

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 15, 2013
Indiana Memorial Union – State Room East
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joelle Bahloul, Abhijit Basu, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Claude Clegg, Mike Conway, Carrie Docherty, Jake Docking, Alyce Fly, Marion Frank–Wilson, Thomas Gieryn, Krista Glazewski, Margaret Gray, Dennis Groth, Vivian Halloran, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Gretchen Horlacher, Brian Horne, Jason Baird Jackson, Jennifer Laherty, Bradley Levinson, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Joseph Miller, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Jamie Prenkert, Lauren Robel, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, Nona Watt, Rega Wood

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone), Kelly Thacker (Maryanne McDonnell)

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Baxter, Gracia Clark, Ying Ding, Nathan Ensmenger, Katy Flanigan, Jeffrey Gershman, Donald Gjerdingen, Timothy Hoch, Cheng Kao, Christopher Kauffman, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Karma Lochrie, Michael McRobbie, Jose Mitjavila, Deanna Reising, Olivia Rios, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Adam Szczepaniak, Mikel Tiller, Jessica Tooker, Julie Van Voorhis, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Elisabeth Andrews (Office of the Provost), Alan Bender, (Biology), Bonnie Brownlee (Journalism), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Mary Favret (General Education), Edward Hirt (CPC, Psychological and Brain Sciences), Ashley Jenkins (Indiana Daily Student), Bob Kravchuk (Budgetary Affairs Committee co–chair), Robert Noel (IU Libraries), Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/13–14/09.17.13.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Alfred “Freddy” Diamant and Louis C. Watson

Alfred “Freddy” Diamant: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/B8–2014.pdf>

Louis C. Watson: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/B9–2014.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Faculty President Herb Terry)
4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Provost Lauren Robel)
5. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
6. Update on the Media School (30 minutes)
(Provost Lauren Robel, Interim Dean Lesa Hatley Major, Faculty President Herb Terry, College of Arts and Sciences Policy committee Chair Ed Hirt and School of Journalism Policy committee Chair Claude Cookman) [DISCUSSION]
7. General Education Committee Report (30 minutes)
(Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Dennis Groth, and Professor Mary Favret, Co-Chairs of the General Education Committee) [DISCUSSION]
8. Indiana University Principles of Ethical Conduct (15 minutes)
(Faculty President Herb Terry) [DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B10-2014.pdf>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Terry should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcoff@indiana.edu

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ROBEL: Welcome everybody. Hello Council, we have a quorum. Our quorum is not as usual in most academic settings, focused in exactly in front. It's over the sides and stuck in the back but, we'll try to make it work. We begin, as always, with the approval of the minutes. Do I hear a motion?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved.

ROBEL: Thank you, and a second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.

ROBEL: Great. All in favor? [Aye]. Okay, opposed? [Silence]. Thank you. I turn as is our tradition to Vice Provost Tom Gieryn for our memorial resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ALFRED “FREDDY” DIAMANT AND LOUIS C. WATSON

GIERYN: Freddy Diamant was born in Vienna, Austria. Following the Anschluss, and after a series of adventures in which he displayed his characteristic fortitude and concern for others, Freddy reached the United States in 1940. Not as yet an American citizen, Freddy volunteered for the army the day after Pearl Harbor. Shot in the back during the Normandy invasion, Freddy was officially designated partially disabled. Later when Congress passed legislation giving special health benefits to people in this situation, he (typically) expressed the strong desire that this aid be given to someone who really needed it.

After the war, Freddy at last was able to pursue his intellectual and professional dreams, receiving his A.B. from Indiana University in 1947 and his Ph.D. from Yale in 1957. He embarked on a distinguished academic career — first at the University of Florida (1950–1960), then at Haverford College (1960–1967), and finally at Indiana (1967–1988). While at Indiana he served as Chair of Political Science and on two occasions as Chair of West European Studies. He also received a number of academic awards including a Guggenheim, a Fulbright Senior Research, and an Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung Fellowship. For a number of years after his retirement as Professor of Political Science and West European Studies, Freddy continued to teach his graduate seminar, “Bureaucracy and Public Policy in Western Europe,” and he remained active in university affairs, serving, for example, in the Students Advocates Office.

