPHENS: Okay, [remark indistinct] the team report but I think that I first need to start out by saying that it's been sometime since this Council received a report on Gen Ed, not because we were being lax, but because the last report was in April of 2009 and you might have received the report back in April 2010 except the BFC circular says we should report annually in October and we wanted to get back on the regular calendar and since the Gen Ed meeting at which significant changes were going to take place at the end that month, it would have been more appropriate to bring it and report to you on the regular calendar, so this why we are reporting to you in October. So since the last report quite a bit has happened, and I think first off Venkat and I would both like to thank Russ Hanson and Barb Bichelmeyer for the excellent condition in which they left General Education – when they left as co-chairs – which has made our lives so much easier. But there are other things that have gone on since that. Parts – some of which they set up and we carried forward – and others which we have picked up as we went along. Some of them are to do with implementation teams, so if you get closer to the implementation of Gen Ed there was a need to think about the kinds of issues that we might come across when it's implemented. So we have various different implementation teams on communications, advising – I'll tell you a little bit them in a moment, the forecast in particular – and in particular which has been really useful as we think about the number of seats we might need, for example, in math. But we also through those meetings, I guess, found some additional policy issues some of which we were able to address last year and some of which to address this year.

The other things that have happened is that degree [indistinct] coding needed to be completed for the new curriculum in every school that's being done with the exception of the outstanding policy issues. And advisors needed to create tab sheets for their advising for this new curriculum and all that is now being done. One of the major changes – and we can talk a little bit about this in a moment – was that we had two new task forces; one, the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee (GEMS) and then a task force to look at transfers which we will talk about later today. And then finally the piece that we finished together of course is round four of the Gen Ed course proposals. So what you have in your packets is basically the current BFC circular and a report of the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee, as well as a copy of the circular which identifies the changes which have been brought about as a result of the April 2010 Gen Ed meeting. So I just want to kinda go through those policy issues a little bit just so you are clear on what has happened.

The first thing was – I think I can take you through these one by one – [remark indistinct] the correct page. The first one is on page ten and relates to language study. You'll see there that some language has being struck through. Basically, the "Students must successfully complete the study of a single approved world language..." This language was thought to be problematic by the Common Ground Committee for world languages and cultures, and they were particularly concerned about it in the light of, sort of, potential changes for online placement

exams with the decoupling of that with credit and so they wanted to amend it to the language which follows in other words, “Students must successfully complete the study of a single approved world language through the second semester of the second-year level of college-level course work. International students whose native language is not English may fulfill the foreign language requirement through demonstrated proficiency in their native languages, in accordance with the practice and policies of the College of Arts and Sciences. At the discretion of departments offering the relevant world language courses, and with permission of the appropriate academic dean, exemptions for approved courses may be earned by satisfactory performance on departmentally approved examinations.” So that’s just to take care of any changes that might come soon, and to clarify just what that policy is. Oh, and I should say that, you know, that all of these – the changes that you see in this document – were the changes in the document that were presented to the General Education Committee which voted on all of these changes and approved them. So what we are presenting to you is approved changes from the General Education Committee so that you know what happened in that committee – just to clarify.

The second issue that arose was the length of study abroad that might qualify a student for the General Education requirements in that area. There was much discussion of this. There had been some requests from schools that this be looked at particularly closely because there were some relatively short periods of study abroad that did not – that would not – meet the criteria if it were understood to be six-weeks in duration which is what we understood previously. It was never the less agreed by the General Education Committee and the language subcommittee that to satisfy the international experience option students must complete an approved study abroad program or an approved study abroad internship of at least six credit hours and at least six weeks abroad in duration. This comes about because to some extent we have some courses where the course maybe longer than six weeks, but there aren’t six weeks abroad. So there are hybrid models, and so this absolutely had to be spelled out so there was no confusion when the curriculum goes live. So I should say all of these policy decisions were approved in an overwhelming majority by the Gen Ed Committee. They didn’t see anything problematic about this. The next one which is on page – where’s the next one? – this was to clarify the –

DOWELL: What page was that?

STEPHENS: Fifteen, fifteen. This was to clarify the policy with regard to exceptions, and exceptions as opposed to exemptions from the General Education Common Ground. So degree program requests for exceptions to the Common Ground requirements may be approved only by affirmative votes of both the appropriate Common Ground subcommittee and the General Education Committee. And this was looking back at the policy, there was confusion about the language of this and exemption can only be approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council, but exceptions can be approved by the Common Ground committees with the endorsement of the General Education Committee and exceptions being a smaller piece of the whole, okay? This is an important piece because as co-chairs we have received a request for an exception and so we had to go back and look at the policy and we are likely to receive another one request for an exception shortly, I think. So there are cases where we need to be very careful about insuring

that we don't harm ourselves by being inflexible without wanting to lose the integrity of the program.

HORNE: I'm sorry, may I ask you a question?

STEPHENS: Yes!

HORNE: When you said – this may be very clear, but to me I just want to check – are you talking about when it says degree program requests, that some school or department put in a request that an entire major be excepted from some part of this?

STEPHENS: Right.

HORNE: So anybody ever who is enrolled in that degree program or –

STEPHENS: So, right that would be an individual part of the program. That would be an exception for a particular major because of a set of requirements particular to that major which were in conflict with – or which might in fact satisfy in a different way than – the Gen Ed requirements, and that's the case we have in hand. They request that formally with a case on why they want to do that.

HORNE: Thank you.

STEPHENS: And there's a case we'll explain to you in a moment. Are there any other questions about that?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Who will be granting exceptions to? For transfer students?

