

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**March 26, 2002**  
**Indiana University Foundation, Peterson Room**  
**Bloomington Campus**  
**1:30-4:30 P.M.**

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes:
  - A. November 14, 2000  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/00-01/11-14-2000>
  - B. February 13, 2001  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/00-01/02-13-2001>
  - C. March 27, 2001  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/00-01/03-27-2001>
  - D. April 24, 2001  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/00-01/04-24-2001>
  - E. September 25, 2002  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/01-02/09-25-2001>
  - F. October 2, 2002  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/01-02/10-02-2001>
2. Presiding Officer's Business  
(President Myles Brand)
3. Agenda Committee Business  
(Professors Paul Galanti and Robert Eno)
4. Question / Comment Period  
(President Myles Brand, Professors Galanti and Eno)
5. Plan for Student Enrollment Services Academic Priorities Committee  
(Associate Vice President Donald Hossler)
6. Topics for Task Force on 18/20 Retirement Plan  
(Vice President Judith Palmer)
7. Update on 18/20 Alternative Group Benefit Plan  
(Mr. Dan Rives, Office of Human Resources)
8. Interim Reform of the Master Course Inventory  
(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels, Educational Policies Committee)  
(Circular U8-2002)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/01-02/U8-2002.htm>)
9. Report on ICHE State Commission on Transfer and Articulation:  
"Principles guiding Statewide Transfer and Articulation"  
(Professor Robert Eno)
10. By 3:45: Executive Session:  
Honorary Degrees to Be Awarded  
(Professor Henry R. Besch, Jr., Honorary Degrees Committee)

## ATTENDANCE

**Members Present:** Simon Atkinson, Jim Baldwin, Abhijit Basu, Julianne Bobay, Polly Boruff-Jones, Myles Brand, Richard Carr, Jeffrey Dean, Dan Drew, Robert Eno, K. Michael Foos, David Fulton, Paul Galanti, Ann Gellis, Marilyn Kintzele, Judith Palmer, Ruth Person, Ken Rennels, John Ross, Albert Ruesink, William Schneider, Suzi Shapiro, Moira Smith, P. Sarita Soni, Martin Spechler, James Tolhuizen, Kizhanipuram (Vinod) Vinodgopal, David Vollrath, Richard Ward, Enid Zwirn

**Members Absent:** Hasan Akay, Zameer Bade, Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Henry Besch, Chris Bjornson, Catherine Bonser-Neal, Erwin Boschmann, Sharon Brehm, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Geoffrey Conrad, Andre DeTienne, Paul Eisenberg, Brian Fife, Mary Fisher, Dottie Frapwell, Janice Froehlich, Laura Ginger, Edwin Greenebaum, Marie Harf, Jennifer Hehman, Paul Joray, Rachel Kipp, Jackie Landess, Anna McDaniel, Sara McNabb, Joseph Miller, Mark Myers, Marvin Needler, Jacob Oakman, J. Marc Overhage, Kenneth Perrin, Ellen Pettay, Mary Pagliero Popp, F. C. Richardson, Cynthia Roy, Barry Rubin, Bob Sandy, S. Jim Sherman, Jeff Stake, Cheryl Truesdell, Frank Wadsworth, George Walker, Michael Wartell, Jeffery Watt, Gail Williamson, Jeff Wuslich, Nanci Yokom, Robert Yost

**Members Absent with Alternates:** William Schneider for Rebecca Porter

**Visitors:** Emily Hernandez, Mark Sothmann

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

**BRAND:** Let's start with the approval of the minutes. Any questions or comments? You also have on your blue sheets the list of websites where you can find all of these minutes. Hearing no comments, I would ask for a motion to accept.

[voice vote: minutes approved]

### **AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

(President Myles Brand)

**BRAND:** Let me bring you up to date as much as I can about where we are in the discussions of our budget. I had a meeting with some people from the Statehouse earlier today. The state faces two problems which directly affect us. One is a long-term set of issues; the other is a short-term set of issues. In the long term, the legislature did not solve the budget problem in its last session. One set of issues and concerns there is in restructuring the tax system to take into account residential property tax hikes due to court-mandated reassessment, which was not addressed. The tax bills for residential properties likely will not come to individuals until late in the fall. As such, there wasn't that immediate need to settle it. In addition, there are some business taxes that disadvantage Indiana businesses in the marketplace, keeping them from being as competitive as possible. That also needs to be changed. The tax restructuring problem is for the most part a zero sum game. The restructuring problem is not an attempt to raise the total revenue in taxes, but to reorder the taxes so that we solve the reassessment problem as well as the business tax problem and some problems and K-12. That may require increases in sales tax or perhaps income tax, but the total revenue base will remain constant for all that restructuring and shuttling is done. That is one long-term issue. The other long-term issue is that there is a deficit. We are spending more

money than we are taking in. This is not a one-time problem; this is a deficit that is a continuance and is on the order of 600 million dollars per year. Some in the legislature believe that we can grow out of this; we can increase tax revenues through sales tax and business taxes that would automatically take care of that. Most analysts, and certainly the ones I have talked to, believe that is not possible in the foreseeable future. There is a deficit problem that must be settled. The past legislative session intended to settle all or part of that through additional gaming revenue. That did not succeed, so there were no new revenues from gaming. As a result, we have these two long-term issues of restructuring the taxes and solving the deficit problem. They will come back, if not in a short session, which would be unlikely but very possible, then in a normal session next year to deal with those two issues.

We are now in a recession. The recession is more difficult on the budget of the State of Indiana than the recession in the early 90's. The national recession is considered mild. In Indiana, it's not mild, because of our Rust Belt economy. The early 1990s' recession took us four years to overcome as a state; I don't know how long it will take us to get out of this one. Again, it depends upon what is going to happen in the next regular session. We do have long-term problems that are not resolved and the resolution of those problems will obviously affect the university's budget. There is no question that it will affect the university's budget. That remains in the "work to be done" category.

In the short term, because no solution was found, we have a biennium deficit for the coming period. We have expenditures committee in excess of revenues and so the Governor has been announcing a series of cuts. Indiana University has so far been earmarked for 102 million dollars worth of cuts. Thirty-six million of that is a postponement of a month's worth of operating funds from the state. We are expecting to get it back in several years, and have been assured that will happen though no one legislature can bind another. We have been assured we can get it back, but the fact of the matter is that we don't have it now. That presents us with a problem too. If you recall, the way we've handled the short-term problem is to take as much as possible out of the administrative side of the university. Seventy-five percent of the money has come from university administration. Some of that was mandated. For example, the R&R money was designated as a cut. That is university-wide money. Some of it was mandated, a lot of it was not. We asked each of the Chancellors to protect the academic units as much as possible. There was some variance from campus to campus because of their budget situation. At the Bloomington campus, for example, the aggregate amount of one-time cuts passed down to the academic units was 0.19%, less than one-fifth of one percent. What do I mean by protecting the mission of the academic units? I mean that all our academic searches go forward; we are not freezing or slowing down any of our searches. We are filling open positions. Faculty salaries will continue at the rate we can afford. By comparison, in the state agencies, each state agency has taken an operating base budget cut of seven percent. That is not one time money, but base budget. Salaries have been frozen at all state agencies and are frozen for the indefinite future. No raises and if someone leaves, you cannot fill that position. State agencies are taking much more serious cuts than we are. There will be another cut, a base budget cut, announced this Thursday or Friday by the Governor in his Deficit Management Plan. I believe we can continue to use the process we have been using and take those cuts from university-wide administration. There will be no further cuts as I understand right now, but I can't be sure until Thursday or Friday. My understanding right now is that we can manage this without any further cuts to the campuses and hence no cuts to the academic units. The principle we follow remains in place: filling vacant positions, no freezing or slowing down, having competitive faculty salary increases, all despite the announcements you will hear on Thursday or Friday.

