

Untitled Document

Steve Ashba

UFC: 4-16-96

Brand: Let's begin please. I have no special business under item one except to welcome you here today. You are welcome. Moving on to Agenda Committee business, Professors Greenebaum and Warple. Ed.

Greenebaum: I have a few announcements. There are a few items that the Agenda Committee has referred to committees since we've met last. Regarding one of the items, we had a communication problem. Bruce Cole and Richard Chiffon on behalf of the Alliance of Distinguished Ranked Professors asking that the question of waivers of confidentiality and the balanced case be reconsidered by the council and we've referred those issues to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Also, the trustees at their meeting in Kokomo had moved, but late on the table, certain two motions relating to grade inflation issues. One of them would mandate academic units to establish grading policies and the other relates to recording on internal documents grade indexing information. The trustees anticipate I think returning to the issue in March and would like to hear from the UFC in that regard before then and we are referring those matters to the Educational Policy Committee. Again with relationship to the trustees, at the trustees meeting on December 15th in Indianapolis, and in particular in the meeting of the university policy committees at 8:30 in the morning on that day, the topic at that meeting will be Mechanisms for Rewarding Excellence in Teaching. And we would hope that there might be faculty representation at the meeting. It would be a matter of great interest to us. For those of you, this is a nuts and bolts item, for those of you who may still be doing your e-mail on the VAX system, University Computing Service will be shutting down the vaxes in the future and so you will need to migrate as the verb is these days, migrate to a different system. University Computing Service has provided us a consultant to help council members do that if you have not already done so and if you need any consulting help communicate with Ellen Petty who can put you in touch with Stil Foster who is our helper in that regard. We have a busy spring semester in front of us. Just to name a few of the issues that are in front of us to work on, we are committed to trying to coming to resolutions on issues related to clinical ranks and other associate faculties. We have a conflict of interest policy and an intellectual property policy that will come to the council for consideration. We have the grade inflation issues that I mentioned a moment ago, the fringe benefits committee will be reporting to us on a new proposed early retirement plan and also bring us up to date on the status of proposals for a cafeteria plan. So that's just among the things that will keep us occupied. So do not fear, there is life after the Strategic Directions Charter and we will be into that very soon. The only remaining thing that I have to say is that the Agenda Committee has granted requests for speaking privileges at this meeting to George Walker, Don Gray, Norm Overly, and Jeffrey Stake, who's requested those privileges.

Kathy: I just want to underscore the importance of entering in as quickly as possible to discussions about the trustees resolutions that are on hold. That is the one about grading policies and the one

about grade indexing for all of the campuses other than Bloomington, Bloomington's already dealt with that. I indicated to the trustees that getting back to them by their late March trustees meeting would be possible. So I hope that not only our Faculty Council Educational Policies Committee, but all of the campuses also get to work on this as soon as possible so that we can have a response. The grading policy is quite straight forward. The indexing may require a little more discussion.

Brand: Good, on to the question and comment period. I suggest that if it concerns the Strategic Directions Charter, that we save that for item #4.

Spechler: Two very brief questions Ed. One is with regard to the meeting of the trustees, I believe you said December 15th with the Educational Policy issues connected with that and rewards for teaching and so on. Is the Agenda Committee going to suggest to people to attend or do we volunteer or just how are we going to make sure that our interests are...

Greenebaum: Well we haven't actually taken any steps in that regard as yet. Kathy and I will certainly be there and I would hope that, especially Indianapolis faculty, would manage to attend seeing as it's closer to home for them. And if the relevant committees would take an interest and see that there's some representation, I think that would be helpful and I'd, I thank you for the slight needling that goes implied with the question.

Brand: It's at the Policies Committee meeting of the trustees and I don't remember the schedule, 8:30.

Spechler: 8:30 on December 15th.

Greenebaum: Right, at the Conference Center

Spechler: I was going to ask about the early retirement. You brought that up. Am I correct in thinking that the early retirement proposal for those people rather recently hired rather than a change in the early retirement plan for those who are veteran.

Greenebaum: That's right, it is not an alteration of the 18/20 plan, but is an early retirement plan for those that have been hired since the critical date, looking for Jim Sherman to...

Sherman: 1989.

Greenebaum: 1989. Peterson.

Peterson: I have a question about the VAX computer. I assume you meant Bloomington and not the Indy VAX.

Greenebaum: Right, yes, thank you. I don't know anything about the Indy one. Yes Baldwin.

Baldwin: Would Professor Brand want to comment on the editorial in the Star this morning about graduated tuition.

Brand: I didn't see the editorial.

Baldwin: Is that still under consideration.

Brand: I haven't seen the editorial. Who wrote it? I will comment on the tuition policy independent of what that says. We are facing a very serious problem in student financial aid. Our students in some ways are not aware of the problem yet because it hasn't hit them. It will this coming fall. The Congress right now is proposing to cut back 11 billion dollars in student financial aid over 7 years. That may decrease as we go through the budget process at the federal level yet, but we should realize this is a multi-year attack on student financial aid and not one time only, once solved we're out of it. It will affect the accessibility of students, particularly low and middle income students. It will probably drive up interest rates over time, it will probably make it more difficult for both graduates, undergraduate, and professional students to get grants and aid as opposed to loan programs. It will do away with some of the loan interest forgiveness programs. It will affect the number of students who can get Pell grants all across the board. The question is, if nothing happens, what affect would it have on the university. It will have a negative affect because many talented students will no longer find IU accessible, not just Bloomington, but all of our campuses. I started to discuss tuition policy with the trustees at the beginning of this academic year and laid out dozens literally of various alternatives. The motivation for that was that we don't really have a tuition policy right now. We essentially try to balance the political concerns all often coming through the legislature, but not restricted to them, with the amount of money the legislature gives us incrementally to our operating budget. That's highly dependent upon the state economy. And then fill in the blanks as best we can with tuition. That's not apolicy, that's ad hoc year by year way of doing it. We've got to figure out what do we hope to accomplish with our tuition policy besides developing a revenue source. And one thought was, could we use this in some productive way to help with the financial aid issue. So one of the issues that was discussed earlier in the year was discussed in more detail recently at the last trustees meeting, namely emulating to a small extent at least to what private universities do, namely discount tuition on the basis of need. In order to do that, the tuition has to be set somewhat higher. So private universities who charge on average 30 to 40 percent more than what the average student pays and use that to self generate financial aid, although students at private universities are eligible for federal financial aid, they're not eligible for state financial aid, except in Indiana. That would have been about a 3-1/2% tuition hike over and above what we normally charge. When that idea was discussed in the trustees and picked up by the press, we got a lot of reaction to it and 95% of that reaction was negative. There was a concern that it would involve some income transfer and some people are not happy about that. There were some interesting letters I got, some I wouldn't show in public, but one theme in the letters which amazed me and shows what an emotional issue it is, people were arguing "I could barely pay the tuition now, I'm right on the cusp. If you raise tuition, I can't attend." But wait, those are just the people who have a net lower cost because this proposal was one that said if you are a family income of \$60,000 or less, your net costs will go down. So they missed the point. But be that as it may, it was a very emotional issue. But what I did succeed in doing was bring to the floor the financial aid issue and at least people are beginning to think about the financial aid issue in a constructive way and seeing how important it was before this discussion. One of the legislators for example, Jeff Espich, who thought we were attacking the middle class, which of course we weren't, but thought that that was the case, talked to me in a conversation about state generated loan programs. And there may