Freddy’s academic work fell primarily in two areas: Political Theory; and Comparative Public Administration and Development. Freddy connected these seemingly discrete fields by focusing on the potentialities for collective social and political betterment. In his book, *Austrian Catholics and the First Republic: Democracy, Capitalism and the Social Order, 1918–1934* (Princeton University Press), Freddy showed how Catholic thinkers and political leaders attempted to grapple with the demise of the Hapsburg Empire and the challenges of 19th– century Catholic social thought, represented in the Papal Encyclical “Quadragesimo Anno,” which asserted the right of the state “to adjust ownership to meet the needs of the public good.” Freddy argued that the reaction, the concept of “corporatism” enshrined in the Austrian Constitution of 1934, was a sham, a “convenient disguise for perpetuating the predominance of big business and of authoritarian political leaders.” He continued his interest in the political impact of ideas in his studies of workplace democracy and the political and policy implications of the “neo–corporatist” revival after World War II.

His concern with historical context and the focus on politics as a key explanatory variable underlay his contributions to Comparative Public Administration and Development. Institutionally, Freddy was a founding member of the Faculty Research Seminars in Comparative Administration and Development as well as a member of the Program Committee

for an eight year Ford Foundation grant for the study of development administration. In over twenty articles and book chapters Freddy argued against dichotomizing “Western” and “non–Western” political systems, against “reducing politics to a dependent variable,” and for a nuanced appreciation of the relationship between the political and administrative order. For example, he argued that in the case of France, “in the presence of a weak political consensus the administrative machinery necessary for a modern nation state will develop its own rules and procedures.” These positions were, and remain, contentious. Freddy advanced his views with tenacity and courtesy.

It would be a mistake, however, to delimit too starkly the scope of his intellectual interests. Instinctively curious, always looking for unexpected connections, prepared to do the work necessary to engage in an array of fruitful conversations, Freddy was a valuable member of our discipline as a whole. The breadth of his attention is seen in the diversity of graduate dissertations he directed, with countries, to cite just one example, ranging from Argentina (religion in politics) to the United States (labor market policy).

This reference to dissertations brings us to Freddy’s relations with students and colleagues, the most personally satisfying and in my view the most important of his academic achievements. Remembrances from colleagues: Russ Hanson—“Freddy read my work, and critiqued it, accurately, but gently. And when it appeared that I could fly on my own, he stood back and cheered me on. His sense of mentoring was enduring, endearing, and eminently humane.” Dick Stryker—“Freddy provided a model for junior colleagues in the selfless spirit with which he encouraged and read our work.” In my own case, Freddy, by his critique of my work and by his professional example, led an overly prickly new Ph.D. toward better listening and greater attentiveness.

From graduate students: Joyce Mushaben—“Freddy was my *Doktorvater* in a figurative and literal sense. He was devoted to infusing the study of institutions, public policies and administrative processes with democratic values. He combined the wisdom of Winnie–the–Pooh with the profound lessons of Hannah Arendt and Victor Klemperer, followed up with a strong dose of Studs Terkel.” Hans Michelmann—“I received important guidance about university teaching. I have used the same basic course structure, applied the lessons I learned watching him teach, and in general followed his pedagogic advice.” Margaret and Richard Hayes – “Freddy taught us much, as a professor and as a friend. It is only now that we understand the importance of his work with the Comparative Administration Group. It is so relevant to our focus on ‘governance’ in Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. Freddy’s wisdom has left a profound mark on our understanding of contemporary world events.” David Robertson—“I learned from Freddy to care about students. Caring about students is the foundation of quality teaching. Without it, techniques don’t matter. I learned to understand the world, to really understand it in the sense of Max Weber’s *Verstehen*, to see the world from someone else’s point of view. I learned diplomacy, the skill of being both firm and kind.”

Although this is an academic review, an understanding of his life would be fundamentally incomplete without noting the deep love and respect Freddy had for his wife Ann (who died in 2003), their children Alice and Steve, and their grandchildren. I also should record how Freddy and Ann were the Bloomington family for so many students and colleagues including myself.

