

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 18, 2006
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: LTC Lori Bass, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Katy Borner, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliott, Emily Fairchild, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Susan Jones, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, David Mackay, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Daniel Melamed, Alyce Miller, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Lisa Pratt, , Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT: Les Coyne, William Leckey, Gerald Marker, Terrence Mason, Alex Shortle, Neil Theobald

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES: Larry Yaeger for Dennis Groth, Geoffrey Conrad for Sarita Soni

GUESTS: Catherine Larson (College of Arts and Sciences), Roland Cote (Enrollment Services), Pam Freeman (Student Ethics), Steve Hinnefeld , Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Deanna Reising (Nursing), John Steinmetz (Geological Survey), Kumble Subbaswamy (Dean, College of Arts and Sciences), David Zaret (Sociology), Betsy Henke (IUSA), Ann Gellis (Associate Vice President for Research Compliance), John Graves (Faculty Council)

Agenda

AGENDA ITEM #1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Ladies and gentlemen, why don't we start. First item of business is Agenda Committee Business and that's Ted.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much, Michael. Let me begin by thanking those members of the Council for whom this will be the last meeting. Some of you will be transitioning off the Council this year and to the extent that that pertains to you, I would like to express my appreciation to you for your service to the Bloomington campus. This has been—well I'm not sure, people may have different views about it but it seems to me this has been a fairly interesting year to be

affiliated with the BFC. So, thank you to those who are leaving. I would also like to thank those of you who are finishing your first year of your two year term. You will be back next year. The only thing I can say to you is that it promises to be a year full of Gen Ed, so prepare yourselves for that.

MCROBBIE: All right, the second agenda item...

T. MILLER: No, no, no I'm just getting started Michael, I'm just getting started. [Laughter]

MCROBBIE: Oh, well...

T. MILLER: I would like to report to you that at the Trustee meeting, let me see, a week and a half ago now I think it was, the Trustees approved the admissions policy for Bloomington. So this is a policy that we had a good bit of discussion about over this year and I'm happy to report to you that the Trustees have approved it. They I believe are very pleased with this policy. All the Trustees representing all the different perspectives they have on the campus, I think are all genuinely pleased with this new policy. To John and to Bill who really were in the center of that activity, I think again, extending our thanks to you and to the members of the Education Policies Committee. It was a very very fine job.

A second policy that was approved by the Trustees was the Conflict of Commitment. This is a university-level policy, of course, but it applies to our situation in Bloomington. We now have an approved Conflict of Commitment Policy.

Last week at the UFC there was, you'll recall one of the agenda items was a Search and Screen policy. We had talked about that here at our previous meeting. The UFC did not approve a new search and screen policy. That's the fundamental message to you here today. So whatever searching and screening we're doing is going to be conducted under the existing policy. The policy that is under development I think is probably close to being approvable. Although my sense is that rather than try to have this policy focus, or kind of have a broad view focused on all senior executive appointments, the policy that we approved, the faculty approved, will probably be narrowed to focus on the senior academic administrators. The other thing is that we, I believe, the reason I say that we're close to approving something is that we've kind of gotten out of the era where people are jumping up and down on the tables about things that were in that search and screen policy. You'll recall there were certain elements of it that concerned all kinds of people. We appear to have gotten those out of there and we're now talking about rather minor details, I think, in the policy. So I think we're close to approving something but it will probably be narrower in scope than the thing we looked at here two weeks ago.

On our agenda today, item 7 is the general education item. You will note that we do not have an action item there. This will be a discussion. My own view is that we have made some significant progress in this area lately. Kelly is not so sure about that. She's a little skeptical but I think we've made a little progress. We do have some problems that we still confront and our purpose here today is to try to talk and really kind of gear us up for another effort at this next year. One of the things that is true about general education is that the Trustees of Indiana University are very, very, very interested in general education. They believe that the Bloomington campus in

particular, since we are the campus that really doesn't have a campus-level general education, they believe that Bloomington really needs one. I think they believe that for two reasons. One of which is that I think they believe it would be very good for the student body of the Bloomington campus for such a program to exist. That is to say, good in terms of facilitating progress towards degree. The other thing I think they are very interested in from this point of view is improving the relationships of the Bloomington campus to other institutions of higher learning in Indiana. They at least say that they are beaten up regularly as they go out around the state, over various problems that people have trying to interface with the Bloomington campus. So there are a couple of pretty basic reasons that brings their concerns to a pretty high level and they really are encouraging us to, as you read in their January 14th statement to the faculty, they are encouraging us strongly to work on this particular issue.

Now, you have at your place, underneath your agenda, there are two documents that constitute a report that we have looked at here for the last three years. This is the faculty composition report. You'll note, if you pick up the single sheet of paper, you'll see this is a campus-level document giving us head counts basically for appointees across the various academic categories in our personnel system. We have the counts for 2003, 2004 and 2005 and those are the years that the PeopleSoft environment has been functioning and so one of the things to note about this although it's not explicitly stated on the sheet, if you look at the full-time lecturer category, that would be roughly line 4 or 5 going down into the table. Full-time lecturers, there are now 153 full-time lecturers in Bloomington, 23 more than there 2 years ago. The percentage increase there is a little bit bigger than 17% if you would like to make a note of that. In the clinical category in the next line, there are now 91 clinical appointees in Bloomington, 13 more than there were two years ago when they were 78. That's also roughly a percentage increase of a little more than 16%. Those percentage increases of course are substantially larger than the percentage increase of the tenure eligible faculty. This is the principle reason why this report is being produced; we're trying to track the composition of the faculty, particularly the key non-tenure-track categories versus the tenure categories.

The second document in this report is also a Bloomington campus report but it is broken down by schools, and also included in the report are the various responsibility centers that are in the campus. So you'll find information for all of the schools and for the College, you'll also find information for the Dean of Faculties office, which is one of the RCs on the campus and so forth. So this is information that you can take with you. Oh I'm sorry, and on the opposite side of the one page sheet, you'll see the student academic appointment report. This again is a Bloomington campus document. Various categories of student appointments, how many of them, where the appointments are held. So this is information for you as you consider the state of affairs in your own units. Hopefully it will be useful to you. One of the pieces of data that comes immediately off of these two sheets is that we have now roughly 1400 tenure eligible faculty in Bloomington and if you look at the Arts and Sciences number on the corresponding other sheet, it's 785 this year; roughly 800 out of 1400 tenure eligible faculty in the College. I mention that because that will be relevant when we come to discuss some of the issues in the Gen Ed document.

Well, next year, so looking forward to next year, what are the issues that at least I am interested in? Well general education is one of them. This is something that the Council will try to do something with. And then a second issue that is of particular interest to me has been for a

number of years, is the situation of the clinical appointments on the Bloomington campus. There's a corresponding document to our Bloomington campus sheet, there's a document like this for every campus. And if you look across those campus reports, and you look at the numbers of the clinical appointees across the other campuses, you'll find really a very different sort of pattern for what you find in Bloomington. It's very clear I think that the Bloomington campus is using the clinical appointment category in a way rather fundamentally different than the other campuses; although I think Indianapolis is maybe catching on to our approach and may be using it somewhat in that way. And this is something that is of concern to me. I went to a meeting, just to elaborate a little bit, I know we don't have a great deal of time, but I went to a meeting earlier in the fall. Ken had one of his meetings where it had all of the deans and the directors and I was invited to talk about what the Council was going to be dealing with this year and I had this one on my list, this clinical appointment thing on my list. And well, I was attacked by various deans on the campus. My dean in SPEA attacked me, the business school dean attacked me, because in those schools the clinical category is viewed as being an essential category. They can do things with the clinical appointment that they can't do essential things they feel.

At the same time, the Optometry school dean was sitting over on the side of the room and when it died down a little bit he told me that he hoped that the Council would in fact investigate the use of the clinical appointment because as far as he was concerned the Bloomington campus was turning the clinical appointment into a second class category of appointment and at his school, the clinical appointments, at least from his view, are really really important appointments and he does not appreciate the fact that across the campus, the clinical appointment is turning into something that isn't. This I think is one of the important issues confronting the faculty; it grows out of this faculty composition idea. Well, thank you very much. That is my report.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Thanks Ted. Let me just say two things. First, since we finish this agenda item and the next, we'll go straight down to business. I really would like to try, if we possibly can, stick to reasonably tight times to try and get through all of the business here.

T. MILLER: Did I take all more than five minutes?

MCROBBIE: I'm afraid you did.