It will affect our tuition. Let's be clear. These cuts will have to be made up not just in terms of lower administrative costs, but it's an indirect cost to our students. Our tuition will rise more than it normally does. We will work hard to keep that down so that we remain competitive and accessible, but remember that accessibility is connected very much to financial aid, especially for

lower income groups. The state's financial aid remains one of the strongest in the country; federal aid has gone up. You can help me here, Don, but I don't believe this will adversely affect our lower-income and most of our middle-income students. Tuition will go up. I can't give you a figure right now, but we will begin to discuss this with the Trustees next week. We may or may not reach a resolution in April; we have to wait until May. I'm not sure. We will begin that discussion next week with the Trustees.

The bad news is that we haven't solved any state problems. In particular, we haven't completely restructured the economy; that is why we are so deeply in the hole at this time. Steps are being taken which I believe will have an effect on the nature of our economy, including the Health Sciences Initiative. The legislature still has a lot of work to do, and that work will have critically important consequences for the university. The good news, from your point of view, is that we can continue to manage the situation while protecting the academic units, which has been our key principle all along. From everything I know at this point, we can continue on that path. That's my report. Are there any questions?

**SPECHLER:** Certainly your approach is welcomed and is almost unbelievable under the present circumstances. Will you be ordering any economies at the campus level as well as the central administration level?

**BRAND:** In this next round, no. Some of the cuts will have campus repercussions. For example, our R&R cuts, which are not optional because they are mandated by the state, affect people's jobs. Those are Physical Plant and maintenance jobs in repair and rehabilitation of buildings, and now we will only be able to fix leaky roofs. That's on hold. It's not that the cuts don't affect the campuses; as we cut back on administration it will affect the campuses. It will not affect the academic units in key areas like the operating budget of the departments, travel, supplies, and so on. Positions will continue to be filled. We will continue to press on faculty salaries, though I can't give you a number as I haven't discussed that with the Trustees yet. We will try and make those more competitive. There is one more factor which I didn't mention which increases the degree of difficulty: health care costs. The state's goal is not to give any raises, but not to decrease salaries in order to meet health care costs. Our health care costs will go up in the neighborhood of 12%. That is after a lot of tough bargaining because nationally they are going up about 20%. We will be able to do everything I said and also meet those health care increases, which we factored in.

**RUBIN:** I haven't been following what's happening in Illinois or Michigan; what's happening with our competitor institutions within the Big Ten? Are they experiencing the same kind of difficulties as we or are they having to cut back further or are they able to advance more? How do we stand strategically against them?

**BRAND:** Good question. I think the state of Michigan is doing better than we are and everyone else is doing worse. The state of Michigan's economy, which has become much more diversified in the last decade, has really been chugging along and so the recession has not hit them as hard. They have a high-tech economy; they have been particularly successful in health and life science economies as well. Their tuitions will be a little more modest than ours; they will have competitive faculty salaries, and will most likely be getting an increase from the state. That is the exception. We are taking cuts, but other states are taking much deeper cuts. Wisconsin is taking a base budget cut of around six or seven percent. Ours is very small, less than one percent. Ohio is taking six percent of last year's base budget and another six percent of this year's base budget for the next year. Iowa is very similar. In those states, you're going to find very high tuition hikes; they can't make up all their losses with tuition hikes, but they will be substantially higher than ours, probably. I think we have been hit from the state, but most states in our region have been hit harder. That's enabled us to manage this, though it won't be easy.

**CARR:** Myles, in your talk to the legislature, you suggested a useful partnership between the legislature and the universities to arrive at a sensible tax restructuring plan. I understand what you are saying about the short-term. Is there any prospect for a long-term partnership?

**BRAND:** That's a very important question. There is a body called the Alliance for Indiana's Future, which is made up of a number of groups including universities, business groups, chambers of commerce, economic development groups, business organizations such as Farm Bureau, and so on. That group has been effective, I think, in getting the message on the table. It has not been effective to date at getting the Legislature toward a solution. That group, the Alliance for Indiana's Future, has to stay together and push, particularly through this next legislative session, because the problem isn't solved. The good news is that they really held together, but the Legislature, for reasons unknown, never solved any of these problems. We can't let that alliance fall by the wayside. That partnership will continue. We'll know when we read the papers what the Governor's intentions are, but I think I have a pretty good understanding of where he's going, and I think we'll be okay. Let me just add one final point there, which goes back to the question. Because we are managing the cuts the way that we are, and also because the cuts are not as severe in Indiana as they are in other states, we have a short-term comparative advantage in hiring faculty. I have spoken to Swami and he said he has made several hires in this environment that he would not have otherwise been able to make because we have kept our positions open and not frozen them. Good people have been hired. We also think that we should be able to catch up amongst our peer groups in faculty salaries and we will continue to try to do that. I do know of some other places where faculty salaries have been frozen. I think we're going to see some modest gains, not because they are absolute gains, but because they are comparative gains. Stay tuned in. Any more questions? This is important stuff because it affects our budget and our ability to perform academically. Finally, I want to tell you that I am very proud of our basketball coach and our Indiana University basketball team, and I think they did a darn good job and they're good young men. I'm very proud of them, and I wanted to share that with you. I'll show you my game ball someday. Any other questions? Let's turn then to Agenda Committee business.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**  
(Professors Paul Galanti and Robert Eno)

**ENO:** There is one piece of business on which we should follow up. Last time that we met, we discussed the faculty trustee bill that was before the legislature and we had a good discussion about the pros and cons. As most of you know, the faculty trustee bill language eventually died, along with a lot of other language that was incorporated into bills that came from the Senate to the House, and it's unpredictable whether or not it will be revived in future years. One thing that was an outcome of the discussion we had in February was that Myles had suggested that some of the provisions that we now make part of our normal practice, in terms of faculty and Trustee communication, including the participation of the senior or both Co-Secretaries in executive sessions of the Trustees as appropriate be moved from practice into policy and included in handbook language that would basically switch the default such that the senior Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council was included in executive sessions unless there was an appropriate reason for that not being the case. I can report that we are moving ahead on this. Paul and I have had meetings to try to work on drafting some language. We've met with University Counsel Dottie Frapwell, and I expect that we will be following up on this the next time we meet.

**GALANTI:** I would like to say that it's important for the institution that under no circumstances did something occur that might be considered to be a waiver of the Trustees' right to meet in executive sessions. I know that Dottie is concerned with that. Any language would be vetted by Dottie; in fact, I think she's doing the drafting along those lines.

**AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**  
(President Myles Brand, Professors Galanti and Eno)

**BRAND:** Questions or comments from the gallery?

**ENO:** There is one other piece of Agenda Committee business. For those of you who came in from outside of Bloomington, the Agenda Committee would like to thank you for coming. We had discussed the possibility of brevity in our business today so that those of you who have to travel can do so while it is still light.

**RUBIN:** Just as a point of information, I wanted to share with the faculty council that the UFC Technology Policy Committee has been testing the Viacom desktop videoconferencing technology. We had our first meeting with that using that with Don Hossler. Other than our bridge crashing and needing to use Ohio State's, (laughter) the technology worked very well. Thanks to Ohio State for their neighborliness. I was pleased with being able to see everyone else on my desktop. As long as things on the network are stable, it looks as though that might be a real, viable technology for us to pursue for committee work in the future. I think people did like the ability to interact with each other, see each other, and do it from their offices rather than having to meet in a special classroom. I think it is something that we should explore next year in some more depth for some of the other committees.