STEPHENS: Can I take that question later? Because I'll come to transfer in a little while, and honestly one of the things I would say about transfer is that the Gen Ed Committee has not yet considered – there has been a task force on transfer, they've made some recommendations, but it won't be until the end of this month that we know what the Gen Ed Committee's reaction to those recommendations is.

So on page sixteen, there was another conflict in our policy. This is number six on page sixteen. There are conflicts in our policy which indicated that courses that were 300-level and above could not count for Gen Ed, and yet most study abroad courses are 300 and above. And so that put us in a bit of a tight fit and we needed to restate what the policy was on that. So "With the exception of upper-division courses taken abroad as part of a study-abroad experience (which may count toward fulfillment of the International Experience option of the World Languages and Cultures requirement), 300/400-level courses are ineligible for the Common Ground." That's on page sixteen, so only study abroad courses at the 300/400-level are acceptable to satisfy the Common Ground.

The next change was on page seventeen, this was in fact simply an error. Current policies in the College do not specify equivalents for mathematical modeling, rather they cover fundamental skills math requirement. So this was put to the math modeling subcommittee who recommended no exemption from math modeling be granted on the basis of SAT or ACT scores

since they do not constitute college level math performance and that was their recommendation and it was a recommendation that was accepted by the General Education Committee. So that's actually an earlier documental error. And, oh yes, another, that's right. Number fifteen; the discussion was whether students can take a P in their courses and have them count. It was determined that courses where the student earns a P or a "Pass" will not count toward fulfillment of the Common Ground requirements.

HENSHEL: How about AP tests?

STEPHENS: For math?

HENSHEL: Yeah, yeah. If you test do they qualify?

LUNDELL: Yes.

STEPHENS: They do?

LUNDELL: Yeah, and that's actually covered in long standing policy, because it's not considered test credit. It's equated to course credit, and so because it appears as credit on the transcript for a course that's Gen Ed approved then it fulfills whatever requirements that would.

HENSHEL: Sounds to me like to avoid confusion in the future that might be explicitly spelled out here.

LUNDELL: It actually is. It's actually someplace in the document going back some years – page three under General Guidelines. "Because dual-credit (e.g., ACP) courses, credit by examination courses (e.g., special credit and AP credit), and transferred courses are entered on Indiana University transcripts as their Indiana University course equivalences, such courses are automatically accepted."

STEPHENS: I mean, we will be addressing the AP in any case, because of new legislation and it will be very explicit what different AP exams count towards by December of this year, okay?

TERRY: Could I ask about the meaning of fourteen on page seventeen? The mathematics modeling?

STEPHENS: Yeah?

TERRY: So what you are saying is that all they have to learn to complete the proficiency requirement in English is a minimum of a C-, to complete the mathematical requirement if they earn a D-, they will still get credit for it, is that correct?

STEPHENS: That's correct.

TERRY: And that's been something that the Gen Ed committee is comfortable with?

STEPHENS: Well, that was, I think, agreed to previously and it hasn't been raised since. So nothing has changed in that regard.

TERRY: Okay.

HORNE: I'm sorry, just a teeny question about wording but when you write "Currently," [In section fourteen, page seventeen –Editor's note] that has the big implication to me like we are waiting for further action. I mean, why is that important?

TERRY: Yeah.

LUNDELL: That word predates Sonya and Venkat. (laughter) That goes back to Barb and Russ.

STEPHENS: We can remove it.

LUNDELL: That's right, maybe that's what we should kind of stress.

STEPHENS: Right, so one of the things about this was we have to bring to you any changes to this policy document so that you see that the policy has changed. We did not change the "Currently," that was in there. We are willing to if you would like us to bring it back to you and we can all meet again! So we can, there are another couple of little changes one of which is on the next page, page eighteen, which is merely a correction to my title for accuracy. Yes?

RIESENMAN: [Remark indistinct] is a "P" thought to be lower than D- if a D- will pass or is D- only possible for mathematical modeling and everywhere else you have to have a grade?

VENKATARAMANAN: The P issue is that the faculty felt strongly that they want the students to do a full effort in the General Education curriculum. So their faculty [remark indistinct] then the question is how many courses will have this pass/fail option otherwise a lot of students may not apply themselves fully. So the faculty voted against the idea of P's.

RIESENMAN: Thank you.

TERRY: I guess on the positive side there are two ways in which a student can earn a P. One way is by taking a course in which grading is only by pass/fail option. The other is to declare a course pass/fail. The instructor never knows, and if they get a D- or better, they get a P. Why would you disallow the P that results from the D- ?

LUNDELL: It's the GPA.

STEPHENS: Yeah, it has to do with the grade which affects the GPA.

TERRY: Okay.

STEPHENS: And this was a subject of some discussion. Venkat and I took it up with the deans in every school when we visited, it went to the subcommittees. This was a decision of the General Education Committee and it was discussed and supported for the reasons that Venkat has outlined. That it's felt that after the student takes a P to take a course out of their GPA and when there is a lesser effort potentially. And that was the strong feeling of the faculty who were on the Gen Ed Committee so we can only represent their point of view.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I'd like to raise a question about course numberings that doesn't have to do with this document but rather with your work in general. I been here for fifteen years and I've heard many discussions in my department and many others as to what 100, 200, 300 and 400 means. And my sense is that we don't have a unified definition that I've been able to understand across this campus about what that means. And If we don't want to have that definition then deciding which courses count based on their numbers seems a little bit arbitrary. So if we're going to force course numbers alongside with the kind of expectation of skills and content, maybe it would be really great to have some kind of an appendix to this kind of document that says 'and such-and-such skills are...' If that document exists I'd like to see it, I just...we haven't...