Teacher, mentor, colleague, and fast friend—Freddy’s legacy is seen in the lives and in the work of those privileged to have known him.

A native of Jeffersonville, Indiana, the tenth of eleven children, Louis “Lou” Watson graduated from Jeffersonville High School in 1943, participating and excelling as a member of the basketball and baseball teams. Lou was a Navy veteran of World War II. He served as a gunner’s mate on a Landing Ship, Tank (LST) crew and participated in the historic landing operations of the Allied Invasion on the beachheads of Normandy, France in 1944. He played basketball for his Navy unit as well and was their leading scorer.

After discharge from the Navy, Lou enrolled at Indiana University in 1946 and participated with the basketball and baseball teams, graduating in 1950 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Physical Education and also a Master of Science in Physical Education in 1952. He was a starting forward and leading scorer all four years under renowned coach, Branch McCracken. His basketball team won the Big Ten title in 1948. Honors at Indiana University included consecutive Most Valuable Player awards his junior and senior years, All–Big Ten Conference recognition those same years, All American designation in 1950, and two Balfour awards, awarded for bringing honor and distinction to Indiana University. In his era he held virtually all Indiana scoring records. He was also prominent in baseball, as an outfielder for the 1949 Big Ten Co–Championship Baseball team. After graduation Lou turned down professional basketball offers to assume the freshman basketball coaching position under McCracken and served in that capacity for two years before accepting a position as Head Basketball coach at Huntington High School. He returned three years later to Indiana to again coach the freshman basketball and baseball squads. In 1958 he accepted a position as assistant coach with Indiana’s Varsity basketball squad. When Branch McCracken retired, Watson was the first and only candidate considered for the head coaching position, which he accepted on March 3, 1965. With his appointment, he became only the third head coach in Indiana basketball history, succeeding two basketball legends, Evert Dean and Branch McCracken. During Lou’s coaching tenure, his overall record was 62–60, which included Big Ten co–championship basketball honors in 1967.

Traditional coaching appointments carried academic assignments within the Department of Physical Education. Head coaches were responsible for teaching advanced theories of their respective sport programs. Lou provided quality instruction to aspiring young professionals who

hoped to emulate Watson's coaching philosophy in their future programs. During his tenure as head coach, the Big Ten developed a reputation as a "run and gun" league, what Watson called transition basketball where there was no attempt to run out the clock. Watson's instruction emphasized set shots, increased emphasis on setting screens and picks with a lot of ball movement. His common approach, however, always emphasized, "You've got five guys out there, and there's only so many things you can do out there – there's only one ball."

He became special assistant to the athletic director in 1971 and associate athletic director in 1976 before his retirement in 1987. His responsibilities involved scheduling, maintenance, and upgrading of the continuously growing athletic facilities. He was a 1988 recipient of the Z. G. Clevenger award, which is bestowed upon candidates who promote the highest ideals of university service set forth by Clevenger. He was also inducted into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame and in 1990, the Indiana University Athletic Hall of fame. He was a lifetime member of the Bloomington Elks Club and the American Legion.

Lou Watson was a constant source of positivity. He had an innate ability to lead on the court and in the classroom. His always upbeat and considerate style served students, staff and administrators of the university well. Lou C. Watson's time at Indiana as an athlete, coach, instructor, and administrator covered almost forty years. He was a dedicated servant to this university and to the "Glory of Old IU".

ROBEL: Please stand to recognize these two extraordinary men. [All stand in silence]. Thank you. [All sit]. And I'm once again both moved and touched and grateful for the faculty authors of these memorial resolutions. I will never forget comparing a colleague to Winnie-the-Pooh, Hannah Arendt and Studs Terkel in the same sentence. That's just wonderful. I recognize this time our President, Herb Terry, for Executive Committee Business.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

