

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
September 26, 2006
University Place Conference Center
Indianapolis
1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. (EST)

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Simon Atkinson, Charles Bantz, Jacqueline Blackwell, Julie Bobay, George Bodmer, John Carini, Rosanne Cordell, Ron Finkbine, Mary Fisher, Mike Foos, David Frantz, G. Richard French, Trevor Fulk, Adam Herbert, Dolores Hoyt, Kevin Hunt, Elizabeth Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Nathan Kohley, David MacKay, Anna M. McDaniel, Richard Meiss, Ted Miller, Karen Moustafa, Bart Ng, Ruth Person, Markus Pomper, Paul Rohwer, John Ross, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, Alex Tanford, Herb Terry, David Turnipseed, Maxine Watson

MEMBERS ABSENT: James Baldwin, Marc Beatty, Bruce Bergland, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Jim Capshew, Donald Coffin, Les Coyne, David Fulton, Dennis Groth, Eyas Hattab, Betsy Henke, Giles Hoyt, Debomoy Lahiri, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Michael Nusbaumer, Kwadwo Okrah, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Sara Pryor, Una Mae Reck, Kristina Reuille, Brian Vargus, Rosalie Vermette, Michael Wartell, Nanci Yokom

GUESTS: Jennifer Hehman, Brad Wheeler, Vic Borden, Nathan Kohley, Trudy Banta

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

April 11, 2006

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/minutes/04.11.06.htm>

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(President Adam Herbert)

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

UFC Members: <http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U1-2007.xls>

UFC Committee Rosters: <http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U2-2007.xls>

Summary of Actions 05-06: <http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U3-2007.htm>

4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(President Herbert and Professors Miller and Ng)

5. Review Procedures for Chancellors (5 minutes)

(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

6. Transferability and General Education at Indiana University
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

**2:30 pm President Adam W. Herbert's State of the University Address
University Place Conference Center Auditorium**

Live Broadcast Locations for State of the University Address:

IUB: Radio-TV Services 180

IUPU-Columbus: Main 164

IU East: Whitewater 119

IPFW: Library 344

IUPUI: School of Nursing 314

IU Kokomo: Main 111

IU Northwest: Hawthorn 105

IU South Bend: Northside 038

IU Southeast: Hillside 102

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Herbert, Professor Miller, and Professor Ng should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINTUES

HERBERT: Let's call the meeting to order. Let me begin by seeking approval of the minutes of the April 11 meeting. Do we need a motion on that? Is there a motion that they be adopted? It's been moved. Is there a second? Any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say aye. [AYE] Opposed no. Minutes are adopted.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HERBERT: With regard to Presiding Officer's Business let me today defer making a report. I would provide a report that is a little longer than 10 minutes. So I will just wait and just make my comments then.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me turn to Ted for an update on the Agenda Committee and its business.

MILLER: Thank you very much. I would call your attention to the documents that are at your places today. The traditional beginning of the year documents: a list of members of the UFC, a sheet that deals with the standing committees and the membership of the standing committees.

You will note that with regard to that document things are fairly uneven with regard to that membership. We have decided this year to staff these committees only if we know there is going to be business coming before them. So you will see that the Educational Policies Committee is one that we are trying to get organized. There is a fairly complete list of members at this point and that is because one of the issues before us this year is this general education issue which we are going to talk a little bit about here today. Faculty Affairs Committee is another committee that will have some business this year. One of the things that we are going to do is to review the policies pertaining to non-tenure track appointments. You will recall that it was five years ago this year that the UFC approved the appointments policy that created the Lecturer categories, particularly that was the major step forward at that point. So after five years, I think what we have in mind is to sit down and think about what has happened to us during those five years and to the extent that some of the policies governing non-tenure track categories need some tweaking we will at least talk about doing that as we go forward. So the Faculty Affairs Committee will have that on its agenda. Those are the two main issues that I am aware of.