STEPHENS: I mean, I would just like to say that courses are not approved on the basis of their numbers. I mean, they have to be 100 or 200 level qualified –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – Right –

STEPHENS: – but they are...

BUCUR-DECKARD: But they are disallowed on the basis of numbers.

STEPHENS: Indeed there have been some that would not be accepted on the basis of their number.

BUCUR-DECKARD: They're connected.

STEPHENS: That's correct.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I mean, I can tell you in the History Department there are at least – Padraic correct me– at least a dozen courses that I think would be suitable for the Common Ground, for instance, because there's no prerequisite for them and we can't have –

KENNEY: We really don't want to get into this conversation! (laughter)

BUCUR-DECKARD: The issue is that I think some of us have a different understandings as to what these course numbers mean and it would be really wonderful at some point that our campus have a discussion about that. If not actual standards that have to do with skills that have to do with those course numbers and if we don't do that I wonder what those numbers mean.

STEPHENS: Now is that something the Educational Policies Committee would like to take up? (laughter)

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sorry, I don't want to...

KENNEY: Okay, [Remarks indistinct] the number of the class and that makes perfect sense if the class fits a 200-type. I mean, I feel like I know the difference between a 200 and a 300 level class is, but I recognize that not everybody does. To me it's clear and a 300 to me is going to be

different than a 200 level but I agree we don't have a policy that says what they are. Doing that across the entire....?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Well, we ask our students to take these classes and they should know what those numbers mean, shouldn't they?

STEPHENS: I think we can talk about it and when we get to talking about the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee some of your concerns about skills will be resolved. So if you can hold out for a minute we can come back to that question.

BROWN: I don't want to get into it in particular, but the first year of the General Education Committee we had exactly that discussion. It was extremely contentious, and in a sense there was an agreement to disagree. That's how this resulted.

STEPHENS: Are there any other questions about that? So –

TARTELL: Just one more thing. I was in that meeting as well and frankly to let some of them off the hook just a little bit it's not the Gen Ed Committee to number the courses and we were very well aware that 300-level classes that people felt might fit – because we know the course numbers are arbitrary – might just come back the next year exactly the same with a 100 or 200 number. We understood that at the time and it was quite a lot of disagreement in the room but it's not the Gen Ed Committee's job to number the courses so we were well aware that they may come back that way. If they were appropriate for Gen Ed and the only thing keeping them away was the number, change the number.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's the definition of the number that I'm concerned –

TARTELL: – We know there is no definition. We are in agreement there. Yes.

STEPHENS: Okay. So just so you know: round four of the course proposals there were 93 new courses proposed for Gen Ed, 82 were recommended for inclusion. This was the first year in which we agreed on what might happen to change this policy about variable courses with variable titles which will enable [remark indistinct], courses in Honors College, for example. So there were 46 courses with variable titles that were approved by the Gen Ed Committee and the previous courses were a total of 67 faculty members to serve in 2009-10. I think that just about covers it for the policy changes.

One of the other things that came up was whether there should be a credit hour minimum. That issue was unresolved at this year's meeting and we will be bringing it back to the committee on October 29th. I think that then we will just be following through on what the Council had asked for. This Council mandated that the General Education Curriculum be assessed and Russ Hanson and Barb Bichelmeyer presented to this Council in April 2009 a proposal for how monitoring might occur and it may happen that that will happen then.

VENKATARAMANAN: Because when Barb and Russ turned it over to us they submitted to us their philosophy of monitoring and assessing courses in General Education. So we formulated a subcommittee. We call it GEMS, General Education Monitoring Subcommittee, and then they

came up with some guiding principles of what are the principles of monitoring this and also the procedures for monitoring it. I think that is passed your subcommittee and we went through a lot of debate, a lot of discussion, with quite a bit of [remarks indistinct] common conclusion and it was put to work. [remarks indistinct] General Education Policy Committee. Some of the guiding principles we mentioned that [remarks indistinct] as well as [remarks indistinct] when faculty time and effort but at the same time we would be in a position to say that the philosophy of General Education [remarks indistinct] and also in a period of time but of course will continue to be General Education, not based on the performance.

STEPHENS: So, just I mean, in terms of what GEMS did, it considered as you can see in the document you have before you both the principles and procedures both principles were informed by a document the EPC had brought to the BFC when it talked about principles assessment and some of the same language we embedded in there as a part of our discussion and I hope that that would, you know, inform future people on the matter as well as the procedures. The procedures were really as Venkat has said to be as light a touch as possible given the scale of this operation. So just to let you know what GEMS proposed to the Gen Ed Committee. They proposed that learning outcomes for every Gen Ed Course be identified and that those learning outcomes be consistent with the learning outcomes for the area of the Common Ground to which the course relates. So we already have learning outcomes for each area of the Common Ground, every course now must be aligned with those that meet that code of requirements must be aligned with them. The faculty member teaching a Gen Ed Course in any semester would share that syllabus with GEMS by the third week. That the faculty member would identify one assignment which they would identify at least one of their outcomes and create a kind of rubric map for that outcome and say that they were grading that piece of work looking at it only for that outcome and they would share what that outcome is and how they graded the work and the grades, so that we had a way of talking about student learning in the General Education curriculum. And that this data would be taken and will be aggregated by learning outcome, by specific area so that we can kind of slice and dice the data to tell us things about our students learning in this curriculum. That is one assignment in each course in the semester in which it was given.

HANSON: Questions or comments?

ARNOLD: Do you intend for that data to be longitudinal such that if the same course is taken the following term for Gen Ed requirements that the same assignment would be used for those purposes or it depends on the instructor each term?