**ENO:** The Agenda Committee particularly appreciates the good use to which you have put the technology, but regrets that it has not been able to follow in the same fashion.

**BRAND:** Other comments or questions? Let's then move on then to agenda item number five, Plan for Student Enrollment Services Academic Priorities Committee.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: PLAN FOR STUDENT ENROLLMENT  
SERVICES ACADEMIC PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**  
(Associate Vice President Donald Hossler)

**HOSSLER:** Bob, should this be called a draft, still? I'll start the copies around so everyone can have one.

**ENO:** It's still a draft, I believe.

**HOSSLER:** This document represents some ongoing discussions between Becky Porter and myself regarding the structure of the governance for the Student Enrollment Services Center. Perhaps it would be wise to talk about why we're going to need such an entity. We can attribute this to PeopleSoft, but it is really true of all of the student information systems that are being sold and created by numerous vendors and organizations across the country; it's not really unique to PeopleSoft. If we had purchased SCT/Banner or DataTel, which are both very integrated systems, we would have had the same problems. Depending on how universities implement them; that is, whether they choose a single campus or a multi-campus approach, they still must alter some business rules. We have chosen to be a multi-campus institution, which requires that admissions, registration, records, and student financial/bursar services will work in a much more interdependent system than is currently in place. I'm not one who knows the correct language for that type of system, but they are much more integrated products, and as a result, must communicate with each other. That is the most significant deficiency in our legacy systems that are currently in place. Right now, for example, for us on the Bloomington campus to do something that might involve financial aid and the Registrar's office, there is quite a bit of churning behind the scenes to get these two databases to communicate with one another so that we can understand the relationship between students currently enrolled and the debt incurred by

those students. That would be a fairly involved task under the current system, because those systems were built to stand alone. I'm emphasizing this because it leads directly to why this is going to be more integrated and why we need something like the Student Enrollment Services Center. That would be a pretty involved task, to be able to take a look at course enrollment patterns and loan debt. In PeopleSoft, SCT/Banner, or DataTel environment, this is much more integrated. The database becomes one database across all these areas for Indiana University. That integration requires us to do things differently as an institution, and particularly as a multi-campus institution. The complexities and the costs of doing things associated with that kind of database would be substantially greater to all campuses had we chosen to have each campus have its own version of PeopleSoft, if you will. Had every campus acted independently, costs would have been much, much higher. Frankly, most campuses within the system couldn't sustain those costs. In that context, because the PeopleSoft product is so much more integrated, faculty governance regarding its introduction and impact on student and other issues is becoming more limited as we speak, and that is something we are simply going to have to deal with. That's the reality of it: the cost of implementing this program is expensive enough to begin with, and would not be sustainable if we were to do it at each campus.

There becomes the need for a faculty governance group here. Bob understood the implications of this in the preceding years when he served on the Educational Policies Committee, and began to ask how we could structure faculty governance such that faculty have an impact on academic policies in this more integrated environment. What you have in front of you is the initial public viewing of the probable structure of a governance group to have oversight and prioritize what kinds of policies and procedures should be enacted in the PeopleSoft environment. As you can see, what is being proposed is a committee comprised of three faculty members from Bloomington, three from IUPUI, and two from the smaller campuses. Later, the document outlines how those members would be selected, but that is up for debate, as we haven't yet decided the UFC's role in selecting those individuals and which administrator or group of administrators should make the final selection. In addition to those elected/appointed faculty members, there will be ex-officio members, and this may have some similarity to the Bloomington campus' Capital Priorities Committee, which is chaired by the Dean for Budgetary Affairs, has some appointed faculty members, and then a number of ex-officio members, such as the Registrar and the Vice President for Administration. In this case, there would be a member of the SIS implementation team, the Director of the SES, some Associate and Assistant Deans, whose selection and participation is yet to be determined, and individuals from the larger schools on the campuses who also have a stake in policymaking decisions. What a school or of the College may want is not necessarily in synch with what the faculty want and we need to have a forum where multiple voices can be heard. Ultimately, it is the consensus of the faculty members that would determine priorities for that committee. I'll stop there. Bob, is there anything you want to add, or does anyone have any questions?

**ENO:** I think you've summarized it well. In an environment of scarce resources and high competition for those resources, where people are largely unable to make their case for why their policy or program resource needs should be of higher priority than another program, it seemed a reasonable thing to have a faculty committee drawn from all campuses that would help adjudicate among all those issues and serve as a lobbying group to effect change via the Associate Vice President. On the other hand, the committee will come back and explain to various units or campuses why they might feel that the policy or needs of the unit should not have priority. Hopefully, it will take heat of the Associate Vice President in an appropriate way. That individual would otherwise have to make policy and priority decisions across campuses and units with much less information and much less of a way to show that this represents a faculty consensus as to how things should be prioritized.

**SPECHLER:** Don, I'm from IUPUI, and it sounds like a very generous offer. Can you tell us what sort of issues or questions you want faculty advice on? What sorts of things would we know about, or care about? Can you give us a couple of examples?

**HOSSLER:** One recent example is stellar for that purpose, and it may well be the lone concrete example at this point. At current, we don't have a large inventory of examples to present to this body, the Deans, or the administration, but this is the one example we do have: the FX policy. I'm told PeopleSoft has some logic build in for an FX policy in the software that doesn't match any of the four policies that currently exist within the Indiana University system. On some of the larger campuses, not even all of the units are following the policies that do exist. That is one example, but I think that we will discover others that fit. Another arose about two years ago, when I traveled to the University of Wisconsin at the beginning of our planning phase to see what was going on in Madison. Someone that was involved with the project there said that a very contentious area was that the data collected for the PeopleSoft system did not allow the foreign languages to make course placement decisions in the way they had in past years. No department would be particularly excited to alter their policies because of a piece of software. I was thinking about the way that Bloomington policies for language placement differed from those of Madison's, and how those differ from IUPUI policies, and began to realize that those are the kinds of things that will come forward, where some adjudicatory group can ask the difficult questions in an attempt to find a mutually beneficial solution.

You will hear people say that there are limitations to PeopleSoft; that may not necessarily be true. It is very expensive to bring the basic system online; options only add to the complexity, costs, and inherent inefficiencies in the system. Frequently, what is more true than that we don't have the capability is that we couldn't afford to bring the entire system online at one time; nobody can. Questions have also been raised as to the value of doing things exactly as we have done them in the past. In that vein, I was talking to a person from UIUC about their plus and minus system that was enacted a number of years ago, which they wanted to migrate into the SCT/BANNER environment which they had purchased. The cost of doing that ended up being around \$900,000. They have kicked around a number of ideas, including making the plus/minus designation available on transcripts and to advisors, but not available to students over the web. They thought there might be some legal issues with having multiple versions of grades, and the faculty decided it wasn't worth that much money to do it in exactly the same fashion as it had been done in the past. Those are the kinds of decisions that will confront us during the implementation process and beyond. I was recently at a conference of PeopleSoft users, and I heard the Senior Executive Vice President from the California state system make the comment that most intuitions are finding that they can only implement about 50% of all the things the software is capable of doing. It's not that the software can't do it; nobody has enough resources to bring it all up. If you think about our current system, customized over 20 years, nobody to afford that in one fell swoop, whether they build their own or buy one off the shelf. If you think of all those modifications as toggle switches, nobody has enough hands or money to turn all those toggle switches on the day that the system comes online. I think this committee will be involved in some cases of deciding which toggle switches are more important, and in some cases where customization is necessary and they must decide whether the policy is so vital to the academic enterprise that the cost of customizing warrants the expenditure.