TERRY: Thank you. When we last met, prior to the president's State of the University address, we spent a lot of time talking about the proposal for the Media School. At that time, the proposal had not been released. I am pleased to tell you that the following Monday it was released by the president, and partly as a result of that, although we would have done it anyway, I can tell you that the Executive Committee created an ad hoc committee to implement the campus policies arising from that proposal. We worked with the colleagues at IUPUI because the School of Journalism, at the moment, is a core school, and there are core school reorganization and merger policies as well as campus policies that are applicable. I'll report later in the meeting on what we did and that sort of thing because there's a scheduled

item on the Media School later. Some of you attended President McRobbie's State of the University address on October 1st. Those of you who were there were duly noted. Thank you for coming to that. Several initiatives emerged from that speech that are relevant to IUB. Along with my IUPUI colleague Jack Windsor, I've spoken with the president about faculty engagement in two related strategic planning initiatives that he announced in that speech. The first is a general strategic plan for all of Indiana University, and the second a digital master plan for the university which is related, in many ways, to an initiative announced there to digitize many of our time based media holdings. The president sees the grand university master plan as largely, but not exclusively, an exercise in bringing together and coordinating the master plans of the strategic plans of the various campuses. But he knows, as do I, and as does Jack, that in the course of doing that some things are likely to come up that may turn around and affect the individual campuses, particularly, for example, if the master plan develops some strategies for core schools, or things like that. Working with the Executive Committee of the BFC and the UFC, what I can do is promise that I will work to make sure that faculty are effectively consulted on the development of the university master plan and the digital master plan. I also expect committees of the BFC will get involved in the digitization process. Related to that, I anticipate asking Jason over there, who's head of the Library Committee to spend just a little time this year looking at the charge of that committee, and making recommendations to the Executive Committee for perhaps a revised charge for the Library Committee that reflects both the changing nature of university libraries, and the general issues of, in university, of preservation, digitization of knowledge overall. Another thing arising from the State of the University address, and for that matter also from the Media School proposal, is the president's charge to, "examine opportunities for offering combined liberal arts professional courses of study at IU." His goal, again announced in that speech, is that within the next few years IU will offer combined courses of study in the liberal arts and every professional discipline at IU, and in doing so become known as national leader in innovative education that graduates students who are much in demand for their skills and adaptability. These initiatives will clearly involve faculty governance units of the schools, but since they are designed to cut across school boundaries they implicate the BFC as well. As this progresses I anticipate it will become an active issue for the Educational Policies Committee and perhaps for other committees of this campus.

Preparation for the 200th anniversary of Indiana University in 1920 – 2020 – is accelerating. Indeed, the strategic planning process is linked to that event. But so is a major campaign for the bicentenary to be conducted by the IU Foundation. I hope to meet with Dan Smith, president of the Foundation, in the next few weeks to discuss faculty engagement with the foundation in connection with this campaign. Actually there are three dimensions to that. First of all, I anticipate it will be entirely fair for them to do that – that the IU community will be a target for the campaign, that we will be asked to help support the university in that fundraising

effort. Second, I hope that the goals of the campaign will be influenced by faculty priorities. And third, I hope we can find ways to assist the Foundation – actively assist the Foundation in the successful conduct of the campaign. I want to talk to Dan to find out the most effective ways to accomplish all three of those objectives. At a meeting earlier this year of this Council, Dennis Groth reported on how the university is responding to a legislative mandate for Indiana’s public higher education institutions to develop universal pathways, assuring that Hoosier students can complete the first two years of their higher education programs, and transfer to other institutions without a loss of time or credit. There’s another statute from last year that also demands a quick IU response. This additional law requires that all of the state’s higher education institutions develop systems that will, when they first enter their higher education, present students with a semester by semester roadmap to graduation. All of this must be in place for new students beginning Fall 2014. It’s a statewide mandate which for us means it’s a university wide mandate. I have been appointed by Vice President Applegate to a university wide taskforce charged with getting this done. Dennis is one of the heads of the taskforce. It’s a daunting job and a very challenging deadline, and in the long run it may have very significant impact on education on our campus. I’ll keep you informed going forward and I may ask for advice from BFC committees. In my personal opinion, this is yet another example of the General Assembly mandating potentially costly actions on our part. There’s a lot to do here, where the consequences are not fully understood, and some consequences may be counterproductive. Still, we have to get this up and running and I’ll be working to get that done while at the same time attempting to maximize its educational benefits, and minimize its potential downsides.