T. MILLER: I'm sorry.

MCROBBIE: But I won't, so that will help there. I just wanted to also add my congratulations to those responsible for the development of the new admissions policy. I know that being at the last Trustees meeting, the Trustees really were extremely pleased and most complimentary to the BFC on all the work that was done in developing that policy and they said so publicly and privately. It was a great success as well.

AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Let's move on to questions and hopefully we can move through it that expeditiously to get on to the rest of the business. Any questions, yes, Dan.

MELAMED: Last academic year we talked a little bit about how desperately dangerous it is to cross Jordan Avenue as a pedestrian and we heard about conversations going on with the city of Bloomington about traffic report and that being the most dangerous intersection in Bloomington and it sounded like there might be some progress on fixing that situation. Is there any chance that could be taken up again?

MCROBBIE: I'd be happy to take that on notice and see if we can get a response as to what the situation is with that. It's fortuitous we have Vice President Clapacs with us and may be able to answer.

MELAMED: I'm not sure we need to discuss it here, it would be great if it's taken up somewhere though..

MCROBBIE: Yeah, sure, we'll take that on notice and see what we can come up with. Other questions?

HAWKINS: Since that was raised I will go along with my question or comment. Today as I was going to lunch and crossing from HPER over to the IMU, there was a large tractor trailer that tried to stop and talking to people in the little booth and one of the IU buses came along behind and was very impatient and he zoomed around him on the wrong side of the road and he came three feet from killing one of our students. I stopped and talked to the department folks in the little booth, I said "you need to turn his name in" and he said "we do it all the time, the police just ignore us". I was really appalled at the lack of consideration of our students. This student could not see the bus because of the big tractor trailer was there and this guy, he nailed it to get around him because he was impatient to wait. I think the disregard for our students is a real serious issue and the fact that nobody feels that they can take that to risk management and do something about it.

DAVILA: Did you get his number?

HAWKINS: Yes I did, 657 was the bus.

MCROBBIE: Again, it's fortuitous we have Vice President Clapacs with us today. Terry what would be, if Barbara could send you that information or what would you advice?

CLAPACS: Absolutely. The issue here seems to me would be to talk to the people who run the bus operation...

HAWKINS: They do and they ignore it.

CLAPACS: ... and then we'll deal with that person. A crime probably was not committed so the police could probably not do something with it. Frankly it's a practice that disturbs all of us and

it's a reason why 7th street is closed; because to diminish and keep down the amount of student-vehicular interaction that goes on in that part of the campus...

HAWKINS: But it was one of our buses.

CLAPACS: ... given that, we should talk to the people who run the bus operation and make sure that that driver is reprimanded.

MCROBBIE: Can you send that information sort of formally...

HAWKINS: Yes I will. This concerns me; you can tell that I'm still quite disturbed. I nearly saw a student die.

MCROBBIE: In some form in terms of a letter and put the number and everything and feed that into the system for action.

TERRY: As long as we have a new regime, Vice President Clapacs' comment reminds me of a continuing issue and that's the concern of the unsightly area to the north of the IU Auditorium, the closing of 7th street; the fact that those construction trailers are still there. Ken wouldn't do anything about it so may be you could think about doing something about it next year.

MCROBBIE: May be Terry and I can discuss that with Donna.

MCFADDEN: If I could clarify that I believe that it was probably Ken didn't do something about it, Ken made it clear that those trailers were there because the renovation for Theatre and Drama were still in some progress or may be they don't lack of progress but there are good intensions and although that is awesome, we don't want to see them there. That's the answer that Ken gave her last year. I don't know how we resolve that; they don't look great but we know why they are there.

HAWKINS: I think if you look at the meeting minutes, the very last time he spoke about it, he said they weren't because of budget reasons going to be able do the work on Theatre and Drama and he would have them removed, if you look at the minutes. He did say we would have to remove them, because I brought the agenda item up at that meeting.

DAVILA: I was one of the first that complained about that [laughter] and there are some blessings as Vice President Clapacs suggested that in cutting out some of this free flowing traffic that tears around campus and in that sense I think about it because I walk by there all the time. Not that I want an unsightly situation but I do like the fact that we are discouraging traffic flow that's aggressive and in a hurry as we all are through campus.

MCROBBIE: Ok that's pretty much the question answered, finished. Let's leave it there and move on to agenda item four.

AGENDA ITEM #4: IUB BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

MCROBBIE: Let's leave it there and move on to agenda item #4. This arose out of something I took on pretty soon after being appointed to the position; hearing a lot of concerns about the number of building projects may be not moving as fast as what people wanted. What I did was to meet with Terry and Bob and Neil Theobald. We all met to review where we were on the progress and at that meeting it became clear that there really are a lot of projects going on some which are for various reasons probably weren't moving as fast as we wanted but I think all of those were acted on and we got status reports on the other and then Neil meets now, I think, probably monthly if not more than monthly with Bob Meadows to review those projects and keeps me updated and then the four of us are going to meet little less frequently than that to review things.

I thought based on that list that we had, which I think had about a dozen major projects. Well, not major but a dozen sort of medium sized projects, that it might actually be useful for Terry and Bob to come along and actually present roughly, or at least give an overview of progress on those projects, which is what they are here to do. Terry.

CLAPACS: I'm starting to worry a little bit about the use of the word fortuitous in describing my presence here today but I will take it at that. Thank you for having us. It's very nice actually to be here. This is my 40th year at Indiana University and I have been here several times to talk to this group. The most recent visit was as your athletic director a couple of years ago and I must say to you that it's a lot more fun to be here today talking to you about something that has been a lifelong love and passion for me, not that athletics aren't a lot of fun, but actually I have considered myself to be extraordinarily blessed to have been part of thinking about the way this campus and all of Indiana University grows and develops.

Indeed we have a rich history here and just to take a minute or so before we get into this power point presentation that will specifically talk about projects, I think it's always a good idea to start with the biggest possible picture. And just a reminder that Indiana University having been founded in 1820, spent it's first 60 years in what is now the Kroger site in downtown Bloomington, at Seminary Square and moved out here in 1880 following a couple of very disastrous fires at that site. Under the leadership of David Starr Jordan, started what has become, and I say this without any reservation, the most beautiful campus in America and that's not by accident. We have had a lot of terrific people thinking about the way this place should develop and look and be taken care of and I have borrowed this position now for about 35 years and in about three years I'll hand it over to somebody else and hopefully we can continue to think about it in just the right way.

We've been blessed because we've had firms like the Frederick Law Olmstead firm come on to this campus and give us some guiding principles about how we should look. And by the way you should know, if you don't already, that the plan for the old campus down in Seminary Square was essentially to follow the Princeton University concept which was to develop a series of classroom buildings around the main building but when we moved out here in 1880, the idea then was to follow Jefferson's thinking and to develop along the lines of the University of Virginia, which is to construct buildings around a green open space, which for us has been Dunn

Woods in the original crescent which essentially was all constructed in that transition; from David Starr Jordan to William Lowe Bryan, we had the right kind of foundation. Clearly you can see that all the developments since then has been to the east and to the north and has followed that basic concept of protecting those islands of green that Herman called out in his many speeches and books, but to essentially create courtyards and green spaces for passive social interaction and gathering places for students and faculty to exchange ideas and thoughts and be part of this university feel and we've done that ever since.

When Herman was president, he decided that we should employ a master architect at Indiana University and that that architect should be given responsibility for determining the exact architectural style and building vocabulary, and for many years we followed that concept and employed the firm Eggers and Higgins out of New York, which was a great firm that the Jefferson Memorial among other significant projects. And a man within that firm, Ted Young, gave us leadership almost through the entire Wells Presidency and we have been the beneficiaries of that good thinking because we have a uniform campus. One that's uniform in style and building materials and landscape treatment. We went for a while without a master architect and then in about 1970, particularly when the Indianapolis campus ready to grow and we knew it would happen at an astounding pace, we selected a new master architect and that was Edwards Larrabee Barnes, of the Barnes Firm in New York. By the way, Barnes was 64 years old when we selected him as our master architect and he served the university for 22 years. So up into his mid eighties, but he would always remind us that Frank Lloyd Wright did the Guggenheim when he was 83. So we felt pretty good with his leadership and indeed he provided us with excellent leadership. Ed retired, passed away and it was his wish that his firm would not continue. He chose not to sell his firm or continue it and essentially closed his office.