STEPHENS: GEMS took the view that assessment is a very individual thing, that instructors can teach their courses – even in the same section they teach their courses in different ways and they use different assessment methods – and it was not the business of the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee or of the General Education Committee or, you know, anybody to determine how the instructor should assess their course. So they want to do it to enshrine individual freedom to assess in the way the instructor wanted, but within a certain framework which would enable such aggregation. So the answer to your question is absolutely not, that

the instructor would do their own thing, but in a framework that would correspond to something we could aggregate.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What kinds of judgments will the subcommittee make regarding the materials that will be submitted to the committee?

STEPHENS: What kinds of judgments?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes.

STEPHENS: So the way we can imagine this will occur is that this will just be one data set and that there will be other data sets available to us. I mean, we might and GEMS makes that clear, that we might use placement testing as a way of assessing how the students are when they come in and how they've grown in secure dimensions. Some courses might make portfolios where there might be a qualitative analysis. We might use subsequent testing to determine how successful General Education is as a whole. But I think the way GEMS sort of viewed this was that they will be looking at the data and saying are the learning outcomes that are being identified by the subcommittees of the Common Ground being met by the courses as they're currently taught or are their learning outcomes which are not even being selected by instructors and therefore not being delivered. So what if every instructor picks the same learning outcome? We're not going to determine what any instructor chooses, but I think we assume that there will be a range given that there are 891 courses – not all every semester – but, you know, that we will see a range. And that really what GEMS is looking for is consistency in the delivery of the outcomes of an agreed curriculum.

VENKATARAMANAN: It's not the usual course learning it is not what it is an indication of. We say that according to the level of precision of the culture if you say they have qualitative reasoning at least in a faculty mind that they need it because again given the breath of courses, somewhere around 800 courses, then we only expect them to do ten of them an individual course by itself may not give us that much data but at the same time our hope is in aggregate we can at least say whether [remark indistinct]of the Gen Ed curriculum met the overall criteria of what this committee was charged.

REILLY: I think this was a kind of a tail added to your question. So you don't get the kind of spread that you're looking for in the skills and the learning acquired by the students according to the assessments that you receive then do you adjust your expectations or do you adjust the courses that are part of the Gen Ed Curriculum? I mean, how is that then rectified?

STEPHENS: Well, I mean, I think it will come back to this Council and it will be for this Council to determine how, and this Council mandated that there be monitoring and it was monitoring not only of student learning in the Gen Ed Committee but also of the impact of the Gen Ed Committee on units and enrollment patterns, retention rates, all sorts of things. I mean this is specifically about student learning so if we were to discover that the 890 courses that constitute the General Education Curriculum are not fulfilling the learning outcomes as defined by the Common Ground committee then I think it would be a matter for us to bring back to this

Council and say we're concerned that the curriculum patterns aren't delivering what we want and then it will be for the Council to determine how we proceed.

ARNOVE: It will be very interesting to find out that for certain instructors the assignment did not work and why it did not work and to see variation with the same faculty members constantly let's say with one culture finding out that what they assigned didn't work. And what would work maybe in the subsequent iteration.

STEPHENS: Right, and I think, I mean, so I think that this is going to be a process of reflection for the faculty as they, say, think about this particular assignment that they are going to give, but I also think that we are protecting ourselves in the overall aggregation of the data by saying we're not just going to take random courses and say 'we're going to take your data this year and your data next year,' because of the aggregation it enables us really to see everything that's going on in any semester and to aggregate. And we think we will be able to do different things, we don't actually know how we are going to cut and stitch it together yet to be honest, but when we get it, we are pretty sure we will be able to look at not only learning outcome A but also potentially student C or B who has taken a range of different things and we'll try and compare students who have gone through the process without their names and other identifying information but just to see what the learning patterns are like and to gain some information about students going forward. So there will a lot of data collected and analysis of that data.

HANSON: Padraic?

KENNEY: So instructors could specify on their syllabus learning outcomes which are not among those that Gen Ed has listed?

STEPHENS: So, yes, if you look at the GEMS recommendation here it says that we will assist. We will try to make this as easy as possible for the faculty by saying that we will create templates for the learning outcomes. Which would mean that the faculty could just check off which of the learning outcomes correspond to their course, but they can then identify that there are others which they are doing in addition to the Gen Ed outcomes. They don't have to restrict themselves to these.

KENNEY: They could also state the ones that you provided in subtle different language?

STEPHENS: They can do that.

KENNEY: In other words we can put anything we want on our syllabi?

STEPHENS: Absolutely.

KENNEY: But then, so one thing that I wasn't clear on before is that when instructors are choosing an assignment and linking it to a learning outcome we need to be certain that it's linked to one of the Gen Ed learning outcomes.

STEPHENS: Right, absolutely yeah, that's the case.

KENNEY: And is that actually the meaning of the word “specified” in point three of the procedures [In the Report of the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee – Editor’s note]? I’m trying to figure out where this is.

STEPHENS: Yes, the “specified outcome.”

KENNEY: “Specified outcome,” means it’s the Gen Ed ones not the others.

STEPHENS: These are the specified outcomes. So each course – just to be absolutely clear – each course that is accepted into the General Education curriculum is approved by a Common Ground subcommittee and each of the subcommittees has specified outcomes for their disciplinary area.

KENNEY: Right, but not all of which actually apply to each course.

STEPHENS: Right.

KENNEY: So we actually have two overlapping circles.

STEPHENS: Right.

KENNEY: Okay, great and we want to be sure we are within the overlap.

STEPHENS: Exactly.

KENNEY: Alright.