be something in that that we would want to pursue. So where the institution, given the public reaction, may not be able to deal with the financial aid issue on its own, unlike private universities, we may be able to generate enough interest amongst the legislators, amongst the Commission for Higher Education, and so on, so we can have a constructive state discussion and really approach this problem and get a head start on it before it so harms our students and our access that, not only does it drive down enrollment, but keeps those people out of school who should really be here. So I think the bright side of that is that it is probably the wrong time for this idea, if it's ever the right time for that idea, this is not it. None the less, it does bring to the floor the critical issue of student financial aid and we'll have to deal with that.

Mannheimer: <164>

Brand: You know, I wrote an editorial on this several weeks ago, sent it to the Star and the refused to print it. Maybe they'll do it now in response, but initially they were not willing to hear about this, which is now kind of interesting that now they pick it up as an editorial themselves. There's a commentary there somewhere.

Carr: Obviously any federal moves are going to affect other schools. Is there discussion amongst the CIC schools or are they taking a similar approach?

Brand: I asked that question, not to the CIC alone, but to a larger group of schools and some are, Nebraska interestingly did this last year a little bit. University of California has been doing it for several years. What they do, because of serious cutbacks in state funding, they've had to raise their tuition at least ten percent per year in-state tuition, at least ten percent a year. They have systematically returned about three percent, sometimes even more, to a self-generated financial pool, which is essentially the concept here. So they've been doing it for years. And again, many of the private schools do this. The public universities are not as sophisticated about tuition matters as the private schools and usually have this "no policy" policy that I talked about. I don't think, as major public research universities can any longer go on like that. We're going to have to have some well thought out tuition policy. This may well not be it, but we've got to have some well thought out tuition policy. I wouldn't be surprised if other institutions begin to think about it as we have, to begin to raise some of these issues. But there is a lot of concern about making sure that people don't pay more taxes, that is, that they pay only for themselves and I believe that is part of the reaction, people believe one should be more self-supporting. I believe that caused some of the negative reaction. Are there any more questions? OK, let us go on to the Strategic Directions Charter. There are two issues I'd like to start the discussion with. The first and<202> is the RFP process for the allocation of the consent of funds and George Walker is with us and he can answer some of those questions, but as you read through that document, particularly the flowchart to crystallize the issue, you see that there is a role given to University Faculty Council Agenda Committee on that chart in providing priority direction on those proposals rated highly by the panel. In order to do that, the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee will need your permission to carryout that task. So you see, on a green sheet of paper in front of you in your packet, the committee moves the following resolution, which I'll read to you: "The University Faculty Council Agenda Committee is authorized by the council to participate in the process to fund projects firming the goals of the Strategic Directions Charter in a role consistent with that contemplated by the Agenda Committee in November 8,1995

draft Request for Proposals Strategic Directions Charter.” And since it comes from the committee, it needs no second. It is open for discussion now. <Long Pause> Is there any discussion on this? If no...

Greenebaum: It is an appropriate occasion to raise questions about the process in general because of course the Agenda Committee will be participating in this process, which is a fairly complex one. So the implication of giving us authority to do so is to agree, accepting that process and approving our participation in it.

Brand: We will have an opportunity to talk about the process in general and ask questions George as soon as we finish this item of business. But seeing and hearing no questions, will someone call the question.

<231>: Question.

Brand: OK, all those in favor say “I” <multiple I’s>, Opposed <no response>. We have so instructed the Agenda Committee. Let’s move on to a more general topic and that is the RFP process and from there we will then go to the charter itself. George, maybe you could start off and give us just a few words on the rationale for this type of process.

Walker: I think one of the major advantages through this process is that it will <239> the university and take some time to think, consistent with their own with their own mission, expertise, and interest what areas they feel they need to focus <242> in on. <243>. There will probably be some moves in some communities within the university that reflecting on the charter and reflecting on dominant traditions in general that will think of new initiatives or stronger focus in certain areas than they have in the past. And some parts, some number of those initiatives will require or might be facilitated by some seed money. It’s our hope this process will both facilitate the general kinds of community discussion that I think would be advantageous to the university if they took place, and also is a process by which after fairly wide consultation and looking at various different perspectives, one can begin to distribute what, in fact, is a relatively amount of funding compared to the IU budget and compared the kinds of resources that are needed in order for the university to maintain its excellence and to move forward in selected new directions.

Brand: Good. Any comments, questions about the process. Now’s a good time to ask questions while George is here.

Walker: I should say, that on December 13th, we’re planning to have, we are going to have a workshop, televised workshop, interactive TV, with all campuses and President Brand will be there for the beginning to discuss a little bit about the background. I will be there to discuss ingeneral the procedures and there will be time for questions, there will be a, we plan to have a committee workshop on preparing proposals of this type and we will videotape it so that if some members of our community aren’t available at that time to listen or interact, it will be available to them later. We’ve ask each campus to provide us with the name of a liaison who can be available, in addition to the RUGS staff, to answer questions then locally for each campus, and we’ll provide additional training and background to those liaisons.

Marker: This is a question about, probably for George, on the proposed mission process. The second paragraph talks about the fact that there won't be and filtering, that everything that's submitted will go through. And yet, I know there are at least one or two units that have had faculty groups talk about whether they wished to do their own filtering at the unit level so that they didn't have their own proposals in competition with one another. Will they still be permitted to do that sort of thing or is this simply prohibited given the processes outlined here?

Walker: There's all kinds of freewill. It seems to me if a group wants to get together and make that kind of community policy, they can do that. But, if someone in that group decides to submit a proposal to us, we will review it just like we would any other proposal.

Spechler: George, I've been told that some rather large percentage of the total money is earmarked to be distributed to the campuses more or less proportionately to their current budgets, or to their current enrollments, or generally to their size. Could you comment on how much of the total to be distributed is up for free competition and how much will be earmarked for one or another campus?

Walker: Yes, I could. First of all, I haven't heard that <group laughter>. I would like to talk with who you're talking with. Obviously, and it says I believe in the process, there are some funds that came from the campuses that will go back to those campuses for proposals that have been regarded as meritorious by the process. Over and beyond that, I believe I'm taking part in managing the process where there are no preconceived quota's as you mentioned <multiple voices>.

Brand: The tuition amount that was generated by each campus, one-percent of the tuition that was generated by each campus, resides with that campus. That says so in the proposal. And that's continuing money, but it's only released to the campus for use on acceptance of a proposal. So if it turns out, and I don't think this will happen, but suppose it turns out that the campus doesn't submit a sufficiently high quality programs to warrant all that money, that money will be reserved for that campus because that campus generated it. But everything else is not <315>. I believe it says so in the document there.