And so we then selected the current master architect; a man named John Belle of Beyer Blinder Belle of New York who is giving us great advice and great planning expertise as we think about the way this campus and all of our campuses evolve and look. John Belle comes with wonderful credentials. You probably know some of his work; he was responsible for working with the Kennedy family to rehab Grand Central Station which has won many national awards. He's selected as the master planner for Princeton and he won the King competition to think through what the World Trade Center site should now look like and be. And although that project has taken on many political overtones, John's thinking was right on and he continues to do well by us today. The one project that he's done for us on the Bloomington campus is the addition to the School of Business; the component of the building that sits on the west side of Fee Lane and connects to the original school. And I think John did a good job in picking out and choosing the way that building ought to look.

He doesn't get all the architectural work, we've selected other architectural firms and Bob will mention those in a few moments. But we've selected other architectural firms to do the Multidisciplinary Science Building Phase I and II and think about what the Cyber Infrastructure Building ought to look like as we get on with that and when we get around to doing a new humanities building or a new building for SPEA, we'll select the very best firms in the country. We're blessed that the state of Indiana does not require us to only use instate firms but we do insist that when we hire firms from New York or Washington or Boston, that they partner with

instate firms so that we indeed continue to enjoy that privilege of being able to select the very right firm for us.

Lots of nice projects are happening right now. Many of you in the room were part of the debate that led to our decision to site the Multidisciplinary Science Building where it is today, which basically is a mirror image of Myers Hall, but as you all know, two thirds of that project is below grade so that we can continue to have a courtyard in that area when it's all finished and I think it will be wonderful building. Multidisciplinary Science Building Phase II will kick off, we hope, this fall and it too will set the course for a new science precinct on this campus that essentially will be bounded by 10th street, the railroad tracks, Walnut Grove and Indiana Avenue. And as science programs continue to develop and the needs continue to emerge, I think you'll see that whole area of the campus be just as exciting and just as interesting as this whole part of the campus is today.

You had questions, some were presented to provost McRobbie a moment ago and at the end of our talk we'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have and so we'll try to leave time. But let me introduce Bob Meadows to you who is our current university architect; the person on our staff who works closely with the master architect. His responsibilities are university wide so he spends a lot of time in Indianapolis, Gary, South Bend, Kokomo, Richmond and New Albany, but obviously he's housed here in Bloomington and the really good work, the really fun work, the exciting work, still occurs right here in Bloomington. This is indeed what we think of as the flagship, which has been officially designated as the flagship campus and it's where most of the really good action is today. Bob is a native Hoosier. He grew up in Greenfield Indiana but at that time there was no school of architecture in the state and so he went off to the University of Cincinnati and earned his degree and then did a masters degree at Columbia and then worked in the private sector in New York City for 25 years before we were able to lure him back to Hoosier land about 10 years ago when Ray Casati retired. Bob has a strong interest and a strong flare for historic preservation and so when projects come along like whether or not we should demolish an old fraternity house on 3rd Street, you should know that those are not done in a whimsical way. Those discussions are taken very seriously and thought through and there are economic considerations and then there is also doing what's right. In the end, we all work for a Board of Trustees and they have their own ideas too and that at some point, the decision comes through and then we all do our very best to make it work. And maybe Bob will touch on that but why don't we next ask Bob to walk us through a power point presentation of projects that are either ongoing or seriously contemplated for the Bloomington campus and then we'll pause and ask for questions and hopefully have a little time to just interact and discuss. So, Mr. Meadows, I'll turn it over to you.

MEADOWS: Thank you. Terry is always a hard act to follow; I mean he's been here 40 years. I have to say two things; the reason I'm here is that I have someone in Terry that I think supports the mission that I believe in and I believe in this campus. I think this campus is, as Terry said, it's one of the most beautiful campuses in the whole country and I've gone to a lot of different campuses. So it really is—I view myself as being a care taker, a steward of the campus and I will be here a short time. My predecessors' had been here 50 years and 50 years from now it will probably seem like a small amount of time. So hopefully what I, during my tenure here, will do some good things.

I'd like to just take you through, quickly, some of the projects. I'd like to start out, just quickly; this is the map of the Bloomington campus. It is referred to as our master campus use plan and in simple sort of terms, this is actually the way that the campus has been broken into precincts and you can see by the colors. This is generally the academic area, this is housing, this is recreation, research and service; which is this yellow, and then this is the teaching preserve. Terry talked about the arrangement; the historical arrangement, the old Crescent and the open space and actually the plan is the development, a continuation of that original vision and then the Olmstead brothers firm really carried that on in the sort of what we call the organic evolution of the campus; creating small open spaces, courtyards and we try to continue that today.

This is a map that is one of the products of John Belle's work. Terry mentioned him as the university master architect and this is sort of the culmination of some work that provost McRobbie and our office was involved with prior to his appointment to really look at the needs of the campus in regard to future research facilities. And you can see that what we've done or what John has done is take the information that was provided to him that was accumulated through interviews of many of you and some of the faculty, looking specifically at the research needs but then as it developed we started to see that there was other areas such as the arts and humanities, music, that were both sort of research and academic. So what we asked John to do was to develop a map that gave us some idea of where future possible growth might take place on this campus. And in simple terms, the crosshatching of these areas indicate new facilities, the solid colors indicate where some of those facilities are currently located. For example, School of Business is located here and you can see that the Music School, located here has some crosshatched areas in it which I will describe later. Actually, the framework plan that John prepared, this was presented to the Board of Trustees by John a couple of months ago and you can start to see the development of the campus. This is a very long range view of how our campus might develop. It starts to address what the total expansion program, total proposed parking and additional expansion square footage, which is in total, we have a potential on the side, we believe, of about 5 million 360 thousand square feet of additional space.

You can see in this diagram the development of some of the area I'll specifically mention, the area north of the railroad tracks. You'll see what Terry talked about here, which is the expansion of the new science quad. You will also see that there is the introduction of some additional roads. In this master plan we look at 10th street as being one way east and then we come around there's a new service building and this is a continuation of range road. You'll see that it crosses the bypass which is scheduled to be widened and the introduction of a new road coming through campus, and then this will be way to the west linking up to 14th street. So in fact, what we're trying to do is to develop a one pair on the north part of the campus and then out of that we would also introduce an overpass over the railroad track that would make Woodlawn the new sort of north-south main street bringing the new science precinct into sort of more or less the central part of the campus. 7th street is the east-west main street, and then Woodlawn would be the north-south main street. You can start to see some of the areas of proposed expansion and in fact the first building probably to be constructed in the new science precinct will be Multidisciplinary Science II and the Cyber Information Building is also being scheduled to be located there.

This is very long range and you can start to see that this is very far into the future. There's a removal of some of the current housing and it would be proposed at some point in the future that might be available for academic expansion -- again being aware of the period of time of circulating for class, trying to keep the academic rather compact in the center part of the campus and then some of the research areas a little bit further out in the edges of the campus. Actually this is an idea that came about actually in 1999; it was developed by John Belle. We asked him to look at the old university school and at that point it was looked at as a possible technology center or information precinct. The only reason for showing this is to say that it's resource. We still believe that the university school is beyond its life expectancy that those buildings even though we occupy them, eventually and very soon should be torn down and should be replaced and it's an opportunity. And as I mentioned this road, the continuation of the road coming through here, it will, we believe, make it much more a part of the campus and much less isolated.

Terry mentioned and I think many of you are aware of this is Simon Hall; we call it Multidisciplinary Science I. This is a building that's under construction, you can't miss it. You probably are happy that it's probably a little bit quieter now than it used to be. But this is an image of the way in which it's going to look. And as Terry said, its intent was to be a sibling to Myers and would be all in the family. The detailing, the architects are flat in associates and we are very pleased that they understood and took the detailing from Myers and translated into this new building.

This is the Multidisciplinary Science Phase II. This building is going to be located just north of 10th street. For those of you who are not aware of it, this is 10th, this is the Kelley School of Business, the graduate school, psychology, geology and the new building that we're proposing here will replace the current service building; a concrete block building located at the west part of this quad; the open space court yard. And here you can see two renderings and this is an aerial view looking down at the new building. Right here this is the Kelley School and here is, actually its psychology right here and this is geology. This is the new Cyber Building and I'll show you some better renderings of that building. This is a view looking up the existing Walnut Grove and it's a very realistic view. It was actually constructed from a photograph. This is the edge of geology, this is the edge of psychology and the plan is to remove the street and to bring the landscaping as it is in the central part of the campus to this new north precinct.

This is the Cyber Infrastructure Building. It's the building as I mentioned where the location is. It will be a building that will have numerous labs and office space and it will also have a major hardened machine room located in the lower level that will house all of our computer equipment.