**BASU:** I think some time ago, when you spoke to the BFC, you mentioned that there is a cost involved in customizing PeopleSoft. If many campuses or schools want a particular change, will PeopleSoft pick up the tab? The example I have heard is that when foreign students apply online, they must put in credit card information. When we have applicants coming in from China, they do not have credit cards available at the time of their application. That's a disincentive for them to apply under the current system. It is possible that many schools around the country will be asking their vendors to make those changes.



**HOSSLER:** That's a good example of how complex this all is actually it is even yet another vendor that is managing our application. PeopleSoft and the application side basically has nothing to do with what you just said. What is true is this some campuses at Indiana University cannot, campuses like Bloomington and Indianapolis, it isn't even just the entire campus some professional schools at Indianapolis and Bloomington, on the Bloomington campus for example there were at least three different external vendors who were managing the web applications for the Bloomington campus. You probably don't want to know all these numbers. At the Indianapolis campus they have built their own and the School of Medicine is working with a vendor and the School of Business is working with yet another vendor out there and these are really the business rules and processes of the Individual vendors not PeopleSoft. I think that is. We are still really struggling with because on one hand you don't have the resources right now in terms of enough people to build our own to get past that, that is why we are using these outside vendors, but we are still I think trying to figure out how to do that. We are very aware of it. [Inaudible] from the Peoples Republic, from the former Soviet states and elsewhere in the world.

**ENO:** Just one comment. I think most of us who are familiar with Don would feel that Don has the sort of expertise that would allow him to have access to both cost and benefit calculations with regard to policy issues and the cost of implementing policy and so forth. In the future, that may not always be so with the Associate Vice-President. This policy, however, this plan is designed to make sure that when cost benefit calculations are made by a centralized system which is going to be distant from every campus because it is centralized that there is an academic group that can advise on the academic side of the benefit, which would not necessarily be evident to the person who is in charge of this office. Hopefully this is a future safeguard so that we make sure that those sorts of decisions which are extremely important both for policy issues and for cost reasons are ones that make sure that faculty have a valued input and one that is shared by the various campuses appropriately. I do think that this group would probably like to take a look at the selection of faculty members I'll pause under this which has two possible options and provide some feedback as to which option seems to be most appropriate and perhaps provide feedback on anything else that is not indicated. This is the first time that this model has been shared in a public way.

**SCHNEIDER:** I wasn't here at the beginning but you don't intend to create a UFC committee do you?

**ENO:** No this is an advisory committee set up within SES. The initiative for this comes from Don. It is something which is I think a very wise administrative decision.

**SCHNEIDER:** When you said the UFC will appoint do you expect to use the Agenda Committee, is that what you mean by it?

**ENO:** I would expect the nomination committee of the UFC [inaudible].

**GALANTI:** Are there any preferences for appointing or submitting the names and allowing Don or successor to select?

**SPECHLER:** Well Basu raised the issue of International Students and that seems to me sufficiently problematic but also sufficiently important, increasingly important, and complicated that you ought to have at least one person who is professionally involved with foreign students applying to Indiana University.

**BRAND:** Good point.

**BOBAY:** One perspective that speaks in favor of sending a list of names and allowing Associate Vice-President to appoint is that the person in enrollment services may have knowledge of individuals who would really bring valuable expertise to the table whereas the nominating committee of the UFC knows good faculty names but may not be close enough to the project to really select faculty members who can bring important expertise to the group.

**ENO:** The basic trade off here is if it is just the UFC nominating faculty retain control of that portion of the membership. If it is no the UFC nominating but is a shared nominations process then the goal is that you have pooled consideration such as what Julie is just suggesting whereas

the danger is that in the future the faculty will feel that that is a mechanism by which their preferences would be excluded. It is fifty-fifty either way.

**HOSSLER:** I suggest the first option and Bob suggested the second option. [Laughter]

**RUBIN:** Before you're done talking about the selection, I just want to make sure; I have another question. The question that I have actually goes beyond that one step and that is how and when would this advisory committee communicate with the UFC and other decision making bodies on our campuses and when would the policies that really involve faculty as a whole materialize before the UFC? How would that circumstance come about? I mean if it was the FX policy that is a policy that should be discussed here. How would that come from this committee? Let's say that you are discussing it in the committee and you discovered that it cost a hundred thousand dollars to have four different FX policies across the campuses and at that point the committee suggests that we try to agree on one policy across all units of IU. How would that issue then come to the UFC for policy recommendation?

**HOSSLER:** I would really love to hear your suggestion. Having never been a member of the UFC I don't know exactly.

**GALANTI:** There ought to be a liaison somewhere.

**BRAND:** Well, you would think that in the composition of the faculty committee there would be some overlap. Maybe there should be a restriction, one or maybe two at a minimum should be members of the UFC. That might be the liaison person without adding additional committee members but just assuring that one or two of the faculty.

**RUBIN:** Then there would be an expectation that those faculty members would serve as a communiqué...

**BRAND:** Right liaison.

**RUBIN:** ...between the two and bring those issues to the UFC.

**BRAND:** That might solve. I leave it to the people putting the committee together but that might work. Dick.

**CARR:** I was going to say something very similar. You just said this is not a UFC committee so these issues wouldn't necessarily come back. However, something on the policy that you mentioned could certainly go to the educational policies committee for reconsideration and resubmission. I can see this functioning quite independently above the UFC level.

**BRAND:** But a liaison might resolve the problem if someone was on the lookout for those sorts of issues.

[End of Tape, some words may have been lost.]

**GINGER:** I assume the committee will have a chair if for no other reason...?

**ENO:** The Associate Vice-President.

**GINGER:** So the UFC Agenda Committee would be the obvious. In other words, that person could say the UFC Agenda Committee we have something that and then the Agenda Committee could send it to one of the committees of the Council or not or just bring it.

**ENO:** It is certainly true that matters reach Faculty Councils from administration as well as from faculty committees.

**HOSSLER:** [inaudible] the agendas of every meeting as well as the summary of some kind of minutes could also go to the Agenda Committee.

**BRAND:** You could do all those things. I mean the chair of the committee could take it on as a responsibility. It might also be helpful to have a liaison just to double check.

**ENO:** I think we probably should not try to limit the membership with a clause requiring a UFC liaison who is a member of the UFC because these are four year terms it is very difficult to keep predicting and balancing who is on and who is off under that circumstance.

**BRAND:** But you could still have a liaison.

**ENO:** You could still have a liaison yes.

**BRAND:** Okay I think we are getting close to finishing this issue. Other comments or questions about it? Good. Thank you Don.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: TOPICS FOR TASK FORCE ON 18/20 RETIREMENT PLAN**  
(Vice President Judith Palmer)