Lehman: George, in terms of administrative costs that effort and people hours put into looking at the proposals and judging them, is it commensurate with the number of dollars available?

Walker: I think it is, but beyond that I think it's commensurate with the opportunity that the university has. Fifteen to twenty million dollars sounds like a lot of money, but we all understand when we think about it over the big picture, that it's not a lot of money. But if that's an important incentive for getting us to think about, in general, university wide, where we are and where we want to be, it seems to be that that's one of the most valuable things we could possibly do. And if that provides an extra catalyst or incentive for doing that, then I think it is well worth it.

Fineberg: George, would you address the policy governing the matching funds that would be required with the proposals, including types of resources that might be used as a match?

Walker: I will, and Miles you may want to add something to this, but again I think the important issue is going to be, in many of these cases, how these priorities or initiatives are going to be sustained. And it's going to be important for units, campuses, schools, that are making the proposals

to also discuss how they will sustain these ideas over a period of time. And it's in that regard where I see that the amount of resources, human and financial, that will be required from the units doing the proposing will probably be, in most cases, significantly greater for a period of time than the actual seed money that they're asking for in the proposal process. So rather than say well "is it a 1-to-1 match or what kind of money do we have to..." I think there's a bigger picture there in terms of the impact and in terms of reasonable people looking at the proposal and saying "Does this have a chance for a sustained impact or success," it's going to require I think significant resources in those cases from the people in the units that are submitting. I think once you put it in that context, the question about does it have to be a 1-to-1 match, what kind of money, becomes of less importance than it would otherwise.

Brand: Any other questions

Keen: This is in addition, this new process will be interactive. It's entirely possible for example that a proposal would be found meritorious but have certain flaws. Will in fact the review panels be able to get information back to the applicant organization so that corrections might be made.

Walker: It would depend, but generally that's possible. But you know, there's many points along the process where we hope to have just exactly that kind of feedback. The first is at the sketchy stage where one is delivering a pre-proposal. Because I imagine that by the time the various units that will need to cooperate and move something forward have got it to the actual proposals stage that the panels are looking at, there should have been ample time, before it gets to the panel, for feedback. Once it gets to the panel, the spirit often is in such processes, that there is feedback, it's very important. It may mean though that there could be a delay in actually having the proposal funded. You might have to wait to resubmit six months, eight months, when the next cycle takes place. And that's consistent with the spirit at the federal agencies, for example, and we expect this to be more open and more interactive than generally the federal process is. So the answer is yes.

Keen: Just a point of clarification, when you're talking about that one-percent from the campuses, is that one time money that will be available or is that going to be a part of a base.

Walker: It's part of a base.

Brand: But the proposals are being encouraged to come in on a one-time basis so that money will be, as it were, reusable. Although some might be devoted to continuing operations, and that's permissible, though there's some advantage to the institution as a whole to be able to recycle that money, always staying with the campus.

Keen: Is that for three years or is that in <386>.

Brand: Two. It's only for this biennium.

Keen: OK, so it's for two years.

Mannheimer: I think it's terrific but I'm concerned about the follow-up, what there is a one sentence follow-up on page 5 of circular U696. If you are either receiving funds required to write a report that

identifies the accomplishments of the initiative during the funding period using the assessment plan included in the original proposal. It's sort of the classic inverted pyramid if I might use that phrase. All the review committees and bodies that will be passing judgment on these proposals, and in the end it seems, after I've gotten my money and I've done my thing, I simply sort of write a report saying "We had a good time, we accomplished some of our goals, thank you."

Walker: You don't know me very well.

Mannheimer: I've got to be curious as to how that evaluation might become.

Walker: First of all, again, this is a learning process for all of us, so that if we say a lot of things in detail, we get to change them because as we learn, we get prudent. But it seems to me that a lot of the benefit can come from understanding at the beginning that assessment is very important. And we all, I mean I don't like the word assessment, but we all assess informally all the time. If we didn't, we wouldn't be where we are now. And so it seems to me that you're absolutely right, and others have made the comment, that it will be important to have assessment of the project, reflection of the process itself, and we just haven't, I just haven't thought through in detail to the point where I'm prepared to write all of that down, but more will be coming on that. I think your point is absolutely on target.

Brand: Any other comments on that? OK, we can return to that later, but thank you George. Let's now go on to the general discussion of the Strategic Directions Charter. Al, do you want to put a motion on the table?

Al: I would like to move that <421> B31-96 before us <422> working on charter issues for two meetings and decided that, for the third meeting, we would like to have something concrete and <426> for approval. The chairs of the various committees, Russell of the charter, put their heads together with members of the agenda committee and generated this document. Essentially this document is designed to provide a framework by which faculty involvement can be maintained as we proceed with the charter, the options of the charter, the limitations of the charter. There are really three items here, all in the motion. The first is to preserve usual faculty involvement. Second is to maintain unit autonomy. And the third is to state explicitly that prioritizing will be done in the usual fashion of movements for consideration by council.

<442>: Second.

Brand: OK, it's on the table, any discussion? I hope you've had a chance to read it.

Spechler: Al, a couple of questions about this which you were kind enough to send me by e-mail. The circular talks about three types of autonomy, professional autonomy, which I take to mean the autonomy of the individual scholar, campus autonomy, and academic unit autonomy. I'd like to know whether the drafters of this believe this is fully consistent with the constitution of Indiana University faculty, and with the division of powers and responsibilities which are laid out in that document.

Al: I'm going to refer to Ed Greenebaum on this since he's more familiar with the constitutional situation, he has a legal mind, and he was closer to the drafting of what's on those.

Greenebaum: Yes. Have you got specific doubts or questions?

Spechler: Well Ed, you probably read this as carefully as I have, or even more carefully. You may even have written it.

Greenebaum: I participated in the writing, but that doesn't mean I understand it.

Spechler: Well the situation of the, I'm glad to hear that you do consider it consistent and on that understanding, I'm glad to support the document. The constitutional situation as I read it Ed, and you're an academic specialist in this area, is that the University Faculty Council has so to speak sovereignty or blanket authority for the duties of the faculty and delegate a large number of powers, either to schools or to units, and they're laid out, a specific delegation of authority in the constitution. Is it your opinion Ed that that amounts to substantial autonomy? Those words are nowhere to be found in the University Faculty Constitution.