CLAPACS: Back when we were less respectful, we called this the McRobbie Building, today it's the Provost Building.

MEADOWS: Now we're just going to get into the sort of nuts and bolts of the campus. This is the new garage, may be some of you have heard about it. It's to be located at the corner of Atwater and Indiana Avenue. It is a parking garage that its intent is to deal with the needs that the new Simon Building is going to generate. Our analysis has indicated that this part of campus is the portion of the campus least served. Even though we have parking areas, it has the greatest need and so this new parking garage will start construction this summer and hopefully if

everything goes correctly, it will be completed at the time that we occupy the new Simon Building.

We mentioned the relocation of the Service Building, the Service Building being now at the side of the new Multidisciplinary Science II. This is actually going to be a very utilitarian building and the only reason I mention it is it's the first time we've had an opportunity to do something called design build. And this was a very new way of approaching getting buildings like this and we think its application is service related buildings or parking garages or similar utilitarian buildings, but it really allows us to negotiate and to get the best price from a contractor builder team. And we're very excited about this, this is going to be an approximately a, when completed project, cost of seven million dollar building and it will be constructed in six months. And I don't think we would have been able to accomplish this in other way except [Tape 1, side A ends, some conversation lost] ... there was a lot of, I wont bore you with this, but there was a lot of discussion about how the university would comply with the new federal emissions regulations that are to go into effect by 2007 and there was an extensive study conducted. There were a lot of options looked at including outsourcing, including different kinds of coal and gas fired systems and it was concluded that the best solution for Indiana University is to actually replace two of the oldest boilers with new much more fuel efficient and energy efficient and emission efficient gas powered boilers and then to retrofit the three existing boilers with environmental pollution devices that will meet those standards.

Quickly, this is perhaps one of our smaller buildings that's going on and some of you may know about this building. This is a small research and teaching preserve building to be located out in the Griffy Preserve. I'm particularly excited about this because I think this is an opportunity if we choose; if the university chooses to go down this road, we will design it but if we choose to file it, it will be possibly a platinum leads building. Now, to understand the significance of this, this is the highest level of green building that can be achieved and there are to date are only 13 of these in the United States and we are on track right now. Whether we file it or not, the building will probably meet those standards. It's a small building and in simple kind of terms, it's got composting toilets, it's got portable take roof, it's using geo-therm from the pond or the lake that's just out in front of it and it's collecting rain water, it will close down; it's really sort of a neat building and it's a lab that will be located out in the teaching preserve.

One of the other exciting projects on this campus and perhaps some of you are aware of it. There was a gift by Mr. Hutton of about three million dollars to build a new Honors College and the Trustees have approved the site and the site is located at the corner of Woodlawn and 7th Street, just sort of diagonally across from Ernie Pyle and this is a project that we will be bringing to the Trustees, the design in this coming facilities meeting.

Margrave Apartments, a renovation of an apartment building that's located across from the school of optometry, my pointer is sort of wearing out but it's right there. This is being converted into laboratories and research. There's another building that is going to be hopefully built soon. It's a simple classroom office building that will be located-- right now we're looking at it being located across from Myers on 3rd Street. There's a vacant lot between two sorority houses and it's very much sort of in the style of the sorority houses but it will be approximately 35,000 square feet of just very simple functional office and classroom space. Another project that will be

in construction this summer is a new field hockey and upgrading of a practice field for soccer. This is located; this is the outdoor swimming area, 17th Street and Fee, Jordan and that is part of our compliance with gender equity.

Renovation of the former Beta house; this is a house that the university acquired and initially the thought was that we would tear it down because it is in the location for the new science area, it just works out that we can with minimal cost renovate this building and create offices as a temporary solution for the needs for Informatics. This is a project that we hope will be completed in time for occupancy in the fall of 07.

Just a quick overview of some of the long-range planning ideas, and these are ongoing conversations, there really is nothing final, but this is the music school and there's a huge huge need for practice space and office space for the school of music. We looked at the existing round practice building and sort of evaluated what it would cost to upgrade that building and it actually came very close to being the cost of a new building with the sort of result is that we still have a building that is not attractive or is does not really meet the needs of the school. This is actually, I don't know if you can sort of understand the sketch. This is sort of a view, this is actually Sycamore. You're looking over the top of that, Memorial Hall is right here and this is the round building actually sitting in this courtyard. This would be the construction of a new building to the north and phases that new building would go there, we'd remove the round building and then add the building to the south and then take the area that's right now speech and hearing and eventually in the program would be that we would add a third building there. But that's some of the thinking that is currently going on; is ways to expand the school of music.

Again, Terry mentioned sort of trying to maintain the character of the campus. I mean, these are some views that an artist created sort of looking into that courtyard. And our thoughts and the master planner's thoughts is to try to create a hearth place that the school of music can call home. This is a project, a law school addition. As many schools are confronted with the problem of expansion, the law school in this case very much wants to stay in its current location and one of the ways to deal with some of the needs is to expand. And this is an expansion that we're looking at right now that would be actually facing on 3rd Street. The current entrance on Indiana and then this would be an area that's—it's actually a courtyard.

New student housing; many of you have seen this plan or this project, is currently on hold. But it is designed for the site that we are going to demolish, the old Ashton Housing. That will be demolished this summer and this housing would be located on that site. It does actually take less of the site and we're keeping—we're maintaining some of the area to west for possible future academic growth. And lastly this is just a very small little project that we think is very exciting. The Wylie House is actually a part of the library and there again through a generous gift, there is going to be the ability to build a small barn. Hopefully it will be rather fit in and not so noticeable but it will be an education center for bringing elementary school children to participate and to be taught about the Wylie house. And those are the projects.

CLAPACS: Let me say that Bob's last portion of this presentation focused on very long term projects and was not meant to be a complete list of projects that are being thought about or even moving up the priority list. Indeed a new humanities building for the Bloomington campus is

coming along in a very quick fashion and was one of the highest priority projects that was passed on to the president's office this past year and as we get into the next biennium I'm sure it will continue to gain wind and it sails and be with us as a real project shortly.

You should know that the rules have changed a bit in the time that I've been here at least. It was once thought, in one of the key lessons that Herman would talk to us about was that we should not give on this point. And that is, that it's the state's responsibility to pay for the construction of academic facilities and we should make the state do that and then we would find ways on our own to construct facilities of performance or athletic or union buildings. But the state needs to live up to it's obligation to fund the construction of academic buildings and libraries. We no longer have that principle in place. The major projects on every IU campus today all have a generous amount of private gift support. The Multidisciplinary Science Building Phase I received thirty million five hundred thousand dollars in bonding authority from the state, but it is a fifty four million dollar project and so under Dean Swamy, another twenty million dollars was raised and in deed that's why we now call it Simon Hall and in deed that's why we really didn't want Swamy to go off to the University of Kentucky because he wasn't quite finished raising all the money for that building. So we're not going to let him go until he does that but the fact is that every major project is going to need some gift money in order to leverage that project with the legislature and that's real change in practice from where we were even ten years ago. But it's a fact of life today.

The other rule that has changed is that the state used to provide us with all of the operating dollars for academic building; the cost of heat, cool and clean that building was added to our budget by the state. The state no longer does that and so when a new building comes along it's not just the cost of construction. But you take the gross number of square feet and on the Bloomington campus you can multiply that by about seven dollars and you can see what the annual operating expense is. In the case of a high energy building like Simon Hall, it's more than seven dollars and suddenly we've got another million to a million and a half dollars that we need every year from the Bloomington campus and we take that right off the top because there's no other way to do it. And so the state has used that as a disincentive to all of us to think about how many new buildings we really want to build because we're not only having to pay for the cost but part of the cost of building, but we get to pay for the entire cost of operating that building.

May be we should just pause here Provost McRobbie and ask for questions. I think we've taken more than our thirty minutes and so...

MCROBBIE: We should probably bear in mind the items that we have Terry, we should probably may be just take one or two questions and may be if there's an opportunity to have a further discussion next year. But I know we've got some waiting matters we have to get through, so, Terry just a couple of questions.

WIGGINS: That's a very impressive list building projects you have going. I wonder what opportunities for faculty input exist on planning of these projects.