**BRAND:** Let me ask Vice President Palmer now to talk about the Task Force on 18/20 Retirement Plan.

**PALMER:** Very briefly, President Brand asked the Task Force that reviewed the financing proposals, five years ago now, for the 18/20 program to come back together this spring to take a look at two primary issues. The first being just a five year update on all of the projection figures. We have been delivering to this body as well as other faculty governance groups on the campuses an annual report on the progress that we have made toward realizing the savings from the three specific initiatives that the Task Force recommended and which were ultimately approved. We indicated at the time that the report came forward that we thought it was very important to periodically review the entire financing plan because we have people who leave and will not be including in that 18/20 grouping. There was a recommendation for the elimination of IU's CERF for new hires and that was not fully calculated into some of the original financing plans. It was a good opportunity to step back and take a look at the numbers. We also have the ability now to use what I'm going to call real data, but by that I mean specifically identifying every eligible participant in 18/20 and applying our factors that we used in the analysis that was a five percent growth in salaries and a five percent growth in benefit payments so that we would be in a better position to see what the actual cost is likely to be for the duration of the program. For our original projections we used the average and all of us know that averages can be misleading. We thought it was important to go back and do that. The Task Force has come back together. Dan Rives through his office has asked an actuarial firm to rerun the numbers. We have had our first look at those. We are analyzing them. We have several questions from the Task Force about the numbers. We will be bringing that back to you in time we hope for the next UFC or the final UFC meeting this year. Now, that is a rather mechanical if you will review and update. A very substantive review is focused on the retention initiative. Each time that this body has had a report on the initiatives and I think it is fair to say that almost every place I've presented that report questions have come up about the effectiveness of the retention initiative. Frankly, it was down to two issues. Is it being offered enough and is it being accepted enough and what is the relative value of that initiative because we've seen some rather low numbers in that. So, the task force is looking at options and one of the reasons for being on the agenda today without benefit of any sort of report or recommendation is to get input on that. Frankly we are thinking about some bookends here if you will in ways that one could go. One could say theoretically let's open it up to everyone or let's not offer it at all. So, it becomes a more level if you will playing field for everyone so that it is not done on a selected basis. Now, we know that historically in the 18/20 program many faculty and staff have elected to stay on past the age of 65. So, for every year that they pass 65 one year of their eligibility is gone, therefore there is a savings in the program. It is unclear how much of a difference the twenty percent supplement makes. I've been told that there has been some confusion at times about the role that as a supplement versus a salary increase of the base, which would increase the cost of the program and which was not intended by the Task Force when it made its recommendation. So, that is where we are. No decisions have been reached but we would appreciate any input that you or your colleagues would care to offer to the Task Force as we look at this particular initiative. Now, there is a corollary to the initiative. It was actually set up that way. If one elects to go ahead and take the 18/20 benefit at either age 64 or age 65 then the campus or the department must allocate twenty percent of the value of that salary line back to the 18/20 program. Again, this was an issue of fairness in terms of some units or some campuses that had more or fewer 18/20 eligible and electing to take the benefit faculty

and staff. So, if a person elects not to take the benefit that is offered or if it becomes an open offer that is anyone can elect to take it then there may be less coming in on that reallocation, but of course the department will have the cost of the ongoing salary and the 18/20 fund provides the twenty percent supplement. We are going to need to run the numbers on this depending on which way we go but right now I believe the Task Force feels that this may be a fairly even trade off, not effecting the total integrity of the financing plan.

**SPECHLER:** Judy, Bob Sandy and I made a rather radical proposal with respect to a very large group of 18/20 eligible people from the IU School of Medicine. Without going into that we still think that that is a way of saving a large amount of money because it would reduce the incentive to take the 18/20 at age 64 and I hope that you considered that. I think it is also a fair proposal. It would save us I think a very large amount of money. The second thing is, my sense of the matter is from faculty approaching retirement that this twenty percent incentive is neither effective nor fair. It costs us money. Why is it not fair? Because it is being decided by people. Some people get it, other people don't. Why is that? It could be based on knowledge of the personal circumstances of the faculty member the dean says I must give it to so and so but I don't have to give it to this other person because I know that he or she will stay anyway. It invites unfairness, number one. I think it is ineffective because in discussion with faculty members there are many other more weighted considerations whether you stay or not like do you love teaching, do you have an alternative for your time, do you want to leave the state, this kind of thing. I think it is obviously expensive although not as expensive as some other things. I would be inclined if you talk about bookends and as someone who will face this in five years, six years, to eliminate this selective incentive and just put it open, do you want to stay and do your research and teaching here or do you want to go elsewhere?

**BRAND:** I think Judy some of those considerations were driving the review by the Task Force.

**PALMER:** Yes. In terms of the proposals we have not looked at any but I do have a copy of what you and Professor Stanley proposed so that will be presented to the Task Force.

**SPECHLER:** We will be glad of course to fill you in. You are in a position to know far more of the details and obviously the Dean of the School of Medicine would have to be involved but it did appear to us that we could save a lot of money.

**PALMER:** But, President Brand is absolutely right. Some of the issues that you raised were the driving force of the President asking us to re-evaluate that.

**BRAND:** Just the same solutions. When is the Task Force going to come back with this?

**PALMER:** We are going to try to have everything wrapped up by the time that this body meets in the end of April. I should ask Professor Julie Bobay. Do you want to add anything to this?

**BOBAY:** No, thank you.

**BRAND:** Any other comments or questions on this?

**ENO:** Just a very broad one, which is I think that there is a... Right now we have a very large problem that Marty has identified in terms of the criteria not being transparent, the criteria by which offers are made. The entire 18/20 issue is one that has as much of a hit on faculty morale as it does on University finances and to the degree that this lack of transparency is causing concern within the faculty. I think it would be good if we could eliminate it. If there is not significant savings to be gained by the incentive program given the fact that the replacement salary would be lower and so forth it seems to me that this would be a good portion of the program to eliminate especially since it hasn't apparently produced great savings. But if it does turn out that there are substantial savings I think that we should at least use the other bookend. Either it is universally offered or we have very straight forward criteria to determine what the offers are and that they are more or less mechanical and that the deans have to abide by.

**PALMER:** I appreciate that. Feel free to email me if you have other ideas or thoughts. Two of the members I believe of the Task Force are here. Al Ruesink is also on the task force and I should mention that we have added Professor Vinodgopal from IU Northwest and he has participated with us. We have a vacancy due to the death of Professor Michael Downs.

**BRAND:** Julie or Al anything to add?

**BOBAY:** I do. I just have one point. I think that focusing on this retention incentive and viewing it from the two extremes is useful but there have been proposals for things in-between those two extremes. Right now we are of course in-between those two extremes with the deans making the decision in the absence of any criteria. But, there are other points in between there that I think we don't know if they would have financial implications because they have to do with behaviors and motivators and things like that but I would hope that we would explore those as well as just the two extremes.

**BRAND:** Okay. Good. I'm looking forward to the report in April. Good to get that clarified one way or another.

**ENO:** I just want to thank Judy for coming down on a difficult day to do this for the purpose being to let us all know about what was in the works before a final report from the Task Force emerges on which we could have no input.

**PALMER:** It was just like sledding downhill. Thank you.

### **AGENDA ITEM #8: INTERIM REFORM OF THE MASTER COURSE INVENTORY**

(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels, Educational Policies Committee)

(Circular U8-2002)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/01-02/U8-2002.htm>

**BRAND:** Thank you Judy. Dan Rives is not here I'm not sure that he will come so why don't we skip number seven and go to number eight.

**ENO:** Dan had a very narrow window. He was going to try to hit it, he may be a little earlier.

**BRAND:** We'll come back to him. Bob will you pick up the Interim Reform of the Master Course Inventory?

**ENO:** Number Eight concerns the circular that you have on blue paper. This is something that we discussed at our February meeting. It came out of the Educational Policies Committee when we discussed it I had only heard from a portion of the committee. I have heard from further members of the committee afterwards and I think that this is something that is non-controversial. Last spring to remind you we passed a plan to better manage the Master Course Inventory the way that it is compiled and the way that it is administered so that we don't undermine any progress that we are making in the intercampus transfer procedures that we are all subjecting ourselves to for the current term and on into the future forever. Basically this is a way of making sure that if any campus wishes to take a course off the Master Course Inventory which includes courses that have been taught since time immemorial they first check and see if those courses are being offered on other campuses in the IU system, that they take steps to find out just what those courses are, what they consist of, what the general coverage requirements are, they contact those departments that are offering it and that an assessment go through that these are in fact comparable enough, the plan that they have to offer on their campus is comparable enough that it could be applied to degree requirements, identical degree requirements on the other campuses where this course is offered because if they offer a course identically numbered with those courses that are being offered on the other campuses those courses transfer seamlessly. When we discussed this in the UFC last time I didn't detect any problem with this proposal. This proposal is designed to stand in place until we are prepared through the SIS system to manage the much more complex plan that we developed last year which would essentially move all of these determinations of where the course is being offered and what is in the course up to the web. Ultimately I hope it will be on the web through the SIS system but that will probably take a number of years. I expect that in April we will hear more about this. It looks like we will actually get to work on it very soon. But in the interim this is a much more mechanical process

whereby campuses check with the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office to gather the information of where the course is being taught and they contact those other campuses for what is being taught, what is the course. The courses are then aligned or else if they are not aligned, if they are not comparable, a unique number is determined for the new course to be offered on that campus.