STEPHENS: So now because of the way in which this has occurred that the learning outcomes were specified by the subcommittee before, sometimes after, the courses were approved – okay? – we’re still assuming that those subcommittees were finding out learning outcomes that they had had in mind as they were approving courses. And so now it’s a relatively simple matter for the faculty who had their courses approved to go back and say well, of course, my course has these learning outcomes that correspond to the subcommittees learning outcomes.

KENNEY: Does this template exist or...?

STEPHENS: They do indeed. There is a template for each subcommittee.

KENNEY: That’s within the –

STEPHENS: And it does now exist and if you are proposing a Gen Ed course this year then you have to fill that out.

KENNEY: Yeah.

BIELASIAK: What happens in cases of noncompliance by faculty? Was there any thought given to that? Some faculty have told me they see that as an invasion of their academic freedom and they would not be willing to take such enterprises, and then what happens to the course? Is it removed from Gen Ed?

STEPHENS: Well, I think that, I mean, the final sanction I suppose would have to be that if the course did not fulfill all of the requirements as specified by the General Education Committee it would not be allowed to continue in the General Education group. But, I mean, we hope that will not arise.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's a punishment to the students not the faculty.

STEPHENS: Right.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I mean if you're taking a course under the assumption that this will count and it doesn't, it's like... right?

BIELASIAK: [Remarks indistinct] the future.

ARNOVE: For overseas studies programs that are a semester in duration, those courses are offered by faculty not the universities. So then how do you oversee that? Other than the directors of overseas study programs, they said they met this course.

STEPHENS: So as I understand it the Office of Overseas Study has gone through a rigorous review of their programs and they've identified course numbers that break into different kinds of overseas experience which will make it easier for us to track the kinds of experience students have, but if the office – it's often International Admissions that looks at these things along with the Office of Overseas Study – if they agree on the transfer of a course and it's an approved course of Overseas Study by Indiana University, even if it's through a third party agency, then it will count.

HANSON: Questions or comments?

STEPHENS: Maybe I should just add about the transfer. The Gen Ed Committee approved that a special taskforce be setup to look at the issue of transfer students. Because obviously this curriculum has been defined for students who come to Bloomington in the traditional way, and you know, first year students. That committee met through the summer, worked very hard to have an enormous amount of material – legislative as well as looking at other institutions – and has made recommendations. They have produced a report. Those recommendations will go to the Gen Ed Committee on October 29th for voting and so we will have, I hope, something to report to you soon about what the situation on transfer will be, but it's too soon to tell right now.

HENSHEL: Can I ask one more question about the World Languages and Culture requirement? The way it's written you can't combine across the student, three different sections?

STEPHENS: That's correct.

HENSHEL: Is there a reason for that?

STEPHENS: I don't know what the reason of the subcommittee was, but I believe –

LUNDELL: I think that this dates back to the document produced by this body before there was a Gen Ed Committee.

HENSHEL: Could that be reconsidered?

LUNDELL: I assume that it could be reconsidered.

STEPHENS: So I think that one of the, I mean, it could be one of the things that – we had in fact discussed this not very long ago – because, you know, you could imagine a student who might not want to take six credits of study abroad but could take three in a World Cultures course.

LUNDELL: Right. That’s exactly what I was thinking actually.

STEPHENS: Whereas with the World Languages requirement that is almost impossible because of the language. So, I mean, it really is a question of the World Cultures and the study abroad being mixed and matched rather than anything else.

LUNDELL: Right, that’s what I was thinking

STEPHENS: We can raise that with the subcommittee.

HENSHEL: Thank you.

HANSON: Other questions or comments? Thank you very much. We are at the point where we only have 35 minutes left and we need at least 30 minutes, we budgeted that for the discussion on the Bloomington Campus Calendar. I’m disinclined to call for a break because we are often difficult to get back. Could we just begin? And if everyone has a popcorn craving or something, they could just go up and get it now? Is that alright with everybody?

DOWELL: Yes.

HANSON: Okay. So, Tom?

AGENDA ITEM 8: PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS CALENDAR

GIERYN: Some of you saw the *Chronicle* article, that lead article in the issue before this one, “Will Technology Kill the Academic Calendar?”

BUCUR-DECKARD: I saw that, I liked that. It’s very nice. (laughter)

GIERYN: I’m thrilled over it. So now they tell us, right? After ten months of working on a new academic calendar IT is going to kill it. I have one hope for today’s meeting and that is that the BFC reaches a decisive resolution on the proposal for the Bloomington Academic Calendar. The taskforce has been working, as you know, since January and we, I assure you, have done three things. First, we have considered all plausible variations on the academic calendar. No matter how wacky the idea we’ve looked at it and subjected it to dispassionate scrutiny. No stone was left unturned, no calendars are out there, we believe, that we have not at least considered. Secondly, we got suggestions and reactions from all affected constituents across campus we