CLAPACS: Well there is a lot of opportunity. Let's take an example of the Multidisciplinary Science Building I; first of all we don't set the priorities, the priorities come through on this

campus, the Campus Priorities Committee and then go to the president. And so just in terms of what gets built, you'd have a lot of input. But then once a project has been funded, there's a planning committee and in this case as you know, there were many faculty scientists involved, led by Professor Lisa Pratt. But others like Jeff Palmer and representatives from chemistry and from all of the hard sciences that participate with the architect in planning that building. They come to all of the meetings and they sit through. They are the ones who make the final decisions in terms of how the buildings are configured and how they function and how they work. So it's a team effort. There's a consulting architect or the building designer, there are representatives from the University Architect's Office and then there are user representatives which in this case mean faculty representatives that stay with it all the way through. So every project, that's how it works.

MCROBBIE: One other question, yes Ted.

T. MILLER: Could I just say the project that I hear the most about is the so-called Humanities Building that you mentioned and it's very clear that there are lots of people on the campus who really think that that should be one of the highest priorities that we are pursuing. You suggest that it is a high priority that it's up on the top of the list and I think that's good. On the other hand, we had Curt Simic here the last time and I believe if I recall correctly, somebody asked him about the Humanities Building and he said that he had never heard of such a project. That it's not on the radar screen of the foundation and so if indeed the humanities building is something that we really want to pursue, I think we clearly need to get our act together if we are going to do it.

CLAPACS: Let me say that politically what really happens here is that every biennium we hope to get one major building project for the Bloomington campus. Politically, that's about all we can manage and I can't think of very many political sessions where we have done better. There have been but not recently. So it is indeed a campus academic mission and vision priority that needs to come from the campus. On the one hand we are hearing that we need a lot of research space and indeed the Trustees have said every biennium we should be asking for one new research building for IU Bloomington and one for IUPUI. And indeed if you look at our ten year plan, every two years are five buildings, there is research building on that list. There have been other projects like the renovation of the Wells Library that haven't gone anywhere. Curt would not hear of a project like that until we are ready to go to the state and ask for funding support and we know that if we go to the state and say here's a building that's going to forty million dollars and we want you the state to fund twenty five of it and we'll raise fifteen, then we'll go to Curt and say "Curt do a feasibility study and tell us whether or not fifteen is the right amount of money or whether we can really raise twenty or whether we can only raise five. And then Curt will do that but if it isn't the right moment for Curt Simic, but it's the right moment for Michael McRobbie, it's the right moment for me and it's the right moment for the Trustees.

MCROBBIE: Thanks Terry. We've really got to move on. I appreciate that very much and thanks to you both.

AGENDA ITEM #5: BLOOMINGTON PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

MCROBBIE: Let's move to agenda item 5; Professors Pryor and Reising.

T. MILLER: Could I just make a preliminary statement about item number 5; please note that this of course is a very substantial document. It was in front of us last time. The origins of the document came through a special drafting committee. The Dean of Faculties staff had their hands all over this document. Our Student Affairs Committee has reviewed it thoroughly. We do have a new sheet of amendments to the document. Perhaps we could have some explanation for what that's about. But my point is that we've had a lot of—a lot of eyes have been on this document before it has come to us. Thank you.

PRYOR: Thank you Ted. Again, I won't stroll to the front given that time is short. The comments and amendments that came to us after presenting this to you last time, one during the meeting that if you look at the back of this yellow sheet, so you have two documents; procedures for the Bloomington campus which is thick and meaty and a yellow double sided sheet that's entitled amendments to circular B37-2006. So the amendments really pertain on the front sheet there to ensuring that when this code is applied to graduate students, there are appropriate representation from the graduate student body on the committee that reviews it. And then on the second sheet the major change is that it's just an articulation. Actually the policy that in scheduling meetings over the hearing panel that will be an effort made to avoid conflicts so that before hand the faculty on that hearing panel will know the students' names so they have the opportunity to say it's inappropriate for me to be on this hearing panel. Other than that the document is as we first presented to you and remember we're asking for two endorsements from you and we will insist upon them. I'm free until ten o'clock so no rush from my perspective. And that is that you endorse the document as it stands but you allow us in the fall to go back and just make sure that if there's any further administrative change here on the Bloomington campus, we can just replace president with provost as is appropriate. So we're asking for an endorsement as it stands but also flexibility that we can modify as appropriate given our involvement in such a structure.

MCROBBIE: Discussion, no discussion?

PRYOR: Nothing here. Oh, I should say, it's actually Dean Freeman who's sitting back here and who's been so very important in this process. So, all questions and criticisms should actually be directed to him.

MCROBBIE: If there's no discussion Professor Pryor do you want to move that motion.

PRYOR: Oh yes I'd like to move that you approve the document as it stands and also the additional motion would be that you allow us to make purely changes that pertain to administrative structure.

MCROBBIE: Second?

TERRY: Second.

MCROBBIE: Ok we have a formal motion in front of us, any discussion? Okay, being no discussion, I'm prepared to put the motion, all those in favor of the motion please signify in the usual way "aye" [laughter] you had trouble remembering. All those against please signify by saying none. It seems to be carried anonymously. Thank you, it catches us some time too, well done.

AGENDA ITEM #6: AMENDMENTS TO THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY CONSTITUTION

MCROBBIE: Amendments to the *Bloomington Faculty Constitution*, Ted?

T. MILLER: This document reflects proposed changes to the *Bloomington Faculty Constitution*. Now this of course is something that will have to be approved by a vote of the faculty on the campus after approval by the BFC. So a part of this document focuses on constitutional changes and then starting at the bottom of page two going on, there are some changes to the by-laws of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Those bylaws of course are under the control of the BFC itself. So if we were to approve this document as it stands here today, the bylaws changes would go into effect immediately. The constitutional changes would require a vote of the faculty. Just exactly when we would have a vote of the faculty is not exactly clear because there are a few other constitutional matters that probably also need to be considered and so the actually vote of the full faculty may be put off until toward the end of the fall semester next year, until we can kind of get everything together that we want to send out.

But nonetheless one of the constitutional changes is one that we certainly want to have a sense of the council over because this is in the middle of page 2. There's an amendment to section 5.5 of the constitution which basically says something about who is supposed to preside over the Bloomington Faculty Council meetings. What this language says is that the president and the provost shall have shared responsibilities for presiding at meetings of the council. The president shall preside for at least one meeting each semester. So the idea that's in here is that provost would normally be the presiding officer of the Bloomington Faculty Council meetings but the president since he is now the chief executive officer in Bloomington would come once a semester, preside over of the meeting so that we would actually be able to lay our eyes on that person.

MCROBBIE: Do you want to proceed with a motion here?

T. MILLER: Yes, this comes from the Agenda Committee. It's a motion from the Agenda Committee and I would move that this be approved.

MCROBBIE: Second?

BRADLEY: Second.

MCROBBIE: Discussion?

TERRY: I just have a question, I think probably for Ted and this is not the place to resolve this issue but I want it this under some consideration. This is one of these documents that define the faculty as one of the people with tenure related appointments. Are we still working on how we provide representation for our non-tenure-track faculty colleagues?

T. MILLER: There is some consideration of that issue in the Faculty Affairs Committee and I think that is one of the issues we want to try to deal with before we decide ultimately to have the full faculty vote on this document.

TERRY: But that then might require an amendment in section 1.1 depending on what they do, right?

T. MILLER: Yes. And we will probably see most of these amendments on the constitutional side again before it's sent off to the faculty for a vote, along with the other things that will be in that package.

MCROBBIE: Other discussion? People must be very keen to get to the party. Any other discussion at all? Well if there's no discussion, once again I'm prepared to put the motion, all those in favor please signify by saying aye, against. It's carried anonymously as well.

AGENDA ITEM #7: GENERAL EDUCATION: PROGRESS AND OBSTACLES

MCROBBIE: Due to the alacrity of which we've passed the last two motions, we're almost back on schedule. So now we move to the Gen Ed discussion. Ted is going to start this discussion and then I think Bill and John Carini are going to comment as well before we open the discussion up. Ted.

T. MILLER: So the presentation here today is called Progress and Obstacles. About a week ago I went to a meeting of the Educational Policies Committee thinking that we had finally sort of solved the problem of general education and that it was all falling into place and everything was going to be great and we were going to be able to come here today and have a vote and go onward to glory. When I arrived at the meeting Bill Wheeler informed me that there was a real big problem that had arisen over night and that's been sort of typical in our considerations of general education. It's been kind of an on and off again thing. Well, for this meeting, the Agenda Committee discussed what we should try to do and basically we decided—initially the idea was that we were going to have something that we can actually vote and the Agenda Committee decided not to do it because it was clear that there were some issues that had come up;

disagreements. Some serious disagreements and we just really didn't want to have at this last meeting of the year a big fight in the faculty council over this matter.