Greenebaum: Actually, and there may be those who can find this faster, we had, when we revised the faculty constitution half a dozen years ago, we had explicit debates on these issues on the floor of the council. In fact I think the one real significant amendment to the proposed drafts of the constitution was moved on the floor of the council, in fact adopted by the council, was one that related to campus autonomy and given a moment I could find that in here. Since the university was reorganized around 1970, in the early 70's, it's been a tension for us as to what we need to do as a university wide institution and what we need to leave to local units so that they can flourish doing the business that they need to do to respond to their local environments. That tension is reflected in the, in our constitution I believe, where the various levels of authority are articulated and with this savings clause for local autonomy that was added as an amendment. And I think it's reflected in the motion as well. In its weasel worded way saying recognizing the need to set priorities in vesting resources and to coordinate the implementation of the university wide mission, our excellence depends upon substantial autonomy and the tension between these two needs is reflected right there. We understand that neither the charter in its draft nor we in these documents can expect or realistically have an ambition of resolving that tension, but certainly its no, it was not our intention to make any changes in our constitutional structure.

Brand: That's the way I read it, as the balance has been reached, that's the word maintaining and this resolution says we don't want to change that balance. That's a common sense reading I think, it's the way I've been reading it and don't want that balance to be throated in any way.

Forinash: I would like to offer the committee an amendment to the third item. It says in the first sentence "Our core missions as a research university," since many of the campuses have other missions as their primary missions, if we could change that to the "core missions of the various campuses."

Brand: So you would say "the core missions of the various campuses?"

Scott: How about just “our core missions as a university?”

Brand: How about, so do you accept that? So the amendment is to delete the word research in the last bullet. Is there a second to that. OK, any discussion on that? Hearing, seeing none, all in favor please say “I” <multiple responses>, opposed <no audible response>, OK, now the word research is deleted from the third bullet in the resolution pending before you. Chris.

Chris: This document I think very properly coming from the, out of the whole system of faculty governance stresses faculty governance issues and autonomy and so forth. In doing that, it also quite clearly alludes to such core values as independent critical judgment of the scholarship of<573> various interference’s, whatever the right word here is. I hope that this document really quite clearly also addresses, maybe not explicitly, but implicitly, and I would like to put this on the record that my reading of this document is that it should include a strong statement about the university being a place in which we conduct work in research and teaching and service that in many ways can not be immediately defined in utilitarian economic terms for the benefits of society. But that the university is involved in work that often is not specifically utilitarian, that we do engage in an exploration of knowledge that has to be dependent often on its own terms, not just in terms of its utilitarian values to society. If that’s what this statement means, and I hope that it is implicit in the statement, I would support it even more wholeheartedly than I would be supporting it anyhow. Clearly what I’m saying implies that one concern I have about the Strategic Directions Charter is that so much of it is phrased in terms of how we can specifically and economically benefit society and how we can make some changes in the university to address those issues and perhaps quite rightly so. But I think we also again and again need to remind ourselves in how we present ourselves to the public and this Strategic Directions Charter is a document with which we are addressing the public. How we are addressing the public is often in terms of defending non-utilitarian, intellectual work that we do here for its own sake and that that is a benefit in and of itself <End of tape 1A Start of tape 1B>

Greenebaum: ...from schools on the Bloomington campus. All of those have been forwarded to the Steering Committee, which includes the drafters and re-drafters of the charter and a number of themes like the one that you have mentioned, we hope will, because we don’t think that they’re controversial themes among us, or among or of the Steering Committee or the drafters. We hope that a number of these issues of tone and emphasis that have been expressed repeatedly in the various discussions will be accommodated in the re-drafting of what will be the last version of the charter.

Mannheimer: Two things please, first a point of order, how can we offer a friendly amendment to this. I’m not aware that this is being put before us by ourselves or by the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Greenebaum: It is, it was just moved and seconded that we adopt this resolution.

Mannheimer: By ourselves?

Greenebaum: Yes.

Mannheimer: Excuse me, my mistake. Second, and more to the point, what is this really saying? On my first read of it, it seems, I really come down to the last sentence, or point three, or bullet three as it were, “because we will not be able to do everything we want to, the university governance structure shall establish priorities.” That smells to me, as if we are saying this is a wonderful structure but we need something else.

Brand: Maybe it’s worth back tracking a little bit to get a sense of what the Strategic Direction Charter is trying to do. First of all, what problem is it trying to solve? It’s not the problem of a new president coming in and giving lots of new instructions, that’s not the issue. The issue is that the context for higher education is changing radically and it has been for several years and probably the pace of that change will increase. Without going into a lot of detail, we’re seeing pressures on public funds, both at the federal and state level and certainly on tuition as well. We’re being called upon to be more accountable and live up to higher standards, whether we agree that we’ve already reached those standards and shouldn’t be bothered with it or not is really not the issue. All institutions in America, not just higher education are being called upon that. There is a changing set of directions being given to us by our external constituency. We have done very well as a university in terms of developing our academic missions and our excellence and we should take great pride in that. And so the problem that we have is how do we sustain our excellence, our academic core values, our traditions, and there I would add as a public university in particular, in light of these changes? We have done very well and understand even how to do better on the academic side. Where we have not been as successful, probably because we haven’t addressed it as carefully, is to be responsive to these changes. And so, what the Strategic Directions Charter does is try to provide a framework, not a set of instructions, not an algorithm, but a framework for responding to those external changes that we face in order to position ourselves better to continue our excellence. That’s what it’s all about. It does not say we’re going to radically change the university, it’s not a redesign of the university. Very interestingly, where other major public universities, Michigan, UCLA, I could name dozens of them, are trying to change a lot of their core mission to respond, our attack, running against the tide, is to say “We’re going to sustain what we’ve been doing well. We’re going to sustain our traditions as a major public research university. We’re going to sustain our traditions of our core values. And here’s what we have to do in responding in order to do that.” What tells us how we have to add, particularly on the responsive side to the external environment what’s necessary to continue that excellence. But it gives you a framework for doing that. It says our normal processes work pretty well, we don’t want to change them, they’re in good shape. They’ve been successful in the past. So it doesn’t say that we’re going to develop new processes to say pick areas of academic investment. It’s going to say “Look, these are pretty good, we want to use these.” But how do we put ourselves in a position so that we can be successful in doing that? It’s not a history of all our successes. It’s not a recitation of our strengths. It’s a document written of hundreds of faculty members who begin to understand the problems and have come up with many suggestions which were compiled into how best to be responsive. And so yes, it does say we will continue to use our structures. That’s because they work, why would we want to change them? But the heart of the Strategic Directions Charter really isn’t what it focuses on, is how can we be responsive in a way that takes into account the real problems we face, what our constituencies expect from us, and enables us to continue in our areas of excellence.

Mannheimer: Please don't get me wrong sir, I was involved in the process of writing that and I'm as excited as anyone perhaps outside of Bloomington by the possibilities of the Strategic Directions Charter, but I am a little baffled how we can say university governance structure shall establish priorities and then set up this system. There are several points at which campus and specific inputs are built in.