listened to their interests and your interests, their concerns, your concerns, we made sure we understood how the various proposals – as they changed over the life of this process – how various proposals would affect their operations both administrative and academic. We consulted with students groups, the IUSA, the GPSO who were involved in the taskforce. We have done due diligence in soliciting various opinions. And finally, we did a job of benchmarking by considering the academic calendars at peer institutions, publics within the state of Indiana, and CIC schools to make certain first to collect ideas about what other universities have as calendars and to make sure that our proposal was not so far out of line as to put IU in jeopardy of being perceived as just weird. The resultant proposal of necessity is a compromise. There is no proposal – and we began with this assumption and it’s still true today – there is no proposal that could possibly satisfy all constituents. We considered competing interests and competing concerns without prejudice or favoritism and if you do that, you’re going to end up in a balancing act and that’s exactly where we are. So, is the fall break too short that we’ve proposed – a one day on a Friday? Maybe it is too short, but if we made it longer we would create a more intrusive broken week and rub up against the problems faced by Biology and Chemistry about teaching laboratory classes during broken weeks. Is the new start date proposed too early in August? Maybe it is, but if we didn’t add a week at the beginning of the semester and we made other changes proposed such as Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving Week off and the fall break, we would have a reduction in instructional days and I think that’s a political third-rail position that we don’t want to go near. Should instructors hold class on Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving Week? Well probably yes, because they are after all instructional days but do they, do we? Certainly we could try to enforce those as instructional days or we could acknowledge the realities of student holiday travel and current practices and try to get the calendar in conformity with what is already going on. So these are some of the balancing acts that we’re facing. Admittedly what we’ve offered is a very imperfect proposal for the simple reason that one person’s perfection is another person’s anathema. Imperfect as it is it’s the best possible alternative to the status quo. If you see the proposed calendar as an improvement vote ‘yes’ and if the majority of you do so I propose that we give it a five-year run and then see where we are and decide whether it’s still working for us. If you see no improvement in the proposed calendar or you think it makes things worse I suggest that you vote ‘no’ and if the majority agrees with you, I respectfully request that we call a five-year moratorium on future considerations (laughter) of the academic calendar and entertain no proposals to change the calendar during that period of time. I’d like to turn it over to the IUSA and the GPSO would like to contribute, too.

COLEMAN: Fall break has been sometime that students have been asking for since the 1970’s and I believe Mark Kruzan was in the position I was in back then. (laughter) And to add, I don’t think my parents were worried about me in the 1970’s, but clearly it’s been an ongoing topic of discussion for about 40 years. We would like to see the BFC take affirmative action in seeing some possible way to help out this issue. We note that is no possible way or no proposal that will be perfect for every side. Tom even talked about that and this proposal though seems to have the most advantages to ensure the least amount of uncertainty, and please also the majority. There is no way to tell what the future can hold. The saying goes, “hind sight is 20/20.” To some measure there will need to be a leap of faith on behalf of the university when

it comes to looking at the fall break proposal and I also want our Chief of Fall Break, Katie Tetrick to say a couple words of things she's really been looking into when it comes to Fall Break.

TETRICK: So after the last meeting, you guys all provided a lot of really great feedback and I just wanted to go over a few points in response to your feedback from the last meeting. So in looking at the proposal – specifically the Friday – one of the main concerns I feel like I heard it over and over was that this isn't a long enough of a break for it to be beneficial for faculty or for students. What I want to emphasize is that, you know, the proposal last year proposed a Monday and Tuesday Fall Break, but that created a lot of problems specifically for Biology and Chemistry departments and at the same time it created an additional broken week which was disruptive to the academic week in general. So then I started looking at other universities that are comparable to IU and I found that 21 comparable institutions include IUPUI, Purdue, Ball State, Nebraska, and Michigan have a mid-semester Fall Break. And what I think this really emphasizes is the importance of a break for students and for faculty midway through that fall semester. The way I see it is, would 21 other comparable institutions have this break if it wasn't beneficial in some way? So we arrive at this decision that this Friday is what we see as the best compromise. This is an opportunity for faculty and for students to have a mental break in the semester similar to what we have in the spring semester and it kind of solves that problem of the disruption to the academic week that we saw with the Monday and Tuesday that was proposed last year. So I think with all things in life it's easier to, you know, get nitpicky and look at all the negatives, but I really encourage you guys to think about what this Friday could be and look at it in a positive light. This is a day that we could do anything with. I know that as representatives of IUSA, we've talked a lot about seeing this as a service day but really we can do anything. Like, obviously there are going to be students that will sleep in, but at the same time it's important to realize that many students might utilize this day as an opportunity to get involved on campus or within the greater Bloomington community. We see this as a day that could be a wonderful day for all efforts to be organized in one day so you don't have to kind of juggle class schedules in fitting things in. You know, everything from cultural, recreational, service oriented events, speakers could come to campus, like I said, the possibilities are endless for this Friday. Ultimately, I think it's an opportunity for students to learn outside of the classroom, and ideally this would foster a sense of civic engagement which furthers the academic and public purpose of the university. So when we look at the full week of Thanksgiving, I think there was pretty much a consensus that this would reassure bona fide instructional time. So I feel like there wasn't really that much discussion for the most part we all seem to agree that this would be a positive change. I just want to go over logistically that past proposals have compromised on instructional time. For example, the proposal last year actually retracted three instructional days and this proposal adds an additional instructional day. So I think it's important to realize that in the Calendar Committee we really were trying to compromise and, as students, there's a commitment on behalf of us as students that we will start a full week earlier. So we're giving some and taking a little. I just want to point that out. (laughter) We aren't just asking for days off. Finally, after the last meeting I realized that it's very hard for you all on the Council to take out anecdotal evidence seriously when it comes to Fall Break, so I met with Dr. Stockton who is the Director of CAPS to gain a medical perspective

in regards to this proposal. Dr. Stockton wrote the following statement addressed to the BFC and it reads, "Dear Council, as Director of Counseling and Psychological Services I'm in support of the proposal for a Fall Break for IUB students. By some metrics involving use of CAPS and use of hospital emergency departments, students stress seems to be increasing. Students tell us that having a break to look forward to is helpful to them in persevering with their studies. May do indeed return from breaks refreshed and more energetic. For these reasons I would encourage the Council to consider serious the proposal for a Fall Break for the Bloomington Campus. Sincerely, Dr. Nancy Stockton, Director of CAPS." So I realize that this still provides you all with no empirical data, but I've come to the conclusion that there is no way for us to provide you all with empirical data. Like Michael said, we really don't know what's going to happen anymore then you all do and I know that's kind of a scary position to be in and a grey area where you are unsure, but I hope what I have said and what Tom has said and Michael, I hope that you guys are able to step back and look at this from a different perspective and seriously consider the burden that thirteen consecutive weeks of instruction can have on students and I would just like to close with the fact that as representatives of the student body we still really believe that this proposal has the potential to significantly improve our academic calendar as well as maintain the well-being of students.