So, the Agenda Committee charged me to go to talk to the College administration and it was really the College administration that had some issues with the latest drafts of the document. So I went last Friday and talked to Swamy, I talked to David Zaret, I talked to Catherine Larson.

What you have in your packet here today is a draft of the March 31st – an amended draft of the March 31st version of this Gen Ed. document. The March 31st document was the one that we had here two weeks ago. In my discussions with the college deans we came to an agreement about certain issues that, in my view anyway, were issues that were really in a way dividing the schools on this particular question. So we came to an agreement about certain things and I went back and Kelly and I kind of worked over the March 31st document. Amended it in effect into the form that you have in front of you and I then sent that back to the College folks for their review to see if that would kind of get us past the problem that we were having.

I'd just like to review the two amendments to this that seem to me to be fairly important and which solve some basic problems of view across the various schools of the university. Number one is in what was called technicality number five. That's on the second page of the document, on the back of that first page. Technicality number five you'll see in this version of the document is struck out. The College deans agreed that this particular provision of the document was not necessary so they are in agreement to striking this particular page or this particular section and this is something that in all of the other schools that I'm aware of, there were some real concerns about this particular provision of the document. So there appears now to me to be agreement that that particular provision should be struck.

A second issue that was of real concern to the College administration was this Campus General Education Committee and the issue for the Campus General Education Committee was, at least from the College's point of view, was that they wanted to have a proportional representation. The membership of the committee would have a proportional representation based on the faculty on the campus. So we go back to our little report; the campus faculty composition report. Eight hundred out of 1400 faculty members on the campus are College faculty members. Roughly that would be the proportional structure of the Campus General Education Committee. That is something that the College administration feels very strongly about. They do not like these committees that they now sit on where each school gets one vote and I certainly can appreciate why they don't like that. So the proportional representation was important but of course from the point of view of the other schools, if we have simply proportional representation, what that means is that the College can come in and approve anything that it wants to approve. So the other schools were concerned about a strict proportional representation scheme. And so the language that's in here, this is again on that second page, up at the end of technicality number one. There's sort of a voting structure here that requires that before the campus education, the Campus General Education Committee can approve any course to be put on the Gen Ed list, there actually has to be positive votes on that course from faculty across a number of the units on the campus. It just won't do for the College faculty representatives to vote yes and then everybody else vote no, that won't get it on the list. There have to be votes from across some of the other units and support as well. And then in order to disapprove a course going on the list, a

simple majority vote would suffice. So that's the structure that the college Deans felt would work for them and I think it will work for a variety of other people as well. So these were the two items that from my point of view really kind of separated the schools as they have thought about how this Gen Ed business is going to work.

So the College administration approved that. There was a third amendment that I put in this document that I sent to Swamy and that's on page one. You'll see down sort of in the middle, a little bit below the middle of page one, there's a struck out phrase "as outlined below" and an inserted "taking the outline below as a starting point". As the Educational Policies Committee has considered this Gen Ed program through the year, we have always felt that it would really be next year that we would really get serious about what the categories or what the structure of the general education program is going to be. The stuff that's in here now at the bottom of page one, these seven categories that are there now, have really been sort of something that's been holding a position for what the ultimate structure would be. We never intended that this structure would be the final structure. Well, it could be but we wanted to have—we know that there are people around from Informatics who have ideas about this or people from HPER who have ideas about this because there's lots of ideas about general education and we need a process that's going to allow those ideas to be discussed and ultimately come to some conclusion. So our idea, the Faculty Council idea was that we really weren't intending to approve a general education structure now. Well this is the point where the College administration just is not comfortable going forward. They do not want to go forward with a document which doesn't definitively specify what the campus general education program should be. So that's really why we're not voting here today. We're not voting on this amendment today because the faculty doesn't feel it's ready to adopt this particular structure and the college administration really wants a structure identified that will be the structure before it kind of says "alright we're comfortable with this". So that's kind of where we are.

My sense is that—if you think back historically over this general education matter; we've had various initiatives over ten years trying to develop general education. I think it's fair to say that in all of the previous episodes, the thing that finally did the effort in was conflict between the schools. I have a sense that we've kind of dealt with the inter-school issues here. I'm not sure that we have so much conflict between the schools at this point. Our problems right now are; within each school, if we do adapt the general education program, what kinds of adaptations will the faculty and the administration make to accommodate that. Those are I think are sort of the problems that confront us. So as we kind of close off this episode and thinking about Gen Ed and thinking forward to next year, it seems to me one of the real focal points has got to be to try to engage the school faculties or at least their policy committees seriously in thinking about how this general education program is going to affect their curriculum and how they can accommodate those effects.

As indicated earlier, we are being encouraged very strongly by the trustees to put something like this in place. They have very strong feelings about it and I think many of the faculty on campus are quite sympathetic to doing this and I think we have made some progress this year and I'm hoping that next year we can kind of seal the deal.

MCROBBIE: I think Bill and John wanted to speak but if I can just ask you to limit your comments to just a minute or so. We have things with Swamy and I know that he wants to speak as well. So if you guys can make any comments you want to make, may be Ted said everything that needs to be said. Bill or John?

CARINI: Ted that was very well summarized. The one thing I would add is that the Trustees charged the faculty to develop a general education policy and so far the faculty as a whole has not had a lot of input into this. Partly that's our fault but it has a lot to do with the short period of time we've been working within at the end of the year here. The idea of proceeding next year is that all of us are going to be responsible for this policy and all of our colleagues of course as well so I hope that we can take possession of it next year.

WHEELER: There is so much that could be said that I won't say anything at all.

MCROBBIE: Let me welcome Dean Subbaswamy who I know wants to make some comments and welcome David Zaret too.

SUBBASWAMY: Ted Miller, Provost McRobbie, distinguished members of the Bloomington Faculty Council, thank you very much for allowing me to address you. The topic here is General Education: Progress and Obstacles. After I finish my remarks you will decide whether I contributed to the progress or I'm the obstacle. If the latter you should lament the fact that I'm leaving. Former, if the latter, you should celebrate the fact that I'm leaving.

I just want to make one comment in response to what Ted Miller. By the way, I also want to compliment the members of the Educational Policies Committee who have been worked so hard really, so diligently, around the clock it would seem, to try to get some agreement and move forward and I think we're even closer than what Ted Miller thinks I want to just make one point along that before I just make my general comment and observations. And that is with the last amendment that emendation that Ted Miller talked about, of saying General Education "taking the outline below as a starting point." That is so vague that if you voted on something, if I were voting on it, I wouldn't know what I was voting on whereas if you adopted the framework, you basically adopted it and the next year's task would be simply deciding what courses do and do not belong on that catalogue of approved general education courses. It seems to me that that phrase really basically makes the vote entirely moot because I don't think you've voted on anything. And so that's basically, we are that close, I believe, to adopting a general education framework.

With that said, I just want to make some observations because a lot of things have been attributed to the college and while I can't speak for the entire faculty of the college, I certainly have taken a leadership position in shaping the opinion of the college, at least those who would listen to me, and in that context I thought I would just make some observations and hopefully that will be constructive as you move along in this process. Some general principles it seems to me are obvious. A broad-based education is important for all undergraduates regardless of their major or professional aspirations. This is both because academic fields and professions are changing so rapidly and for effective participation in an increasingly complex global society.

Second, a universal general education framework has several benefits; it gives all IUB undergraduate degrees a distinctive brand with regard to breadth. It also minimizes lost time for students who change majors across schools as their interests shift, improving time to degree. I think we can agree on those. I think we can also agree that at a research university, an academic unit which is a primary home of a particular discipline or field and is engaged in scholarship and pedagogy in that field, is in the best position to ensure curricular quality and rigor and should have the fiduciary responsibility to offer or oversee the curriculum in that field. Good stewardship of fiscal resources mandates avoidance of unnecessary duplication of course offerings.

Five, any potential adverse fiscal consequences of changes in general education requirements on schools and departments must be dealt with by the administration in responsible ways. And the sixth general principle it seems to me is adoption of a universal general education framework requires mutual respect and mutual trust among faculty from different academic units.

The college's role. I want to observe that the college is not a professional school. Research and education for enlightenment and citizenship are the primary missions of the college. As such, it houses the primary expertise in what are commonly regarded as elements of a broad-based general education.