The IU Board of Trustees meets here at IUB at the end of the week – Thursday and Friday. Their agenda is on the Trustees’ website. There will be an up – of interest to members of this Council – there’ll be an update Thursday, October 17th by MaryFrances McCourt on parking monetization initiative. I wrote MaryFrances several days ago asking if she could share with me what she’s likely to recommend. I didn’t hear back from her, so I can’t tell you what she may recommend. Come to the meeting and find out. There will be a report by Provost Robel, Vice Provost Soni, and Vice President for Research Jorge José on research at Indiana University. Some of you might – of Bloomington – some of you might want to attend that. And very relevant to our discussion at our last meeting, the proposal to form the Media School will be presented to the Academic Affairs and University Policies Committee this morning of Friday October 18th, and assuming positive reception there, voted on by the full board at its business meeting that afternoon. More about that later today. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER’S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you so much. President Terry has worked his way through much of the State of the University address, and I may just elaborate a little bit on a couple of those initiatives announced during the State of the University address. Most specifically, President Terry talked about the digital master plan, but I would like to mention the media, digital preservation initiative, and talk a little bit about that piece of the State of the University address just to give me an opportunity to thank so much, so many of the faculty members who worked on that project and particularly to thank the leadership of Ruth Stone, who I think is sitting in the back row over there. The reports that led up to MDPI are, I think, nationally renowned because of their thoroughness, and their thoughtfulness, and the ways in which Ruth and the groups she was working with had worked so carefully on cataloguing all of the time based media on our campus. I've come to understand that time based media are those media that exist that – they're not books which appear to be timeless, but they're those media that exist in various kinds of fragile forms. This initiative will take all of the campus time based media, other than film, which we still are working to – working on, and work through a process over the next five years to get all of those media into digital form, and to make them accessible for scholars on our campus and across the country to use. It's a – this was a massive undertaking and I'm really, really, really delighted that we're at the point where the partnership between the office for the vice president for research, and the office of the vice president of information technology, and of course the libraries, is at a place where we can start moving it forward. As the president said in his State of the University address, part of our charge as a university is the conservation and preservation of knowledge and making that – those primary source materials available to the world, is really an important step for our campus, and for all of us, all of those who work with those materials and – in their research lives. I remember when I first came into this position reading one or the other of those initial reports about media preservation and seeing in them a statement, 'We have at most fifteen years with many of these materials to get them to a stable place.' And thinking at the time, fifteen years! You know, that seems like a long time to me given a lot of the other things happening on campus, but it really is not a very long time, especially with materials that are degrading. So I'm delighted for this opportunity to be able to publically express the thanks of the campus to Professor Ruth Stone and to all of those who worked with her to get us to this place, and I'm delighted that we're in a position to move that forward.

I wanted to talk a little bit as well about the strategic planning process. The committees are all meeting. There are reports or summaries of their meetings up until the point I think they all broke off into subcommittees. At which point, I think my staff threw its hands up a little bit said we're at the end of our reporting capacity. But they – there are reports up on my website. I encourage you to talk to your colleagues on these committees. All of their names are posted as well on the website. We're about halfway through the semester...? Does that – is that

possible? And I'm hoping this coming weekend to have an opportunity to sit down with the chairs of all the committees just to see where they are. They've all been working to produce draft of mission values, vision, for their particular parts of strategic planning. As you can imagine, everything is connected to everything else, and so there are no sharp jurisdictional lines. And what I'm really looking for at this point are the thematic connections among the committees, because I think those thematic connections are going to tell us a lot about what our shared sense of direction might well be. With luck we'll continue to have those moving forward, and we'll put absolutely as much as my staff can bear to get up on the website over the next couple of weeks. And we will of course, before we get to anything close to finals, circulate drafts and have lots of opportunities for public comment, for town hall meetings, to really talk through what the committees are looking at.