The Research Affairs Committee, we can't forget the Intellectual Property Policy, Simon right. You are not going to let us do that. Actually, I am very hopeful that we can have the Intellectual Property policy on our agenda. Well it needs to be there as soon as possible. Whether we can do it next time, I am not sure. The re-draft of the policy I think has been done. I think it's a question of getting it before the various campus committees and having people look at it. But we are under some pressure to get this over with. We have the Faculty Compensation and Fringe Benefits. One of the issues that is outstanding in our agenda is the Family Leave Policy. The trustees at the end of last year gave us a two-year extension on the current Family Leave Policy. Basically we have two years to get our act together in terms of a proposal to modify that. It's reasonable to believe that work should start this year so that is another of the committees that we are trying to get staffed if you will.

Okay so that's the committee situation. Those of you who are co-chairs of these committees, if you think there is some business that really needs to be done please let us know and I think we can find, in really short order, people to staff these committees from the various campuses. But we are trying not to do that unless there is something substantial to focus on. The third document is the summary of actions taken during the past academic year.

The Agenda Committee today spent some time talking about items that are on our agenda and we will come to those. This is the Review Procedures for Chancellors, the Gen Ed discussion. We also spent some time talking about some other matters, notably the matter of Labor Studies. I have received communications from several members of the faculty urging the UFC to take up the question of Labor Studies. So we had a discussion in the Agenda Committee about that and basically where we are right now is that the Labor Studies issue is being looked at on the Indianapolis campus. Labor Studies is an Indianapolis campus program. There is a process in place leading to a decision about Labor Studies. The Indianapolis Faculty Council is playing a role in this and my understanding from my colleague Bart is that at the earliest the Indianapolis Faculty Council will be able to debate or discuss the Labor Studies issue at the earliest in its December meeting. So this process that is playing out on the Indianapolis campus is not close to being over. It's not going to be over next week or next month. It's going to play out over a period of time. So in the Agenda Committee we discussed the idea of putting a Labor Studies agenda

item on our next UFC meeting which will be later in October. We decided that we would do that so one of the agenda items for the UFC in October will be the discussion of the Labor Studies issue. We will invite Chancellor Bantz to come and give us a review of the situation on the Indianapolis campus and we will get some sense of what might happen. The President has a role to play in this which can also be discussed at that particular time. What we are trying to do here today is to basically focus our attention with our regard to Labor Studies to our next meeting rather than to do it today. That is my part of the Agenda Committee report. Bart, do you have something to add?

NG: No, I think you said everything.

MILLER: I will just add that we've also had a request to review policies pertaining to in the traditional sense, to classified research. The university has a policy in this area that goes back many many years which has not really been reviewed in a long long time. Basically what we decided in the Agenda Committee was that assuming that we could get the Intellectual Property Policy out of the hands of the Research Affairs people this is the next project which will need some attention. That is it.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: At this point Ted, Bart, and I are open for questions or comments if there are any. Okay if there are none.

AGENDA ITEM #5: REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR CHANCELLORS

HERBERT: Ted we have Item #5.

MILLER: Yes, Item 5, Review Procedures for Chancellors. Well, this is a five minute item so we do not plan to spend a great deal of time on this. This is an information item really. This is a policy that the UFC has been working on for many years, trying to revise the review procedures pertaining to Chancellors. The Trustees last week were on the verge of approving a policy, a policy by the way which was not consistent with the wishes of the UFC. But going beyond that, at the last minute some issues came up about the procedures that might be used to gather information during one of these review processes and what conditions would apply to that information, particularly the confidentiality of information. In any event, we had quite a long discussion about in the Academic Affairs Committee, in that committee of the Trustees. The Trustee members of that committee decided to defer action of that item for another month to give us a chance to formulate an alternative approach to gathering information during the context of one of these reviews, an approach that might put more of the information into a confidential category as opposed to a non-confidential category.