**WARD:** Just a couple of questions, if you had a situation where a course was offered on two different campuses pulling down on your campus and the two campuses disagree one saying yes it is comparable and the other say no it is not. Do you go by the campus that owns the course? Or does it automatically then go to the committee?

**ENO:** Ownership is shared. If two campuses are offering the course they share ownership of the course regardless of which campus came first. What you would do then is you would go to the UFC committee on course comparability. That is a committee that will be the continuation of our current ICT committee, it draws members from all campuses. They would determine where they feel the arguments are strongest, which seems to be preferable to flipping a coin. See the penalty is rather low. If the course is deemed non-comparable then you simply offer it under another number and you avoid the issue. Because the threshold, the penalty is so low, this doesn't seem like an issue that needs to be raised to the point to where we have a very complex and cumbersome mechanism to assure that everybody is in agreement. So, rather than trying to achieve consensus you hit or miss on that.

**SCHNEIDER:** When you say another number do you mean a new course number?

**ENO:** Yeah it would be a new course number.

**SCHNEIDER:** So there is no circulation of a new course syllabi? No other campuses would see the new course syllabus? Right?

**ENO:** Whatever remonstrance process we now have for new courses would continue untouched by this policy.

**SCHNEIDER:** Speaking of that, [inaudible].

**ENO:** Yes.

**SCHNEIDER:** [inaudible]

**ENO:** Yes, you are right thank you.

**BRAND:** Okay. Alright.

**ENO:** The word undergraduate should be before the word course on the first line as a friendly amendment.

**BRAND:** Good. Okay. Other questions? This is an action item. You are being asked to vote on this today. Other questions for Bob? With that friendly amendment, the word "undergraduate" in front of "course" in the first line, this needs no second. It is on the table. All in favor please say "Aye." Opposed? Good thank you Bob.

[Motion Passes Unanimously]

**AGENDA ITEM #7: UPDATE ON 18/20 ALTERNATIVE GROUP BENEFIT PLAN**  
(Mr. Dan Rives, Office of Human Resources)

**BRAND:** Let me backtrack then to item number seven, Update on the 18/20 Alternative Group Benefit Plan. Dan.

**RIVES:** I have a good report for you. We talked in the past about an IRS ruling that will interrupt benefits for 114 individuals who would qualify for 18/20 or would otherwise qualify for 18/20. We have been working very hard to develop a replacement plan. The item coming around is an outline, still in draft format so we have a little bit of work to do but it is an outline of provisions of a replacement plan for the 18/20 interim benefits portion of 18/20 for just that group. I will just run through it very quickly and see what questions you may have. Again, this is

only to replace the benefits for which 114 individuals are impacted because of an IRS ruling we received earlier and our objective was to develop a comparable benefit, equal benefit if you will, and in the spirit something that would be consistent with the eligibility criteria of 18/20 and the benefits of 18/20. The directions I received from President Brand and others was to develop this in a way that it would not penalize these faculty members. So, I believe we have met our goal. The covered population would be that very select group so it is a very specific group, 114 individuals. They will be listed in documents that we will file with the IRS. The eligibility criteria is exactly the 18/20 eligibility criteria, that is 18 years of retirement plan participation, twenty years of IU service and age 64, exactly the same. The benefit amount is where it varies. We can't do the interim benefit, the deferred compensation formula, the IRS won't allow us to do that anymore so we have to do something else, we are going to do a defined benefit formula. So we define the benefit here and that benefit was based on both salary and service. We've tried to construct this in a way that though we wanted to not penalize this population we did not want to divide the benefit value that was greater than, quite substantially greater than, they would otherwise have received. So, we constructed it in a way and put some kind of limits on it, average salary we defined as base salary, the average of the last five years. At time retirement or age 65, whichever is earlier, and years of service you see a factor of basically twenty-five years of service, that is one, so factor one times final average salary divided by twelve since we are going to do this in monthly payments and then it is slightly reduced when there are fewer years of service. All based on years of service at time of retirement or age 65, whichever is earlier. That captures that essence of 18/20. That also will closely approximate the 18/20 benefit that these individuals would have otherwise received, it is not equal because 18/20 is going to be a little bit based on the earnings and put [inaudible] and so forth, but this will approximate that benefit and it has exactly the same cap on it. The payment stream is over sixty months or until death, it does not say age seventy, so it is sixty months or death it does not say age seventy like 18/20 does. We would not be able to put that limit under this kind of plan. In order to have a defined benefit plan it also has to have an option of a lifetime annuity thusly the participant instead of taking sixty months worth of benefits to take it over the remainder of their life at a reduced amount. The income taxation was very important. It is equivalent to 18/20 that is, income taxes will not be due until the payment is received. And there is no FICA taxes, so that works just like 18/20. The gain for employment we are going to be able to put into this plan that there benefits would cease if the individual is re-employed at the University, a little difference than with 18/20 where it is employment at any Indiana institution. The funding for this type of plan has to be in advance. Meaning we have to put the money in a trust, segregated outside the assets of the University, for this very specific purpose. We have to fund it in a way so that when the last benefit is due in 2036 I believe or thereabouts we have prefunded it. So, this is a summary of the work we have been doing to develop a replacement plan for that 114 individuals. We believe it to be of comparable value. We don't believe it will penalize individuals. It probably had a little bit of some additional options if you will but we could not avoid that to put together this kind of a plan.

**BRAND:** Thank you Dan. Questions? Martin.

**SPECHLER:** Well Dan I see one additional benefit and one somewhat puzzling disadvantage for this group. Let's start with the advantage. They could go to work for Purdue or Indiana State and there would be nothing wrong with that whereas those of us who are on 18/20 could not do that. Why, first question, didn't you have exactly the same limitation on this group as on those of us who will enjoy 18/20?

**RIVES:** Very good, you are absolutely correct. The defined benefit is under a section of code, section 401A, by the way we had a consultant help us put this together, Gerald Dean from Nyhart, which some of you probably know from prior experiences, and we respect very much, that section of the code would not allow us to really put a gainful employment rule on this plan with one exception, work at the same institution that you are retiring from. So, we could not really

develop by definition of the IRS code a kind of limitation that would otherwise exist under the 18/20, which is under a different section of the code.

**SPECHLER:** Well, that doesn't bother me too much. I doubt that any of us who are on 18/20 would begrudge these folks that additional latitude. But the thing that I think may raise some question among the group themselves is this limitation of say 75 percent of the final base salary. Now, my understanding is that if a person took 18/20 with just twenty years of service which is possible then the benefit would be either the average of the last five years or that TIACREP benefit, whichever is less.