Brand: Let me try it just once more Steve. This charter does not, nor should it, say which departments, schools, or campuses should progress academically. It's not the role of the charter to do that. Some may think it is, but it is not. That's to be decided through our departmental activity, faculty members creativity, through Dean's making decisions, through advisory committees working with Deans and Chancellors. That's how we decide, and will continue to decide, which academic areas progress and which don't, which get the resources and which don't. What this process of RFP does is say, within the context of the charter, and particular the areas addressed by the charter, not back filling or advancing particular academic areas, but rather what areas the charter addresses, let us let the best ideas flow to the top. So it's this resolution which I'm quite comfortable with, I think it's motherhood and apple pie, we better agree to this one or we're in trouble. But I think what this addresses is it says that academic decision making, as well as faculty decision making, it's working pretty well, let's leave that intact. But we've also got to be responsive in the ways that the charter speaks now.

Greenebaum: The one comment I'd make Steve is that the word charter has been unclear for a lot of people I think in terms of what kind of document, operationally, what this document was supposed to do. One sense of the word charter as used in the language is more in the sense of being a constitution which governs and controls and limits the decisions that will be made in the future. And the diction in some portions of the draft where it says "We will do this" and "We will do that," also suggest decisions being made definitively at this time. And this has been very bothersome, not just in Bloomington, but elsewhere as well. So we wanted to, among other things in this statement affirm for ourselves and for the trustees and for the public, that we were not altering the way we are governing ourselves through the adoption of this charter, so the language in the first bullet and the third bullet both are intended to reinforce and reinsure ourselves on those grounds.

Coffin: I think there are two things going on. One is the process which at least if you look at the money, is a minor part of the whole strategic direction sort of process. There's not enough money there to reshape the university. OK. But a lot of it is making decisions about how we're going to continue to do things. For example, just as a specific example, as I read this resolution, I mean consider for example, the fourth point in the Recommendations of the Charter to develop a university wide Associate Degree program. Well if I read this, what this says is that faculty reserves the right to make that decision assuming the charter is adopted in some form as broad scale university policy. We haven't just agreed that we're going to roll over and play dead, that we assert the right to control the curricula here. I mean that just as a specific example of how I read this. So I think it puts us in a position saying "We're looking to the future. We believe we have to change in the future. But we're going to do so within a very strong faculty governance framework."

Brand: Anything else? Are we ready to vote on it? We're not ready to vote. We are ready to vote. OK, let's try a voice vote first, all in favor say "I" <multiple responses>, Opposed <no audible responses>, OK, it carries unanimously. OK, Marty.

Spechler: As co-chair of the Faculty Affairs committee of this council, I'd like to draw your attention at this time to the white sheet which we have circulated. These are two resolutions on behalf of myself and Elton Jackson, the other co-chair of the committee. We have circulated these very recently to our committee and I can't report that there's been a vote, but neither have there been any objections, so I went bold to bring this to the council at this time. <Multiple voices regarding some people not having copies-End decision, there were not enough copies-Suggested he read it out loud>. There are two resolutions here. They are different in their intent. One of them is to assert what we take to be a principle of Indiana University which bears reinforcement and to that way the first resolution is very similar to the yellow one that we just passed. It states "Indiana University remains fully committed to the value of tenure for its faculty. The purposes of tenure are 1) to encourage the most open possible discussion of scientific, public, and university issues without fears of reprisals. Two, to allow faculty to take risks in the pursuit of knowledge and to serve the public and their students in ways which may not gain immediate recognition and three, to attract men and women of high ability to university teaching. Now these principles were adapted from AAU principles of a generation ago, but it does seem to me that they continue to reflect the values of this university. Elton and I felt that on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, that this bears some repetition since, in these days, the public don't realize the true purposes of university tenure and think of it as some shallow defense of vested interest, which it certainly is not. So we would appreciate support for this first principle by way of educating the pueblo to what we think are the core values of the university. That's resolution number one. Now resolution number two addresses what we consider to be one of the two or three problems in the strategic charter from the point of view of the Faculty Affairs Committee. And that is, its treatment of non-tenure track and non-tenured faculty. You all know that we will, as we have promised, bring forth a resolution and legislation on clinical ranks by February 1st. And we are also going to bring to your attention a large study that's been done on the number of non-tenure track, non-tenured faculty at Indiana University. But the strategic charter is ambivalent I believe on the question of whether we should make use of non-tenure track, non-tenure faculty to the degree to which we have in the past. It's very extensive on all the campuses. It's true that the kind of non-tenure track faculty used in Bloomington differ from those at IUPUI or on the smaller campuses. But most campuses have a very large percentage of irregular appointments, part time, and other non-tenure track appointments. We feel that it's come to the point where it's distorting the character and nature of our faculty and of our instruction and therefore we are moving resolution number two, which reads "All schools and departments of Indiana University should try to decrease the proportion of their credit hours taught by non-tenure track personnel." In the future, I look forward to bringing you legislation which will improve the condition of non-tenure track personnel and will also deal with the supervision and proper evaluation of their work in our instruction. Nothing here is intended to demean the contribution of these people to the various missions of the university, not at all. But we feel that it's a matter of balance and that the balance has been disturbed, little by little over quite a few years. And if we talk about strategic directions, Elton and I especially feel that we must point in the direction of more faculty responsibility. Faculty responsibility which includes professional

appointment, professional evaluation, and professional tenure and job security. So that's the reason sir we advance resolution number two. We'd be glad to have a discussion separately, as you please.

Brand: I think we should do them separately. Let's look at number one first. Please Professor Fineberg.

Fineberg: I didn't get a chance to reply by e-mail to the message that I got from you about this, but I'm concerned about wording in number one, section one. And the reason I'm concerned about this is because I think that there is no question that tenure should protect an individual with regard to freedom of speech and freedom of thought without reprisal. But, in fact, when that freedom of speech and freedom of thought transgresses the line of that kind of freedom of speech that's protected by the constitution, by that kind of freedom of speech which is, that speech becomes irresponsible, defamatory, inflammatory, then in fact should an individual receive protection by tenure? And the point is that I think the wording is fine up until "without fear of reprisal" because in fact, there are certain expressions that we could use which in fact should not be protected by tenure and that's the point I wanted to make.

Spechler: Ed, I'm glad to have that comment, but you know that on our campus, there is elaborate legislation outlining the outer limits of protected speech and behavior. And we've had long discussions on our campus about the kind of expression and behavior which would be considered professional misconduct and nothing in this resolution would deny that kind of discussion or the concept that the most open possible discussion does have some limits of propriety and good taste.

Fineberg: But the language is very open. It says "without fear of reprisal."

Spechler: But it also says "the most open possible discussion of issues without reprisal."

Mannheimer: I'm upset of course that scientific, public, and university issues and there's no mention of artists <group laughter>. I would think we draw more fire. You know, if this yellow sheet was motherhood and apple pie, this must be fatherhood and cherry cobbler. At what point does the Strategic Directions Charter stop being the elephant that should bear the burden of every reassertion and reaffirmation of basic principles? I would assume that having just passed this, this becomes superfluous, except for point two, which I think is a separate issue entirely.