The draft that we are working with right now has some information in both but I think what we want to do over the next month is to get more of the information into a context where it could be gathered and in could be held confidential in context of the committee. That probably means a more extensive use of a survey type mechanism and/or maybe direct interviews by review committee members as opposed to soliciting a bunch of letters from people—those apparently,

there appears to be no doubt about it, that those letters cannot be held confidential. We cannot assure people that they would be confidential. We're going to work on this a little more. We of course will have another meeting before the next Trustee meeting. The next Trustee meeting is in early November. We will have our October meeting before that and we should have a draft of that language here that we can at least share with you and we can review at that particular time.

HERBERT: If I could add to Ted's comments, we do have two Chancellors who are scheduled to come up for review this year. It is my intention to begin that process. I will talk with the Board to get a clear sense of what they anticipate to be the likely outcome of this in terms of the next Board meeting. We just need to be clear as to which rules we are going to use to govern this cycle. I am very sensitive to the fact that there are some tight timelines that have to be addressed so I want assure fairness on the one hand to the Chancellors and, two, I want to assure that we can go through the process in an appropriate and thorough fashion. By the time we meet next, I will have a much clearer sense. We may go ahead and constitute the committees in any event working with those campuses to assure that we will be able to get the work done. We'll know a little bit more about that in the next few days. I do want you to know that it is my intention to begin both of those processes for South Bend and Southeast this fall. Any questions about that item?

TERRY: Just one, this started long before we had a provost in Bloomington. Will this review policy apply to the campus Provost as well as campus Chancellor's?

HERBERT: It's a different position but it would apply to the Provost. We just need to work out how that would play out. Yes the Provost would be covered in Bloomington. Any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM #6: TRANSFERABILITY AND GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: The next item may be a little longer Transferability and General Education, Ted.

MILLER: Many of you know that the Trustees, in their August meeting, approved a resolution on the topic of General Education, particularly University level general education. They set a deadline of February 1st for the faculty to produce something that could be viewed as a program in general education at the university-level. Many of you participated over the last several years in discussions about university-level general education. The UFC has focused on this for quite a period of time and basically the main conclusion that we have come to, and I have said this to the Trustees on several occasions, the main conclusions that we came to in all of those discussions was that the individual campuses basically preferred to have their own general education programs. Now some campuses do not currently have a general education program with Bloomington being a prime example. We are working on this and next week, Tuesday, at the BFC there will be a proposal acted on by the Faculty Council. The resolution will be to give some preliminary approval to a general education program for Bloomington. There are a lot of details in that that need to be worked out and that will be done over a period of time. But Bloomington is at least on the precipice possibly of approving something. We have tried for years to do this of course and we have never been able to be successful. So far this time, it looks

much much much more promising. We don't have people jumping up and down about this current proposal. There are several other campuses that are working on developing campus-level general education programs. Kokomo is one of them. IUPUI is another. The Northwest campus is another. South Bend and Southeast are quite settled, and I think Richmond, Marcus, Richmond has a program, is that correct? Or is that not correct?

POMPER: It's not correct. We don't have a program, but we are working on it.

MILLER: Yes, we are all diligently working to do this. Well alright, one of the issues that we confront then as a University Faculty body is that given that there is some sort of an unsettled condition within the campuses from this point of view it wasn't exactly clear to me how we should approach the Trustees' resolution, what we should do to comply with what the Trustees have asked us to do. You can see on your agenda the item here is labeled Transferability and General Education. It's very clear to me in talking with the Trustees that their interest is not exclusively focused on general education. In fact I think historically, their interest has not really been focused on what we would call general education. It is really focused on transfer and articulation. They have been talking about transfer and articulation among the campuses of IU for a long time. Now my own view is that the inter-campus transfer and articulation issues, really I don't think we have issues like that anymore because the PeopleSoft implementation essentially preceded with the assumption if a course has the same number and name on one campus as another, it is viewed as the same course within PeopleSoft. When the degree audit system of PeopleSoft kind of processes a particular student's record to see if they have satisfied requirements, that course counts on a particular campus irrespective of where it was taken. I think that we, from the point of view of inter-transfer and articulation, really have resolved – PeopleSoft, I know we like to criticize PeopleSoft and there is a lot maybe to criticize. I can say that because Michael is not here today. He doesn't like to hear criticisms of PeopleSoft. Brad, well Brad are you sensitive to this, Brad?