DOWELL: I would just like to make a quick statement – more procedural than anything – that as Tom's introduction made clear there have been twenty people who have worked on this for quite a long time and that the campus calendar is very complex animal and the constituent elements of this proposal are numbered but I would like to encourage everyone today – and the Agenda Committee agreed on this – I would like to encourage everyone to treat it as a cohesive whole and know that sort of picking it apart is probably counterproductive at this point. And just to think about it in a holistic way and vote up or down as you desire and I am sorry if I cutoff GPSO from their follow-up comments. So probably...

D'AMICO: No, it's okay. I'm not sure we have much more to add anyway to what IUSA said. I mean, we were happy to work with, you know, the Calendar Committee on this proposal. I think the Graduate Student Assembly is in favor of the proposal. We think it's good for graduate students both in terms of allowing them to structure their summer activities a bit more with these proposals. We're all in favor of getting a full week of Thanksgiving off both as instructors and as students. And, I mean, I know that the Friday Fall Break is probably the most contentious issue of this policy for a lot of people on the Council, but I would echo the comments of President Dowell that we should really treat this as a whole and that I think IUSA has presented some really great, you know, ideas for how this day can actually be used usefully for students rather than simply as a lazy day. I don't think that will actually happen. So I really encourage the passage of the proposal.

HANSON: Additional comments?

JIMENEZ: I also – GPSO also – want to say it's difficult to find empirical evidence, but I know that recently the university has been undergoing a greater influx of out-of-state students. I happen to be one, and the reality is that when holidays approach travel is going to be something that we will all be looking forward to and for some students they'll just have to

coordinate as best they can or maybe even skip a class if necessary. This is an opportunity for us to rearrange the schedule in such a way where no one is losing any class time and we are actually going to get more.

HANSON: Any comments, Sonya?

STEPHENS: I mean, I would just like to speak for a moment in support of the Fall Break. I mean, it is true that students find this semester very long and I do endorse what the IUSA has said about using that day for other purposes. There are very few opportunities we have to build community on the campus and to build a sense of community between the campus and the Bloomington community. I think the proposal to have this as a service day meets not only those criteria but also will help build the importance of service and civic engagement which the faculty has defined as a central clause of General Education as well. And so this notion of engagement and the idea that we might actually get our students to engage with each other on this day by thinking progressively about it. I think this is one where we should not take lightly it's a helpful and useful suggestion. I'd like to thank them for putting in the effort into thinking about that.

ARNOVE: When you study 21 comparable universities, I am curious as to the number of days generally given off. For example, my alma mater the University of Michigan, when it has a fall break, how many days does it...?

TETRICK: It's October 18th and 19th so they have a two-day Fall Break. What I found is the majority of them do have a two-day Fall Break, for example, Ball State has just a Friday off October 22nd which is kind of where in the Calendar Committee the idea was developed to just having a Friday, but for the most part all of them have two-day Fall Breaks. There are few that have one, like the University of Georgia as well as the University of Arizona also just have one day.

HANSON: Other discussion on this?

FARGO: Yeah, I was just curious – Tom, I hate to ask this because I know you guys worked on it hard – but did you guys consider the possibility of tying the one day Friday Fall Break to Homecoming in some way so that it would seem to be a logical connection if you are trying to think about ways to schedule activities is to have the Friday off be the day before Homecoming.

GIERYN: We actually received word from the Athletic Department that they were hoping that it would not fall on Homecoming Weekend. There are a number of activities already planned and the focus of Homecoming is distinctive and the AD is working very hard to build that tradition here. And it was felt that we were kind of thinking more along the lines of what Sonya was suggesting, it would not necessarily be compatible with Homecoming. Scheduling that Fall Break is an issue and the Athletic Department is very interested in what specific day it is.

HANSON: Sue?

WHISTON: This is a very minor point, but I think an important one, in that the nomenclature we are using is Fall Break and I think that in ways sets it up to fail in that people think that would be

equivalent to Spring Break and it is not. The other thing is that other institutions do have a two-day so it says the Fall Semester Recess or I think if we came up with some other term for it to be associated with rather than using the term "Fall Break." I think there would be less complaints about it in the next five years, Tom. So you may want to think about that.

MCLEOD: I promised my constituents that I would say that they expressed a great deal of skepticism about the meaningfulness of the one-day break, but I think it's an empirical question we can't answer as to whether or not this will meaningfully reduce stress among the students at this university. But I did also hear people say that are of course many other things that the university could contemplate to help reduce stress among university students such as creating spaces and activities that foster deep engagement in support of interactions, working to decrease class sizes and reversing the trend to increase advising loads. Any of which is likely to be as successful as a one-day recess would be in this regard. And then I did just want to be true to their concerns and note that I heard some support, but I think mostly acquiescence to the idea of the one-week Thanksgiving Break and understanding that this would bring policy in line with practice, but some concern that in the same way that many of us find it hard to get everything rolling again after Spring Break that we'll experience the same in the fall semester and we only have two weeks at that point to get things back going so that we really need to think about how to maintain that as really productive classroom time after that break.