**RIVES:** That is not correct.

**SPECHLER:** No?

**RIVES:** The 18/20 benefit itself is a hypothetical annuity based on the stream of the University's contributions to the base retirement plan split fifty percent to TIAA fixed annuity and fifty percent to CREP stock and because the compounding earning element the longer the years of service the larger the benefit on this CREP as well at least. Of course the cap is there, the average of the last five years is now a ceiling for everybody. What we see today is anybody with twenty-five years of service with the compounding of that hypothetical account balance they get the cap. The further you are away from twenty-five years of service then the less likely you are to get that cap. So, this arrangement does resemble a pattern we see today. It may actually be slightly more generous but we want to err on that side than otherwise.

**BRAND:** Okay, other questions?

**GINGER:** Actually it is, we were just saying that it would be nice to have a real brief summary sheet like this for the normal, those of us who have been here long enough to be under the original plan because most people don't wouldn't be able to you know say oh yes I understand all of these things about the current. So just a suggestion that maybe this could be for used as just a matter of information and send it around to faculty.

**RIVES:** I received that feedback from several individuals lately.

**GINGER:** There are always arguments about it means this no it doesn't. [Laughter]

**RIVES:** The newspapers don't help.

**BRAND:** You know it would be good just to give out to the media. Yeah, that would be useful. Good. Please.

**GALANTI:** I would like to thank Dan for his work on the replacement retirement plan and for the domestic partners benefit. You and your staff have done a great job and I just want to go on the record as saying how much at least I and I hope all of us appreciate your efforts.

**RIVES:** Thank you. There were lots of individuals, for instance assembling this document in the background was a whole committee of faculty and a few staff members helped. The domestic partners resolutions came from the faculties and we are very happy to [inaudible].

**BRAND:** Good. The minutes will read that. Other comments? Thank you Dan.

**AGENDA ITEM #9: REPORT ON ICHE STATE  
COMMISSION ON TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION:  
"Principles guiding Statewide Transfer and Articulation"  
(Professor Robert Eno)**

**BRAND:** We are up to item number nine, Report on ICHE State Commission on Transfer and Articulation: "Principles guiding Statewide Transfer and Articulation." Bob, back to you.

**ENO:** Last time we met Becky Porter and I spoke to you briefly to update you on the work of the state transfer and articulation committee of the Higher Education Commission. One of the things that the committee was working on was a set of guiding principles for its current efforts to try to increase the number of range of transfer and articulation agreements among Indiana public



universities, colleges and universities both two and four year, and hopefully from the committee's standpoint private universities ultimately as well. Since last time the committee has come to a more or less of a consensus of its members as to the set of guiding principles that it wants to abide by and it plans to propose these to the commission for the commissions adoption in May. Before doing so the committee decided to circulate these draft principles to faculty senates around the state for information purposes and to get some feedback on them as well. Becky is not here today so I'm going to present these to you asking for your feedback and comments which I will take back to the committee. I should note that these principles are meant both for the purposes developing more transfer and articulation agreements and also the principles that will govern those agreements once they are in place. There are some places where there is really a distinction between them for instance in item number four, transfer students should be comparably treated to native students by the receiving institution. That is a clause that would only apply once articulation agreements were in place assuring the comparability was appropriate. In other cases such as the faculty privacy clause, which is the first clause, these are principles that guide us from this point on. One other thing I need to note, these are not my principles. These are principles the committee has developed and I'm happy to take back any feedback that you have but they do have a life of their own.

**BRAND:** Have you had a chance to look at these principles prior to this?

**ENO:** Not much because I fudged [inaudible] messed up on the email and discovered never to use that...

**BRAND:** Let me suggest that, they're not long, take two minutes to read it. It is important enough for your attention. Let people read it for two minutes. Questions, comments? Martin.

**SPECHLER:** Well Bob, what has always bothered me about this program, which I understand that it is necessary politically and in principle a good idea, but what had always bothered me is that students who come from two year institutions be given a false hope, a false idea of what it will take to graduate at a four year institution such as Indiana University and specifically in mathematics and foreign languages. That a student who goes to Ivy Tech State College may need more time at the very least more time to get up to a position where they can compete effectively in the second level of a foreign language or mathematics. It worries me terribly that those students would be dumped into one of our larger campuses and then fail, fail to catch on in the intermediate course. Now referring to five, course transfer, do you envision that we may say that math 100, an imaginary number, given at Ivy State College may not be equivalent to a semester course taught on the Bloomington campus in mathematics and that student at Ivy Tech State College may need to take two semester courses in order to be fully prepared for the two hundred level course in mathematics and the same in foreign languages. Those are the areas that worry me the most.

**ENO:** Yeah, they worry me too. There are two ways to respond to that. One is the first clause, faculty privacy requires that the articulation agreements should be devised by faculty or looking at them on a course to course basis. So they are supposed to be looking at them for comparability in the same way that we are. As I said last time we met, I'm concerned about the degree of faculty time that has to go into devising those and maintaining those arrangements. The other and second best way to handle this because it is after the fact for some students is in clause number eight where institutions collect data on the performance of students, not only in graduation, but in terms of sequence courses and how they perform afterwards and that where problems emerge it is shared among members of the agreement and the agreement is re-examined so you can reopen the agreement. If it looks like Ivy Tech students coming from Math 100 moving into Math 200 are failing you can reopen the agreement on that basis and the basis of their performance. That doesn't help the students who established those data but it would help future students. Also, we do know in the way that the committee is going about its business, it is starting by looking at the actual ways that courses are transferred onto transcripts now when they come in to institutions and it is compiling a map in terms of the forty most commonly transferred courses in terms of the

transfer equivalencies that are assigned. In many cases the transfer courses don't transfer. In other cases it does require a sequence of courses to transfer as one course at the receiving institution. So, there are established patterns in place that implicitly recognize the problem that you are speaking about and that address them in terms of higher requirements than a one-to-one correspondence.

**SPECHLER:** I teach an elementary statistics course that seems to require a lot of math sophistication, you wouldn't think so but it does. Would we be allowed to have an entrance exam for all native and transfer students as a way of advising them of whether they are ready for such a course?

**ENO:** I could tell you on the ICT procedures that we have established, entrance exams or proficiency exams for the purpose of advising are licensed anywhere you want them because they serve the student. It is even more encouraging if they are universal as opposed to just transferring students in. I can't see where there would be any problem with that from this standpoint. It is advising rather than an assignment issue.

**SPECHLER:** So we can tell a student, look your results indicate that you'd better go back and review that prior course otherwise your chances are not good.

**BRAND:** You could do it for diagnostic reasons and you should do it in an unbiased way because say if you are going to do it my recommendation is to do it for all your incoming students rather than pick out the ones that come from two year colleges. That is the spirit of this. Yes.

Question?

**SONI:** Item number seven refers to inclusion of independence, we are talking about the private institutions there?

**ENO:** Yes. One has expressed interest so far.

**WARD:** I'm bothered a little bit by six. I'm wondering if somebody could address the intent of that. It seems to me that the intent is to sort of homogenize majors so that a student who started out in anthropology introductory courses in a two year could transfer them to any anthropology program in a state institution. Then, you are running counter to the Commission on Higher Education's goals when they licensed programs that we not repeat each other. So, for instance at Indianapolis we've concentrated on developing an applied anthropology major, it is still called anthropology but we would maintain that it is a very different animal than what is offered at Bloomington. I would understand this if the intent is to the fullest extent possible work with each other to ensure that courses transfer [inaudible] and in a kind a way as possible. It seems to me that this may be opening the door to that homogenization process.