WHEELER: Not at all.

MILLER: Well, anyway...I really think that in this instance the PeopleSoft implementation has really solved a rather messy problem that we have been plagued with for years and years. I just don't think that is an issue anymore. Many of our problems in terms of transfer now are really sort of campus-based problems that is to say that people come to the Bloomington campus for example and they think they want to do major 'X' and they start down that path and then they decide that they want to change to major 'Y' and the courses that they did to get into major 'X' don't count in terms of major 'Y'. I think really that we have far many more problems like that now than we have inter-campus transfer problems. Of course one of the purposes of the gen. ed. program, on a campus, is to ensure that a student can come to that campus; start off taking courses that satisfy the campus gen. ed. requirements and that gen. ed. requirement is a part of all degree programs offered on the campus and so if they change their mind ultimately then all of the gen. ed. stuff is going to come along with them and they can go forward into whatever their major choice is. My feeling really is that what we are doing on the campuses is really the main work that needs to be done at this point.

Now, I'm not sure that the Trustees see it exactly that way however. I am not sure that they do. So what I have tried to persuade them, is that, well let me back up a little bit. As I have said, the UFC has had a long history of investigating university-level general education. At the end of last year, something new was brought into this equation, something that seems to me at least to be potentially very helpful to us in trying to deal with what the Trustees think they would like to see. The State Legislature, this is something that many of you know, the State Legislature approved some legislation that requires the identification of at least a minimum of 70 courses that will be transferable among all of the state institutions. The work of identifying those courses and determining which courses on each of the public campuses are equivalent in terms of these general course titles, that work is being done by a committee appointed by the Higher Education Commission. It is a committee which we have talked about on a number of occasions here. It is called the STAC committee. And Indiana University has three representatives to the STAC committee. Purdue probably has three. Others have several. All the public institutions have representatives to that committee and that Committee is in process of developing the list of 70 or so courses that will meet the legislative mandate.

What I talked to the Trustees about last week – at least a subgroup of the Trustees – was the idea of, since we are going to have to deal with this legislative mandate anyway, that we start our process under the label of university-level general education, that we start our process focused on the lists of 70 courses. Right now there turn out to be 88 courses that are on the list that are being evaluated. Some of those may be set aside. I don't know what the final level will be. There is a set of 88 that have now been identified that are still under consideration. So what I proposed was that each campus of Indiana University would take this list of 88 courses and evaluate, to the extent that it is possible now, when at some campuses there really isn't a fully developed gen. ed. program, but take those 88 courses and go through the list and indicate to the extent possible which gen. ed. requirement that course would satisfy on that campus. Okay. That is work that I hope we will be able to get done over the next couple of weeks. It is not a big job. These courses are very standard basic courses: Introduction to Political Science is one of the courses. We are all familiar with these courses and I think we all could probably come to the same conclusion of where in a gen. ed. program those courses would fit. But what we are going to try to do is for each campus go through the list and when the campuses have finished their work we are going to sort of collate the work and see whether the campuses actually do have common ideas about general education.