Number two, at IU as elsewhere, the college's Bachelor of Arts degree is conceived of as a broad-based liberal arts degree and the second courses in most fields are built on the assumption of broad introduction to various fields from the first course which generally satisfies general education requirements. Thus more narrowly constructed general education courses severely constrain the B.A. degree programs. From an inter-school transfer perspective, therefore, the college has a vested interest in the nature and content of courses that are part of the general education curriculum.

Number three, the college asserts its lead role in the general education curriculum based on its express mission. This is the mission given to the college by the university. Proportional representation on the General Education Oversight Committee as contained in the March 31st version of the memo, of the agreement, is in fact a reflection of the college's lead role.

Number four, if a professional school is thought of as a mini college of arts and sciences, concerns about unnecessary duplication and good stewardship of resources, then raise in my mind at least, the question of why that school exists as a separate independent entity in the first place.

The process for and the impact of a universal general education requirements—this is it, I'm almost done. Number one, the simpler the requirements, the more universal they are likely to be. Conversely, the more complex the requirements, the more exceptions are likely to be sought and granted—and this is true for transfer as well, from students coming from community colleges and or other campuses. So I think that a normal distribution that's pretty much universally and commonly accepted I think is the way to go and also the argument about the B.A. degree being a generalist degree also argues for having the categories that are currently contained.

Number two, adoption of a meaningful universal general education framework will, in my opinion, I think it's obvious, require every undergraduate school and college to make necessary and appropriate changes to its own degree requirements. No school nor the college can be totally immune from the changes and this is where it seems to me that to not have the framework first and try to start thinking about what changes the degree requirements will have to change is to get the cart before the horse. So I think that the framework first has to be established and then the schools have to go on and say okay, what does this mean and how do we then make the changes that are necessary and which changes are acceptable and which changes are not acceptable, some may in fact mean that flexibility for students may be limited, but so be it.

Number three, all important stake holders should be involved simultaneously, not sequentially and iteratively in developing a universal framework. Associates and assistant deans for undergraduate education, university division advisors, representatives from school-based curricular committees, and the BFC Educational Policy Committee should all conduct a direct dialogue in a structured retreat environment to come up with the framework rather than just interpret it and assert that so and so said such and such, it seems to me a direct dialogue is helpful. I think we've gotten to that point after many many iterations and a direct dialogue between Ted Miller and the college deans and I'm sort of disappointed that you're not voting on a slightly modified version that we had nearly come up with.

Number four, once a meaningful universal framework is adopted, that's I believe sequentially each undergraduate school would have to make the necessary and appropriate changes as I said before. Even with the transferable general education [End of Tape 1, Side B, some comments lost] ... there's no alternative to that. If you want to become a physics major when you are...switching from an English major to physics major when you are a junior, you better back track and take calculus courses if you haven't done that. So there's no substitute for excellent advising and a universal general education requirement is not a panacea for time-to-degree for everyone, it depends on what choices you make. Those are really the positions that the college has taken consistently from the days of COUGAR, for those you who remember, it has never been about power and control, it has always been about these principles and I think that any new dean would still adhere to these same principles. Thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Swamy. Discussion, since this is an item for discussion? Bob.

KRAVCHUK: I think that no one would disagree with much of what Dean Subbaswamy has had, that there is however something to be said for some element of choice involved. I'm thinking specifically of the question of the so called duplicative courses across the curriculum. As co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, I'm essentially concerned with the efficient use of resources and yet when I look across markets in the United States and elsewhere, I see the proliferation of magazines, media outlets, books, crafts, beers; one of my favorite expanding markets, and in visiting the former Soviet Union fifteen years ago, there was just one beer. It was called pivo, Russian word for beer, that's what you had. But now there are many more choices. Good things can come in many different kinds of packages and so some limited degree of choice perhaps is useful. I can't speak for my school but I can tell you what/how they feel about where we are. We want students who take broad liberal arts courses in the college; we want students who can organize their thoughts such that they can put a coherent paragraph together on a page.

We want students who are not intimidated by a small piece of mathematical analysis that you might want to use to embellish lecture. But we would also like the possibility of having some students come over and take one or two courses. Not many, but one or two courses in SPEA that might qualify as a Gen Ed course and not be penalized necessarily for it. And I think we're moving in that direction and I feel actually quite sanely about the future, about the next semester's work. I know the EPC will be busy over the summer as well.

MCROBBIE: Herb?

TERRY: I have a question, I guess for Ted. Do you think we could still adopt the general education requirement in time to have it take effect with the freshman class of 2011?

T. MILLER: Well the time frame that we've been talking about is—well, the Trustees have given us; their idea of the deadline is the fall of 2008. They would like to have something approved by the fall of 2008. Now, as Swamy said, there are going to be lots of consequences of approving something like this. The degree programs in every school are going to have to be evaluated and examined and try to figure out how it's going to fit. The PeopleSoft, the advising stuff is all going to have to be reworked; it's going to take a lot of time to kind of get this in place. And our document basically has 2011 when the new admission policy takes place, as the time when this is going to be implemented. Well, sitting at it right here is 2006, it seems to me like we ought to be able to do that by 2011, but it's just an intuition on my part.

TERRY: In that case, I'm concerned the Trustees would perceive our failure to adopt anything as an indication of they are free to adopt something.

T. MILLER: No I think they have given us a deadline of 2008 in the fall. So I'm not too concerned about that. I think the fact that the topic general education appears on our agenda is a sign to them that we are working on this. This is a very basic change in culture for this campus, they understand that. I've made that point to them as forcefully as I can. We have never done anything like this before in the history of the Bloomington campus, so this is a real big change and they understand that this is going to take some time.

MCROBBIE: Yes, let me back that up. I've had the same discussion with the Trustees and what Ted says is exactly right. What we indicated was that we were proceeding towards getting close to a sort of framework, which is what this is, and then the details were going to be worked out in the next academic year and they understand that and I believe they were comfortable with that as well. Bill?

WHEELER: First, I heard Dean Swamy's mention of a retreat with a great interest; I have to come for that, in the fall or something like that.

T. MILLER: If you bring the donuts Bill.

WHEELER: Okay, I think the coffee and donuts; I'll ask someone else to do that.

MCROBBIE: I think something like that is an excellent idea.

WHEELER: But I think its important today for us to keep ourselves on discussion, as indicated by the agenda and Dean Swamy's letter inside the College itself. There are many issues here. Some of them are deep, there are many issues to be talked about here and I think we should focus on discussion today and answer any questions that people may have as to why various parts are as they are and that's the most thing that we can do here today.

MCROBBIE: I think there was someone up there asking a question; question, any other questions and comments, discussion?

YAEGER: Well I had actually come with a specific motion in mind. But since we're not going, I think I'll just put a point of discussion. I come on *CDE funds*, new to this; in fact, substituting for someone on the council. My point of view is very different I suppose and I have neither the wisdom nor the baggage associated with having been here a long time. I am genuinely concerned about a couple of things in here and have a sort of a full unanimous backing from the faculty of our school of Informatics about the—a Couple but about one issue in particular. I have my own issues but the one in particular that the entire faculty wanted me to express is that we are uniformly in favor of the general education policy. Everyone agrees that this is a great idea and for exactly the reasons that Dean Swamy put forward. But in the Dean's words, our students are going to be making decisions in an increasingly complex society and the nature of that complexity, like it or not, is often a technical one. The document already addresses this. It makes a point that we're going to be producing citizens that have decisions. They put technical, political, social and ethical applications of scientific knowledge and yet nothing in here addresses technical competency in our students. And with no exceptions, we felt that this was an important specific area that needed to be addressed. Every student that we graduate without technical competency kind of diminishes the value of our degree and we are producing citizens that have to go out and face these decisions without a proper background. Well, lots more to be said.

MCROBBIE: Let me, when I get a chance, I'd like to back that up. One more comment then I really—we should close this so we can get to the next agenda item.

ROHWER: ___ on behalf of students is that if you take a look at the four year graduation rates here, it is incredibly low and as you move along on this, I hope that you move quickly because it affects, it takes years off their lives that they have to spend taking extra courses. I hope you appreciate that as you move along; just how impactful it is on the students today.

MCROBBIE: Let's finish the debate so we can get on to the agenda item, I can give Julie and Professor McFadden a chance to comment on Annual Diversity. All the input will obviously be taken into account. I think the idea of the summer schools is a good one. Sorry ___ [laughing] the idea of a retreat is a good one and we'll look into how to do that. Obviously there's a lot of dialogue going on and will continue. Thank you to everyone for their heroic efforts in this. It's a remarkable progress.