Jackson: The charter, in the draft that we've seen most recently, does not discuss tenure. Tenure is under attack throughout the country. We're told that important leaders, political and business leaders, view tenure with contempt. It was our feeling that if this is going to be the charter that would take us forward into the next several decades, and sort of say what we are as America's new public university, that we might want to be explicit about this particular practice that's unique to the academy and provides us with much more experience.

Brand: The charter does not explicitly address tenure. I don't want you to draw the conclusion that it disfavors tenure, but there are lots of things it doesn't discuss. I'm in the process of drawing up a preface which will be ready for distribution with the final draft. In that preface, I express my view, as well as I expect on the part of the university, that tenure is an essential ingredient in our university and indeed in higher education, I may not use exactly the same words, but it is in that preface. I

would suggest to you, rather than making it a separate recommendation, maybe that's what you prefer here, that including it in that manner is adequate. But it does explicitly address that in part I think to respond to the original question concern you had, but also in part to state a view, in light of the developments in the nation about tenure.

Lohman: Are there other assumptions about tenure that might be included in the preface and what a public university...

Brand: Yes, that's exactly what I try and do. I try and talk about our core values, about faculty role, I try and talk about our core values, about education and excellence, as well as our role as a public university. I try and play that out using my own words in as reasonable way as I can. But that's the intent of the preface, to make explicit the kinds of assumptions that I take we all are working from and I'd be amazed if there wasn't universal agreement in this room about. So that will be a part of the document, but not as a recommendation because the recommendations are really concerned with what initiatives, actions we ought to take, This is not an action, this is an assumption by which we're building our future and I assure you, at least from my perspective, no disagreement about the importance of tenure. I'm not addressing item two, I'm addressing item one. Please Elton.

Jackson: Could you give us some sense about how the trustees feel about the institution of tenure?

Brand: I'm not sure that I can, but I haven't heard any objections to it. I hesitate to ask, I will not ask them to address that. But let me tell you this much Elton, I'm personally not only convinced, but committed to the institution of tenure. I feel that probably now, more so than in the past few decades, that tenure is important and let me give you a concrete example of why. I was speaking to my colleague, Charles Young who is the Chancellor at UCLA, and he was relating a true story about what happened with their Board of Regents, and tenure is under attack at the University of California system, and one of the Regents said I want to find out who was against this proposal to downgrade Affirmative Action so I can take action against them. And you know, Young's eyes lit up. And that's a real case, these were faculty members who were making an argument for Affirmative Action in that environment, they happened to have lost the battle, not necessarily the war, but they lost the battle. They were making, in a perfectly legitimate way, arguments about what they thought the best future direction of the university should be. And it should not be the case that anyone inside or outside the university finds it actionable. And I fear that those kinds of attacks will increase rather than decrease, and so I think, under these conditions, it's important to reaffirm tenure.

Jackson: But then, would there be any objection then to actually incorporating it in the body of the charter itself.

Brand: I think it's incongruous in a certain way. The charter is not a statement of what our assumptions are, it's not a statement of our values. It's a statement of framework for action of the future. But there is a place for statement of assumptions and values, and that's what I'm trying to develop.

Chris: I think it might work out if Marty and Elton were to accept sort of a friendly amendment. Those of you who have this, the first line of the first resolution says "The Strategic Directions Charter

should include the statement," that's obviously now sort of a contested area whether it should be in the charter or where it should be. So if they would agree to simply rephrasing that slightly to saying "The Strategic Directions Charter or it's preface should include the essence of these statements," perhaps we could come to an agreement on.

Jackson: I'd be comfortable with that.

Brand: Marty, Elton, you comfortable with that? OK, well you could pass it if you want, it's already in the preface.

<308>: I call the question.

Brand: As amended by Professor Lohman. All in favor please say I <multiple responses>, Opposed, <no audible responses>, OK. Let's go on to two, Oh, Elton.

Jackson: Let me begin by saying we did not want to open up the issue of clinical faculty. There is a sense in which these two statements are related and that is to say one way in which tenure can be weakened is that you continue to tenure a certain portion of your faculty, but you hire more and more part-time adjunct people to teach classes so that less and less of the mission of the university is carried out by tenure track faculty. The intent of this statement is to essentially say that the charter should include a statement that says that we want to decrease our reliance on non-tenure track faculty.

Brand: There's the sense that putting this in the charter pre-empts the discussion that UFC is going to have in the future isn't there. What the charter says is that this is an issue that has to be addressed. It doesn't resolve the issue, but says that this is an issue that must be resolved and addressed and then the UFC is in the process after the new year of coming to grips with this. As a matter of fact, I understand there's a major report forthcoming. But by putting it in the charter, are you not trying to pre-empt that discussion and saying it's already been decided.

Jackson: Well the reason why these concerns arose is because the charter speaks of establishing career paths for adjunct faculty. That sort of seemed as if adjunct faculty were going to be sort of institutionalized, which meant that in a way that pre-empted the discussion.

Brand: But even if this is true, that there will be fewer adjunct faculty in the future than there are now and fewer than there are up to a certain limit of 15% or whatever that limit is, we will never reach the case when there are zero, and the charter talks about the case of what you do with that adjunct faculty, whether they're clinical faculty, whether they're adjunct in the Law School or SPEA. I mean we're always going to have some faculty and the charter speaks with how you deal with that group of faculty. What this says is how you want to decide the clinical issue and the adjunct issue, and I thought that pre-empts the discussion of the next several meetings. Please Kathy.

Kathleen: I'd like to encourage the council to vote against this part of the resolution that's before us, partly because I agree with President Brand that it is a pre-emptive sort of statement, although I understand where you're coming from as they say. As a member of a department in the School of Medicine, I'm not sure I could vote in favor of it anyway. For some departments, it is not appropriate

to decrease the proportion from where we are. I know that you have been working on the clinical ranks and the other interesting ranks all fall and that you have all sorts of knowledge and have formed opinions. But I don't think it's fair to ask the council today, without hearing all of your presentation, to take this step, not today.

Bepko: <367> but there's one additional concern that I have with the way the puzzle is worded. And that is, that it may be worded and suggest that faculty members in some units teach more than they do currently. One way of decreasing the number of courses taught by part-time or non-tenure track faculty is for full-time faculty who are on a tenure track or tenured to teach more and we're having discussions all across the university about what is the optimal point at which faculty should have responsibilities in the classroom and what part of their work should be devoted to other activities and I think this could have implications in that discussion that I think would not aid that other discussion.

Carr: I have a question for Marty. When you speak at the end of section two of non-tenure track personnel, you are including Associate Instructors in that discussion?

Spechler: Richard, that's correct, certainly AI's are not tenure track personnel and the specific stimulus to this resolution are things that is, various statements in the strategic charter which talks for example that we do not want to increase the number of AI's in use, for example. But it doesn't say anything about other kinds of non-tenure track personnel. In other words, the strategic charter already talks of these matters. It already talks of these matters and therefore we felt that we ought to get the thing straight, that we want more tenure track and tenured faculty in the university and teaching our courses.