So, Introduction to Political Science; in Bloomington, one of our categories is Social and Historical Studies. Introduction to Political Science is obviously a course that is going to satisfy a requirement in that category of our general education. Other campuses have similar categories-- maybe not name exactly the same thing, but roughly similar categories-- and I assume that Introduction to Political Science will satisfy that requirement everywhere. At the end of this process what we are going to try to do is collate this, and hopefully what we are going to find is across these 88 courses there is a fairly large number of them that satisfy the same kind of requirement everywhere. If we can do that, that may be the basis for developing an idea, a concept, of what Indiana University general education is about. What are the commonalities? We can at the very least formulate a statement based on the data that gives us some sense of that there is this commonality. It may not work out this way, although frankly I cannot imagine that

it's not because the course lists are very basic standard courses that are in this list. I would be surprised if we ended up on a completely different page across our campuses.

Now, one of the advantages of taking this approach is that we will be able to provide information to any student who enters a public university in the state. We will be able to tell them that if they want to transfer to another campus, to an IU campus, we will be able to tell them what courses they can take at their campus of enrollment whether it is Ivy Tech, Indiana State, Ball State, whatever it might be, wherever they are starting. We will be able to tell them that they can take these courses on their current campus. Those will transfer to an IU destination campus and they are guaranteed to satisfy general education requirements on those campuses.

Now, that's an area of course that is applicable to people who have a plan. If people don't have a plan, if they start off at one campus with the intention of staying to finish their degree, and then something happens and they need to transfer, well what I'm talking about here won't necessarily solve problems for those students. But I think that if we can guarantee that if a student has a plan to transfer, if we can guarantee that their coursework where they started will transfer to an IU destination to satisfy requirements, that should go a long way toward satisfying some of the critics that have been aiming their barbs at us. I recognize that it doesn't solve everybody's problem but I think it solves really a very core problem that we have. If we also can have the campus gen. ed. programs in place, that's going to solve another set of problems for people who come to a campus and want to move around within that campus. So there is still going to be some outstanding issues but frankly I'm not sure that any system no matter how we set it up would guarantee that every course that everybody took, no matter where they went is going to count somehow. I just don't think we could ever get there.

So what we're going to try to do is to work through with this Transfer Course Library that the Higher Education Commission is attempting to develop. We're going to develop information for each of the campuses, we're going to try to put that information together, we're going to try to demonstrate that there is some commonality in the gen. ed. program that's being considered on the various campuses and I'm going to present a report to the Trustees in early November, which hopefully will encourage them to think that we are actually going to be able to do something that will be useful from their point of view.

That is my introduction to this topic.

HERBERT: Are there questions or comments, feedback, suggestions?

CARINI: Well, so at the UFC then I would say that one of our jobs is to try to pull together the information. We can also make the case that each campus seems to be coming up with its own way of structuring a general education program for that campus and they are not interchangeable. In fact, the ones that exist now are structured quite differently. We need to educate the Trustees about how that process has unfolded so far and then, down in Bloomington, we should have an outline too and that will be a fourth or fifth way of doing campus-wide general education. So it would both celebrate our differences but also make it clear that we share quite a bit of coursework.

MILLER: John Carini is the Bloomington co-chair of the UFC Educational Policies Committee this year. So he will be working with his Indianapolis counterpart to kind of pull this information together. I think that's the job that we see initially for the UFC committee is to take the results of the campus-level kind of working through these course lists, and the UFC committee will kind of put this together and try to see where we stand.

HERBERT: Herb?

TERRY: It would seem to me that it would be important, or at least logical, that the system-wide general education core requirements will probably amount to fewer courses and fewer credit hours than the general education programs that we're considering at Bloomington. I rather despair that we will ever get to a program that might occupy a couple years of the students' time to spread out over two years that we could all agree upon given the different missions of the campuses, given in mission differentiation. So I wonder if that is the path down which you are thinking of taking this, that it might be a very limited number of courses, maybe composition and mathematics and a couple of other things rather than something reaching down into a more detailed general education requirement that's we're considering at Bloomington?