HENSHEL: I would just like some clarity here. Is this supposed to start for the coming fall or are we going to have more time to prepare and straighten out how summer programs are being setup for next summer as it will destroy the summer programs?

GIERYN: Right, good question. We anticipated the earliest we could roll this out is the beginning of the summer of 2012. And I'm looking at Roland and I want to thank Mike and Roland for getting back from West Lafayette very quickly for this meeting and we decided – Roland, maybe you can speak to why it made sense to begin at the start of the summer, rather than at any other cut point.

COTE: Well, we do need to begin in the summer because of the additional week that we've tagged on for the Fall. So we need to start the whole process during the summer. The summer bulletin, the summer schedule of classes for this coming summer is already pretty much established. It's there, and the departments will need to do a lot of serious modeling and we'll need to help them figure out which courses do they want to put into a four week module or into an eight week module or however we want to structure this modular summer session. It's going to take some time. Recognizing that the problems you are bringing up, we really can't start before 2012, but planning should start now.

GIERYN: And in the interest of that planning I'd like to propose – it's not part of the formal proposal – but that the administration – I think it would involve Sonya's office as well as my own – would work with the academic units to provide some guidance and help and maybe a forum simply for the schools to come together and talk about the new summer calendar, this sheet we handed out last time. So that we get everybody to talking across the schools so that we don't work at cross purposes, but rather see the opportunities and flexibilities created by

the new schedule and also appreciate some of the challenges that the Registrar will have in trying to make all of this work in a systematic way.

COTE: We would see this tremendous advantage to get us all together so that nobody goes down a path that can't be re-implemented that we work together to make sure that whatever it is that we're considering, before we make any formal plans, that it's tested out and we know it can be done. And we've done some modeling on our own, but we don't know how much the departments will take advantage of this and really modify their schedules considerably. That's why it would be great to get this started.

HANSON: Herb?

TERRY: After our last meeting I sent a summary of the discussion here to the members of Arts and Sciences "D" and asked them for comments, and if anything I heard back more passionately that a large number of faculty in this group – which notably includes Anthropology – thought that the earlier start was exceedingly disadvantageous to their discipline and to their research activities. I subsequently heard from other faculty who do international work, and they would point out at great length that American universities already start earlier than European and many Asian institutions and that collaboration with other colleges or field work was difficult. Some of them came back with the University of Michigan calendar which is unfortunately for us a political non-starter. Yes, they have two-day spring break. They meet Monday through Wednesday of Thanksgiving Week and they start the week after Labor Day which gives them the shortest academic calendar in the Big Ten which would be a political non-starter for us. At our last meeting some expressed doubts that Biology and its research program might be adversely affected by the earlier start date. Yeah, I also heard a lot of skepticism about the value or merits of a one-day Spring Break or something like that, but for the most part what my constituents were concerned about is that we're a Research One Institution and this was cutting into that. I believe the Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, David Zaret, takes that position and so I've come here disinclined, unfortunately, to approve this package despite all of the efforts that have gone into it, because I've changed my mind. I mean, I can live with this calendar, I think people in my field can, but listening to my constituents, as you put it, has convinced me that the early start date that is more or less mandated by taking the extra time officially off at Thanksgiving, by recognizing Labor Day and by incorporating any kind of a Fall Break, has in the eyes of my constituents – and they have convinced me of it, not all of them, but for many of them – academically adverse consequences. So I would be interested in what Biology currently thinks.

RAFF: Well I'm not Biology speaking, but speaking for the – we have a lot of Biologists here – this schedule is disadvantageous for Biology because of the lab problem and Tom has promised me he is going to solve that by building some new lab classrooms. (laughter) But the other big impact is that there are many people in Biology who do their research in the summers, and it's extremely important and forgotten that a lot of people are leery about the ability to start.

HANSON: Any other comments?

WATSON: It seems to me our start time in the last ten years or so has moved back and forth, right? So I can see where people may be concerned to backup, but they've adapted to it in situations where we've had it before. I mean, we can take everybody's story, for me it would be better if we ended two weeks earlier in the spring. So I just think there is no way to accommodate everybody. We've moved it back and forth and we've survived. And I guess I'd like to support the calendar change, please.

GIERYN: A small reminder that many research universities, in fact, of the 11 we looked at, seriously, seven of those begin the one-week earlier many fine research institutions such as Purdue, Illinois, Iowa, Penn State, and Nebraska.

ARNOVE: And do they have anthropologists and people who work in International Affairs.

GIERYN: And doing fieldwork.

BIELASIAK: There is another side to this working with people from Europe. They often come here during that period, because their semester starts in October. And I think in some way, you know, there's an advantage in having people an extra week to be able to work while the semester is in session. So it works both ways, I think. It's not a monster. But anyway, I think we could all disagree on various points, but I second what's been said, this is an integral, holistic calendar if you start messing with parts we'll never get out of it, so I want to call the question.

TERRY: Then we have to vote on it.

HANSON: Our parliamentarian is gone. I'm curious as to what calling the question means.

TERRY: It means you have to vote on whether you want it to go through or not.

HANSON: Okay, well you want to vote on that?

DOWELL: Let's go ahead.

HANSON: Ready to vote? Okay. All in favor of...?

TERRY: I should second it.

HANSON: What?

TERRY: I should second.

HANSON: Of course, thank you. All in favor of the proposal signify by raising your hands. [36 in favor] All opposed. Are we getting counts?

DOWELL: How many?: Split...three..four...five. [5 opposed]

HANSON: Abstentions?

DETHLOFF: One abstention. It passes.

HANSON: It passes! And we are in adjournment!

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:25PM