Carr: I think the section you're referring to doesn't state <402> in those terms. It suggests that we rely less on them and the, <404> but to come back to this issue in terms of your recommendation, don't you think that especially in this time of increased assessment that we would be turning our backs on <409> to say prepare the teachers of the future, which is essentially what we're doing with associate instructors.

Spechler: Well Richard, you hit on one of my pet peeves and that's quite a different issue. When we prepared the teachers for the future is a little off the point, but the current issue of the AAP bulletin points out that 50% roughly of those who we prepare do not get jobs. And that is a big issue at Indiana University also.

Peters: Is it possible that the thrust behind this resolution, not the specifics, but the thrust and the importance of tenure track faculty <423> would be an appropriate inclusion in the preface. And without going into the kinds of specifics here, but never the less the important place here, not just the principle of tenure, but the I guess important contributions that we expect of tenure track faculty, that that would...

Brand: Yes, that's included, but that doesn't directly address the issue I'm afraid. It strikes me that a motion to table until after the conversation about, I think starting in February is when I'm taking this up. I hear a motion to table. It's not debatable, all in favor of tabling item two please say I <multiple

responses>, Opposed <no audible response>, it's tabled till further. Any other issues about the Strategic Directions Charter?

Ginger: I think it would be nice to see in the next draft in the preface or preamble before the trustees vote on it. Is there any timetable for printing and distributing it to us. It's not that I don't believe what you're saying about what's in it...

Brand: We're not going to go through another round again. I mean we already went through a very serious round, two rounds actually, of debate and comments. We've got to draw this to closure. The drafting committee, most of who are here today, have been listening very carefully to the comments and a lot of work is being put into it. It'll probably be ready a few days before the trustees vote on it. I told the Agenda Committee as well as the Steering Committee as well as the trustees themselves, we'll have just a couple days to look at it beforehand and see if there's any egregious error that has to be corrected, but we've got to get on with this. I recommend we don't go through another round.

Ginger: I understand that. I'm just saying a lot of people's concerns are being met with the assertion "Oh we're going to deal with that in the next draft and the preamble," and not that we don't everyone that says that, but on the other hand it would be nice...

Brand: I don't think every concern will be met in the next draft or preamble or the preface. In part, because there are contradictory desires among our many colleagues, not everyone wants the same thing or to hear the same thing. All that you have is our promises that we'll do the best that we can.

Greenebaum: But also it's in point on that, again coming back to what we were saying before about what the nature of the document is, how these tensions are acted out will in fact rely on our governance processes rather than saying that any issue has been definitively laid to rest in an action way by the draft of the charter.

Ginger: I understand that, but I just would feel better if the final version that the trustees I'm going to assume got was something that we could see before their discussion. I'm not saying that everything needs to be nailed down up front. I guess I'm just not comfortable with not getting the ultimate version to vote on and discuss.

Brand: You're not voting on the Strategic Directions Charter today.

Ginger: We're not?

Brand: No, there's no resolution on the table to vote on it. You voted on a resolution about certain principles that must be abided by in how we enact the framework that is the charter. But there's no resolution to vote on the charter.

Ginger: Well, I'm still not happy with seeing the ultimate version of something and being asked to make comments on things that aren't here. I'd just like to register that.

Brand: OK, Jerry.

Bepko: The final draft will go out to the trustees a few days before. Could they also go to the members of UFC at that time.

Brand: Sure, we could do that, but we're not going to go through another round. If there's something egregious that you find that is not stated there, or stated badly, or a point that has been missed, we can do to, there's e-mail. Of course you got that information. As long as it's understood that this is not a whole another draft and that it will go back and be drafted again. We've got to bring this thing to closure folks.

Coffin: I guess one of the things when we began to talk about what the council was going to do that disturbed me is that the trustees are going to vote on the charter, so presumably this is going to be adopted by the trustees and in some sense, official university policy. But we as University Faculty Council are not voting on the charter. While we can vote on a resolution that talks about how we are going to deal with the implementation process, there is a sense in which we have not been asked, although we've clearly been asked informally, but we have not been asked formally to take a position on this document as a whole.

Brand: But it's a hard question to ask you, a) you don't have the final version so you're not voting on that and the final version is a reflection of a lot of input, and secondly, if voting yes means that you agree with everything in the charter, no one could vote yes to that.

Coffin: Well you're asking the trustees to do that.

Brand: The trustees are adopting that framework, yes. But I think that to ask this group to vote on a charter as opposed to having significant input into shaping the charter, is a bit odd I think.

Coffin: What it does to me is it confuses me as to what the faculty role is. So I guess I'm not necessarily sitting here saying I think we ought to vote on the whole thing, but I'm sitting here saying I think I'm confused about what the faculty government's role is with respect to this as official university policy.

Spechler: Well Don, I think it's good that we're not voting on the strategic charter because we would certainly need a great deal more details on any specific proposal. For example, the all-university Associates Degree, which has been raised. I think we maybe sort of informally committed into considering this, but all of us would need to see a great deal more in the way of detail before we would approve it and it's just not approved. It's something that we'll look at.

Brand: What the charter does is give you a framework for considering that and says "This is an idea worth considering in detail" and also gives you a path through the normal processes of developing such a degree. But it doesn't say the degree will look like X, Y, and Z. That's why it's a framework. This group, Shirley and many others as well, have had significant input into what that final version will be, which will be considerably different than the earlier versions.

Peterson: My concern then, as the Board of Trustees votes on this, will they take this as a charge to the university to carry on all of the strategic directions that we have stipulated in this document.

Brand: Well, for example, it says "Explore the two year degree." Yeah, we'll take that as...

Peterson: As exploring but not as to...

Coffin: The actual statement as it stands now, and it may have been changed in drafting, it doesn't say "explore," it says "develop" a university wide Associate Degree program. And that's a different statement from "Explore the development of."

Warfel: I think the faculty council has had an opportunity to look at the drafted charter and to say number one, there are certain things in it that we as the faculty find unacceptable and we resolve to take out item X. I think we've found very much that's unacceptable. We also had an open opportunity to put in things that the 8 task force groups and the drafting committee somehow overlooked, but that we think it's very important to go into the charter. And I think the discussion about reaffirming the importance of tenure is an example of that. I agree with Marty that it doesn't seem really appropriate for the council to vote on the charter as a whole.

Coffin: I don't know that I feel it's appropriate, I feel ambivalent about where we are in the process. I feel as if somehow, and I don't know what it is, but I feel as if we're looking at the trustees adopting something as university policy, that in a sense I don't feel like this council feels there's closure on, at least I don't feel like it.

Warfel: This isn't a faculty council document. This is a document really written not only by faculty participation, but administration, staff, community, alum's, and those either voting on, this is a real community product and, in my mind <End of tape 1B Start of tape 2A> this is the appropriate direction to go.

Scherer: I understand that but I'm still not persuaded fully, although I don't have any specific objection to anything in the document, I'm not persuaded that it would not be a better policy and more in line with our division, that we shouldn't vote on it. Not necessarily that it is our document, but that are reacting officially to it. It is of considerable importance. We are representing the faculty on issues such as this and it seems to me that in the past, things similar to this have been voted on. That's my impression.