**ENO:** Number six is pointed primarily at the transfer from two year to four year institutions by students. The idea is that institutions should cooperate to design a model that will allow students to move from the two year program to the four year program and be able to complete the program in four years if they take the right mix of courses at the beginning. We signed agreements on I think on all of the IU campuses over eight majors with VU, VUCCI courses, Vincennes University Community College associate degrees, last summer. Essentially each of those maps a set of courses that tells students, allows you to advise them, saying if you take these courses and you get a suitable grade in each course and your grade point average is at such a level overall then this is the minimum requirement you would have to complete the BA degree or BS degree in the same major if you move to whichever institution is being identified, whichever of our campuses is identified. It was a principle that the requirement would not exceed sixty-five hours, that which was left. We managed to devise eight programs where that was the case. In the case of those programs I would say that the first principle, the first guiding principle here was not adhered to. We did not abide by faculty privacy, the individual courses were not reviewed by faculty carefully to make sure that they were comparable, we were under a certain amount of pressure to get this done. These principles are designed to make sure that as future articulations agreements by major are devised that we will have faculty privacy. Again, I'm a little skeptical about what faculty privacy will actually be because it is so costly in terms of time investment by faculty. To

the degree that we have few students actually following these transfer patterns we don't want to invest a large amount of faculty time into devising this agreement. To the degree that we have a lot of students doing this and they affect the dynamics of classes we do. We really will have to feel this out as we go along. In terms of what the guiding principle means, this was conceived with the division of the two year to four year program step.

**CARR:** I hope the committee recognizes that there is a certain artifice to the elaboration of these principles. These are guidelines but they can hardly be considered as solid guidelines. Let me explain what I mean. I'm thinking of a long tradition that we've had at Indiana University according to which the teacher has a great deal of liberty defining just what material goes into a course that he teaches. It may have the same course number and there may be several sections of this course on the same campus but there is variety within that course. This is a liberty and freedom that we've granted to the teacher and I think it is one of the great experiences that one has, especially young faculty members in the Indiana University system. So, course equivalency is really something that has to almost be put in quotes. I'd say as you move from campus to campus it becomes somewhat of a myth. It is the basic problem with that Master Course list. There is something else that bothers me. You can set this up in any term that you wish, however, we are encouraged to keep courses up to date, there are new texts that appear, there are new materials that appear. Courses change. Any sort of equivalency is going to be approximative for that very reason. What I'm trying to suggest is that these are defined as guidelines provided there is sufficient flexibility built into any system so that it doesn't demand that that course be well from the point of view of material the same throughout the state. This is an impossibility.

**BRAND:** I think equivalency rather than identity is the right word. You are not going to get identity because people do use different texts and teach in different ways just as you point out. Functional equivalency, playing the same role in a degree program is probably what is intended here.

**ENO:** I think the points are well taken Dick.

[End of Tape. Some words may have been lost.]

**ENO:** ...these sorts of agreements are most important for example in math courses, foreign languages courses. I think there is less flexibility for individual instructors to determine the range of material covered and types of proficiencies required because they link up in a very tight sequence of courses taken by very large numbers of students.

**CARR:** But think of the difference of methodology.

**ENO:** There are certainly differences in methodologies, but I'm just saying relative to some other courses if you are teaching a literature course in a broadly defined field you might select completely different corpus of text from what you might choose on another time. There in fact the articulation is probably less critical, or at a less critical standard than it would be with a math or language course. These are the sorts of things that we live with on each of our individual campuses statewide.

**BRAND:** Again the idea is to play the same role in a degree program. I think that is the key concept here. I had mentioned to Bob a little earlier, I had a particular problem myself with item number two, in that there is a potential misinterpretation of that in so far as it may be a misinterpretation of item number two. It may be taken to mean that we will automatically have two plus two programs in all our degree areas. Remember the rest of this is talking about courses, two is talking about degree areas. Let me give you a specific example. In the School of Music, you have someone who takes a two year degree program at a community college, that may well not fit into a two plus two program for someone who then wants to move to the Bloomington campus and get a four year degree in Music. I consider that the exception rather than the rule. I would hope that in most cases two plus two programs are possible but there will be cases where it doesn't make sense. So, something clarifatory in number two would be needed such as the Trustees retain the, I don't mean this to be a specific sentence to insert, but the idea is that the Trustees retain the ability to control degree requirements so that each campus continues to have

its ability for these exceptional cases to control what it offers degrees. Maybe that is implicit, maybe it is not. Another thing might be doing somehow to change the language of two so it talks only of general education and not baccalaureate degree programs.

**SPECHLER:** I think you raise a very important question. That is that some of our Schools have limited admission to their undergraduate programs. I believe the Kelley School of Business, they don't allow everybody in. The School of Music certainly doesn't allow everybody in. Our we implying here that if you've taken a two year program in Music or Business or even more in Math that you are automatically into the Kelley School of Business.

**BRAND:** No, I think it means that if you are admitted it counts. This doesn't guarantee admission.

**ENO:** Once an articulation agreement has been fashioned then once you are admitted, native students and transfer students are treated equally means the course numbers that they have would be assigned to comparable requirements. Until the articulation agreement has been reached that is not necessarily true. The course number may transfer in but may not be applicable to degree requirements or the course number may not transfer in. Once the articulation agreement is complete when you're admitted then you are like a native student to the degree that the articulation agreement [inaudible].

**RUBIN:** I'm a little bit concerned in number twelve that the role of the transfer coordinator is. Could you sort of specify in some more detail? It just says a course transfer coordinator should be identified but it doesn't say what they are going to do. It seems to me that that is a critical role with respect to some flexibility and bizarre things are going to happen. So, you need someone who can or potentially make some substitutions from one course to another with respect to the articulation agreement but you also don't want that person going so far as to defeat that articulation agreement. So, it seems to me that there should be some set of responsibilities associated with that individual that are clearly stated otherwise...

**ENO:** There is meant to be only one. This is the person who is supposed to report to STAC and say hey...

**RUBIN:** Oh, this is just... I understood it to say that at each campus there would be one. Is that what you are saying?

**ENO:** At each campus there is going to be somebody whom STAC can call up and say hey we've heard there is a problem, tell us about it or that person contacts STAC and say we have a problem with the agreement.

**RUBIN:** Okay but that looks at it from the side of the STAC what about from the student side? That is the only point where I see any flexibility for special circumstances accruing and what is that individual's role with respect to a transfer student? Are they going to have powers?

**ENO:** None I hope because on Bloomington that is me.

**RUBIN:** That would be fine. What would you do? What would you see your role?

**ENO:** If I were alerted that there were problems that developed I would contact STAC and say that we have a problem. STAC is a committee of people and we are all the liaisons essentially for our campuses. This actually happens when students have trouble transferring. I hear about it either from another STAC member or from our admissions office. Then, I am responsible for bringing it to the committee. We work out a solution. Or, I'm responsible for working with the committee to get a solution resolved on our campus or on the other campus.

**BRAND:** Barry this is not the person that deals with individual student problems.

**RUBIN:** Okay, so where is that person?

**BRAND:** That is the advisors.

**RUBIN:** It says you have to develop a process.

**RUBIN:** Okay, but would it be appropriate to be a little bit more explicit about that then in terms of what the...?

**ENO:** My feeling is that it is in our interest that STAC be as non-directive to individual institutions as possible and allow us to do what we feel would be most appropriate.

**BRAND:** Other questions? Okay. Bob you have heard the comments of the group and you will represent the group within the STAC committee. I would like now to turn to our final item, which is executive session. I ask those who are not members of UFC...

**AGENDA ITEM #10: EXECUTIVE SESSION:  
HONORARY DEGREES TO BE AWARDED**  
(Professor Henry R. Besch, Jr., Honorary Degrees Committee)

Meeting adjourned 4:00 PM  
Bob Eno, Co-Secretary