MILLER: Well I think that's probably exactly right. I think that's no doubt how this is going to turn out. To the extent that we identify common elements I think it's pretty clear that that will be a subset from the point of view of each particular campus. It will be a subset of what is in the gen. ed. program on that campus. The problem, I think that we have, is that if that kind of common subset turns out to be so small as to be...that I think is going to be problematic. Hopefully it's not going to end up that way. I'm not sure what the magic number of credits would be but I'm hoping that we'll get near 20, but it's somewhat unclear to me exactly how this is going to end up.

But I think the point you're making is probably right; that it will end up being a smaller number than the program on any particular campus because the campuses do have different components that they working with. One of the points that I have tried to make to the Trustees, and to the President for that matter, is that from my point of view, the campuses are different places. They have different strengths. They have different capacities. The smaller campuses are in a much, much better place from some points of view with regard to general education because they can develop specialized courses that could be required of all of their students, at least there is a possibility of doing that when the numbers are small. South Bend has got some wonderful -- in the course of the review of these curricular, we have seen that South Bend has got some wonderful interdisciplinary-- science courses that we in Bloomington I think would love to be able to offer but we really don't have the capacity to do it with the number of students we are trying to deal with there. We've got different issues that come up. Bloomington has some strengths that we are trying to highlight in our general education program, the international dimension is something we are trying to highlight, and its not clear to me that is something all the campuses would want to do.

I think we need to allow the campuses to do what they think is best for their situation but hopefully in the end we are going to have some part of it that we look at say well, okay, we are all doing this so we can talk about that. I'll tell you the truth though. I have a feeling that at the

end of the day that common part is going to be difficult to get excited about. I don't know if you recall from last year, we had a document that was in front of the UFC at one of the meetings in the spring of last year, and it basically had the flavor that you are talking about. It identified maybe four different categories that seemed like they might be common; at that time we didn't necessarily have the data, but it seemed like that might be common. We were talking about this for the point of view of a university-level general education program and that idea was criticized roundly in the UFC meeting and one of the typical comments was, well, you this just isn't very interesting. It's kind of trivial. I think that may be where we end up if we want to talk about university gen ed. I am not sure that we want to do something that can be looked as and be said, well, you know so what.

HERBERT: I should tell you that I am more optimistic than Ted is about this. Other comments?

Bart did suggest that I make reference to one item if we are concluded with that item and that is that we have created a university-wide office of Research Compliance. I should just bring you up to date on that. We will have Steve Martin serving as an interim. We will over the course of the next few weeks develop a position description formerly for it, for the Executive Director of Research Compliance. On an interim basis, Marsha Gonzalez, who has been working in the Medical School, will work as the research compliance person for Indianapolis and Ann Gellis will continue to serve in that role for both the Bloomington campus and all of our regional campuses. What we are doing now is taking a look at the pre- and post-award functions and I will keep the two co-chairs informed about that. Right now what we have is a consultant taking a look at all aspects of what we are doing in terms of pre- and post-awards. What we want to assure is that we are providing maximum services and that we are doing that in a very timely basis. One of the things that we will want to do is get some feedback from faculty relative to, especially experiences that you're having, issues that you think we should definitely focus attention on, but again I will work through the co-chairs in terms of assuring that we get that input before we make some final decisions on that.

MILLER: Just on that point. We are trying to facilitate meetings between Steve Martin and the various campus Research Affairs Committees. That is something that has got to happen before we get to the end of this.

The final thing is that there is a sheet that I forgot to tell you about. There is a green sheet in your folder. It's a committee list if you want to volunteer for one of the standing committees, either an active one or an inactive one. Feel free to make your choices known and send these to Kelly.

And the final thing the next meeting of the UFC is scheduled for Oct 24. We will meet in what might be referred to as the jewel of the Kokomo campus. I'm saying this because the Kokomo Chancellor is with us today and I am spreading the good will around here.

HERBERT: Is there anything else to come before the UFC today? If not, I invite all of you to join me in a few minutes to hear a little overview of what is going. Thank you all very much.

Meeting adjourned at 2:17 pm