Greenebaum: I don't know if there ever has been anything like this really.

Scott: <010> and I share Donald's concern about lack of closure and I share in Marty's concern about voting on his particular documents. But it seems to me that one thing that we might do is offer to ourselves a sense of immediate resolution that might have three or four parts. I've heard two or three things today, particularly from President Brand, that encourage and delight me that I expect will be upcoming in the preamble or preface that he's writing. But our sense of the meeting today that we've talked to each other about includes several things. The first thing they include is a real sense that we are in the midst of change and that we need to do some things, specific things, in response to those changes. The second thing we've said to each other is that there are certain core values that we do clearly want to take and we've outlined a few of those and left some others a little fuzzy, but one that's important to us for example is tenure. The third thing that we've said is that any document like the charter can be used, like President Brand says, as a framework for planning

and for our addressing these changes in the upcoming future. And the fourth thing we've said is that whatever these plans and changes are will go through the regular faculty and other governance procedures. And it seems to me that we might offer a sense of a meeting resolution that would say what our chief concerns had been without approving or disapproving any specific document.

Brand: Myrtle, will you make that as a motion?

Scott: I so move.

Brand: Is there a second to that?

<023>: Second.

Brand: OK, any discussion of that? All in favor please say "I" <multiple responses>, I hope the secretaries got all this down. I think we understand it, any opposed <no audible response>, OK. Let us go on to any other issues.

Mannheimer: I feel so closed <laughter erupts>.

Stake: Are we still on the charter?

Brand: We're still on the charter.

Stake: I have a couple of concerns with regard to external constituencies. One, it has to do with what was just discussed and that is I think we set the university up and ourselves up for some embarrassment if later on something is passed by the trustees and the faculty says "Oh we're not going to do that," and the news reporters say "Why not," and we say "Well we never agreed to this." I think that could be quite embarrassing. It looks like it's a document to the outside world, maybe it doesn't to us, but it looks like it's a document that says what we will do and if we refuse to do it later on the grounds that we never agreed to it, it might not look so good. Thinking about the same external audience, I think we should assume that the document is the one document from IU that some people, many people, in this state will leave this decade and it ought to, if it's going to be that one document, it ought to knock their socks off. It ought to glow with the nobility of our cause. It ought to reflect the depth of our commitment to it and I fear that it doesn't and won't knock anybody's socks off as it now reads.

Zietlow: That's going to be in the preface <laughter erupts>.

Brand: There is going to be some re-drafting, but frankly I doubt that this will be this 40 page document that people will read. There will be extracts from it and reshaping of the same things.

Stake: Yeah, there ought to be something in it that can be pulled out that they can read.

Brand: Yes. Well the content is the same, but stated more eloquently. We will need to do that to disseminate to our publics what is going on here. This will not do it. It's written for us more than anyone. But next draft should do that.

Peters: Is it appropriate to address any specifics in the document at this time?

Brand: Sure.

Peters: There may be something that has been modified already. In item number 4, end of paragraph, there is an indefinite article which strikes me as terribly misleading <multiple conversations>. Unfortunately, it's substantive. In the, under item number 4, in the second full paragraph, excuse me, in the second sentence, I'm sorry, it says "we look to develop a single IU Associate Degree, including an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science and Configurations, that will be fully articulated across campuses and lead seamlessly to a Baccalaureate Degree at any location." I'm worried that "a" may, that a natural interpretation of "a" is<061> and I don't think that's what's meant.

Brand: You mean any location.

Peters: Yeah, "a" baccalaureate.

Brand: Oh, I see what you mean, some baccalaureate degrees will and some won't.

Peters: Right

Brand: OK. Don, you got that one.

Gray: <067>You have before you a sheet from the Educational Policies Committee which is not so much recommendation, but the results of some discussions we had, here's Kathy who will present it before we leave. We had a "meet me conference call," it's a very cutesy name, but it is a telephone conference. We didn't discuss the general principles to the same extent that this meeting has been today, so I did delay getting into this area because of<080> detail, but since <081> there is a very neat transition that could be made to the first item and let me just call your attention to a couple of the points since you have them all presented on this page and in pretty fair detail. With regard to the university wide Associate Degree that's recommended in the charter, personally there was a bit of confusion as far as that degree already exists. The School of Continuing Studies offers this degree, but also a degree of discomfort here among the members of the committee feeling that, given the diversity of the campus missions, that an Associate Degree would be better defined by the campus by canvassing themselves rather than one over-arching degree. A second major concern, and this is one that I think I've heard talked about ever since I've been at Indiana University and that is the question of the transferability of the credit, which comes up several times during the charter. This is an uncomfortable issue and one which we dealt with at our last meeting in Indianapolis. There were some rather firm words about this issue at this time. It is recognized that it's a problem of sufficient extent that it has to be dealt with. One thing that I rather enjoyed from this meeting that we had over the telephone was there really seemed to be a major step that was taken toward a resolution of this problem. The problem exists and it probably always will. We accept the fact that academic units, schools, colleges, whatever it may be, have the right to define their own requirements, their degree requirements, and so forth. These are not the same as you move from campus to campus. Campuses have their specific missions, these are not the same. Campuses offer the same courses, same course number, these are not the same. I think this is a truth that we have to recognize and

not push under the rug. To the same extent, this should not be seen as something which is a great failure in our system. We are, after all, 8 campuses trying to help 8 groups of people. These differences could be seen really as one of the strengths of Indiana University rather than some major obstacle. Students who transfer from campus to campus are not always aware of how much of the course credit is going to transfer and indeed it does not always. The recommendation that we're making is to make some of this information available and this is a recommendation that was very greatly and warmly received by the Recorder of the College of Arts and Sciences. It is the Recorder who transfers these credits. Student's don't go through some sort of admission to be admitted to such and such a campus. The Recorder looks at their record and copies across what is acceptable and what is not. To this extent, having this information available to students would make a number of the problems we encounter and have encountered for years. The recommendation that you'll see on the<123> is that we develop on the web some specific information which could be advised to students at whatever campus they might be and then move to whatever campus they attempt to go to. This is a positive recommendation which is quite honestly<129> so that we can address this problem. The other items on the page are I think fairly clear. And I'm happy to see the chair of the committee is here who may add something to my brief statements.

Olmer: I would only want to point out we spent a lot of time cruising the web and discovered lots of information on the web, very impressive information on the web, and information for prospective freshman about admissions and for persons transferring from other schools. When I pressed the appropriate button for information about transfers from other IU campuses, I received an error message indicating that there was no information there. When I checked with the people in the College of Arts and Sciences, they said yes that it really is a problem.

Brand: Do we want to move on to our last item of business? Are there any other questions about the Strategic Directions Charter? Well seeing and hearing none, let me suggest that we go into Executive Session. OK, take 5 minutes then go into Executive Session.