AGENDA ITEM #8: ANNUAL DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT

MCROBBIE: Professor McFadden do you want to start.

MCFADDEN: Yes, thanks in particular to the BFC for along Julie to come in as is always important each year to talk about the work at the office of Affirmative Action. What you'll hear from Julie today will be a report which by implication talks also about the valuable work done in the office of Affirmative Action. The one point I want to make before we hear from Julie is that all of us are committed to diversity and affirmative action and I think a place that we in particular have the opportunity to make that happen is with committees such as this. The BFC, other committees we serve on where it's very important that we nominate people and to our personal relationships with people on campus, we make sure that this committee and other committees that we are on continue to expand in diversity. So thank you and now I'll turn it over to Julie.

KNOST: Thank you for the last few minutes at the last meeting. I'll try to be quick but thorough. Everyone would have received a more complete report that was passed out. Also I'd like to call your attention if you want more of these. This is a nice brochure that we put out on teacher student relationships that cover some important issues and if you call my office we can send you hundreds of them, we've got many of them. Finally I also want to tell you something else that's available that I found really exciting and that is Diverse Magazine which used to be called Black Issues in Higher Education. It's changed its name, there's a little bit more breadth to it. Just in it's last issue published, and again I will send you these; a wonderful interesting list. They gave out the Arthur Ashe Awards which is student athlete awards and it lists by team. These are only students of color, they have to have a 3.2 and they have to have both athletic and academic success and it lists by team, by individual, by GPA, by school and by major and it's like 20 pages.

In terms of recruitment for graduate students in particular, this is an incredible resource. This is where I feel like we have to make our efforts. And that is, recruitment doesn't just happen. So, I will caution, we have got to be careful about violating NCAA rules in terms of recruitment. But start with the list and then go from there. It's primarily juniors and seniors that are listed. In terms of progress on looking at the faculty, what I like to see and what I think everyone would like to see is steady progress. On the data provided for you, Ted had asked me if my numbers are a little bit different than the ones he gave on the academic report. We count only fulltime faculty and we're looking at tenure, tenure-track, primarily definition of faculty and librarians. The fulltime faculty currently is at 1380. This was an increase of one last year. This does include administrators in this count so that if you have a faculty appointment it would be included. The total minority faculty was set at 15.3% and that includes people who identify as African American, American Indian, Asian American, a new category that was added last year; Native Hawaiian, which we had no one identify, and Latino or Latina. And I'll give you the breakdown in those categories in a minute. The increase of minority faculty last year was 5% and for women faculty it increased by 4%. Women faculty now make up about 30% of the faculty. That's quite an increase over in 1997 it was 23%. So there has been a very steady progress on gender issues. The total minority librarians remain the same at 11%.

So giving you some breakdown then, I could tell you about non-tenure track faculty but I think I'm going to bump over that and talk about our new hires. This information that you are receiving is our current faculty as of October of 2005. There were 24 fewer faculty hired last year than the previous year. That's a lot but the previous year we had almost a hundred new hires, this was 79. It was a particularly robust year; hire year. I can tell you right now looking at, and I don't know the exact number because I don't know how many offers are out, we'll get accepted and then come to actual fruition in this year, our numbers look done again in terms of hiring. I would expect that they will be low. There were 8 fewer minority faculty hired in 2005 than 2004. However they still accounted for 22% of the new hires and women represented 39% of the new hires in the past year. Most hiring continues to occur at the assistant professor rank. There were four librarians' hires, all at the assistant librarian rank and that was three women and one man and there were no minority hires.

Promotions are another area that we track carefully. There were 37 total promotions last year. The distribution is that there were 20 from associate to full. Of that 30% were women and 10% were minority. From assistant to associate, 33% were women and there were zero minority. The librarians from assistant to associate there were 2 promotions and both were women and there were no minority. I'm going to get to the librarian situation in a second because it's kind of an interesting one.

Retirements is the other thing that's happening and that's why it's very interesting to think about the composition of the faculty we are hiring because there were 40 total retirements last year. In the last three years there's been 117 retirements, is that right, I need to double check. This year I just pulled out the numbers and I don't again have the absolute exact number but it's looking like there will be 28 faculty retirements this year and 3 librarians. Of that, last year out of the 40 total there were 10 women and no minorities that retired. It's clear that our retirements are basically whatever gains we're getting and hiring we're losing very quickly and retirements. Other area of concern is resignations. There was 37 total resignations last year; 12 women, 8 minority. There have been a 106 resignations over the last 3 years. And last year what I did is tracked the women and minorities that were identified as having resigned to see reasons. The reasons were primarily seeking better positions—obtaining better positions, not seeking them. The details are in by department and by reason in the report.

Another big issue is spousal issues and that is, people that are leaving to attain two jobs rather than one or where someone is on a non-tenure-track appointment, here as a spouse can now receive a tenure-track appointment at another place. And one was a tenure issue. There were 20 resignations at the assistant level and 4 were women and 6 were minority. Among librarians, there were resignations; 2 at the full level and one at the assistant level.

To give you an idea of the profile of the tenure-track faculty, the total tenure-track faculty again only increased by one. There was a—the distribution; I'm trying to skip over some staff here so that we don't run into it too many times. The distribution of African American faculty is at 4.4%. This was a 33% increase over 12 years. However, you need to look at the numbers because we're still looking at relatively small numbers. For the first time 4% of the total faculty was African American and 4% of the senior faculty level was... that's good. I mean, that means that we're not just hiring assistants and either they are not being tenured or they are leaving. That we have

really increased on our rank issues in that category. Also the Hispanic/ Latino, I use Hispanic/ Latino because list them as Hispanic in our affirmative action report. Our 3.3% of the total faculty, the Asian faculty is 7.2%, American Indian population always fluctuates between one and three to five and the Hawaiian as I said were zero. The female representation was an increase from 1993 when there were 23% to 2005 where there 30%.

Among librarians, one thing that's highlighted in this report is that we have had zero percent minority librarians at the librarian level for 5 years and I know there are a lot of librarians on this council. So this is a good example in which it's very specific and recruitment is very important and hiring is going on and clearly you can identify a particular group that we could have an impact on especially since we have a library school here as well. But 5 years is a long time. On the concerns that come out of this year's report, retirements are going to continue at a high level which will always pause at our increases. The rank distribution, better promotions are clearly an issue. Again, we're lagging behind especially for minority faculty members and promotion to full. Among the librarians we need to be looking at particularly into the full librarian category.

The other thing I'd like to call attention to is that our distinguished ranks also have almost no minority representation. At the distinguished rank level I think the only minority we have is a—this is not titled, the Rudy professor doesn't count. Meaning they are a part of that rank but they are revolving. The distinguished rank, David Baker, I believe is our only distinguished person and clearly again this is something that we need to look at and ask why.

MCROBBIE: Julie I need one minute—we have one minute left.

KNOST: And that's it.

MCROBBIE: Masterful.

AGENDA ITEM #9: STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MCROBBIE: Thank you very much, I just—under agenda item 9, because from where I sit, the clock is not quite 5:30, can I just draw your attention. You should have a copy with your papers, a report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee that Bob and Herb co-chair. They may want to say just 45 seconds worth of comments to it. Let me thank them by the way for the incredible work they did. This is an extremely hard working committee who's work is quite superb, Herb or Bob.

TERRY: I will call your attention to the figures in here. One thing you can see is our task is daunting we received a request for \$12.7million worth of provost fund money. We had \$1.8million to distribute, which we recommended to the provost at his distribution. I will note to you that this was the last substantial list to deal with in part because on its way out of office, Ken Gros Louis made some commitments. We were not consulted on those. We wouldn't necessarily disagree with them but we were not consulted and that reduced the amount of money that was left for us to look at this year. We did again this year indicate to the provost that we supported some efforts that appeared to be urgent to deal with fiscally distressed units. We did that last year

with regard to enrollments service and this was regards to other units and basically this is reported primarily for those who as Ted said at the beginning will be cycling off the campus—off the BFC. We will give a more detailed report in the fall at which time we'll tell you what Provost McRobbie did with our recommendations.

MCROBBIE: Thank you Herb. Bill you've got about 10 seconds.

WHEELER: I think we should conclude this year by giving a round of applause to Ted Miller who has given us superb leadership this year (applause).

T. MILLER: Thank you very much; we're going to have a party ha?

MCROBBIE: Okay, we'll see you all at the party and we can repeat the round of applause for Ted there. Thank you, we'll see you at the party in half an hour.

Meeting Adjourned.