And finally, on the legislative agendas we – I've been watching those very carefully as well. They had – they do have big implications for the campus. Luckily for us, the implications for – some of the legislative mandates, such as the degree mapping requirement have – dovetail quite nicely with some of the work that has been ongoing around advising, and particularly advising infrastructures. So I think we're in better shape than we dared hope to be able to deal with this particular set of requirements from the state. And for that I really want to thank first Sonya Stephens who worked so hard last year on getting systems in place, and then Dennis Groth for continuing to think through those systems, and particularly to think through the connections among the systems in ways that will allow us to meet the requirements that the state has put out that we provide a degree map for all of our students, so that they can get through their undergraduate degree in a timely fashion. So with that I think I will stop. I had one question from the – that was forwarded from Craig and it had to do with summer grants through CITL and I'm just going to – if you don't mind defer that to Dennis since he's – that's squarely in his bailiwick.

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

GROTH: I'm happy to, thank you very much Provost Robel and President Terry. The question that was forwarded was a request to address concerns about the process surrounding the summer instructional development fellowship grant program which is administered through the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. And the request of the faculty member was, to be blunt really, why is it focused on online? Can't we be more creative? And the answer to that is really on a – we review the call on an annual basis, and we did do a couple of years of focus on online education because it was a priority for the campus to move forward in that area, and it actually, our efforts there predated the activities of IU Online, and so it was a reasonable approach, we thought, to support the academic units in moving in that direction.

This year we're – we've shifted to hybrid courses, and we haven't put together next year's call, and I think we're open to other approaches. We'll continue to want to be sensitive and thoughtful to the priorities of the campus and also look towards sustainability and continue, hopefully, to support matching funds from the academic units so that they have skin in the game and actually interest in seeing these programs, these initiatives, these creative activities that the faculty move forward in supportive – in supportive ways. It also lets us double the number of people that get grants under that program.

HASS: I have a comment on that. It was my question and actually it was about the program, the fellowship itself, has been defunded. The money that, I don't really know the mechanism, but I guess the money has gone directly to the units, but not available to individual faculty directly as fellows as this program was. But the question is we – Provost Robel had mentioned last week making the residential campus relevant. That's certainly a big part of that, is our classroom teaching not our online teaching. And so I would advocate for both, that we can't deemphasize innovative approaches to classroom teaching in favor of online teaching, but we can certainly do both. And I would really like that to happen at some point. Again, I was a recipient of one of those grants ten years ago and I've reaped the benefits for that entire time. It was very important to my teaching I [comment indistinct] many faculty members. I would love to see it come back refunded.

GROTH: Well, could I follow up – ?

ROBEL: That's a great point, thank you.

GROTH: – Actually there's been no defunding of the program. The fellowships continue at the same funding. In fact, with the matching funding from the schools at twice the amount and they continue to be awarded to – directly to the faculty's accounts –

HASS: – SIDF? –

GROTH: – SIDF. Absolutely, yes sir.

HASS: We'll I've been at CITL for the last two years, and they said that they have no funds for that program. Maybe I'm mistaken.

GROTH: I can follow up directly with you and give the list of recipients, but it has continued every year without abate and no reduction in funding.

ROBEL: Thank you. Thank you.

WOOD: So that's in the answer about the continuation of the funding. What about the other part of the question, emphasis on the classroom as well as online teaching?

GROTH: As I said, this year we actually flipped from pure online to hybrid which is combination of classroom and online support, and we haven't put together this year's call, and we're certainly looking at possibilities surrounding the large, perhaps large lecture environment or other innovative uses. But I believe that we won't be – I can definitively say we won't be strictly looking at online.

ROBEL: Thank you and we'll resolve this factual question in time for the next meeting, and way before then so we can get you a direct answer.

HASS: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 6: UPDATE ON THE MEDIA SCHOOL

ROBEL: Yeah. Other questions or comments? Alright. The next thing on our agenda is an update on the Media School and I want to start with my thanks to our President Herb Terry, and to the BFC, and to the UFC for being so quick and agile in getting to the reorganization and mergers policy, getting their requests out for comment quickly, and also to the policy committees of the College and of the School of Journalism, and the faculty members of the departments of Communication Culture and Telecommunications, and of the School of Journalism for moving very quickly to get their comments in place. I received the School of Journalism's comments directly from the policy committee there – yesterday I think, and Herb you might want to talk a little bit more about this process. The proposal is online and has been since... whenever. The Monday after we last met.

TERRY: – The 23rd, yeah –

ROBEL: I encourage you to take some time to read it. The other things that are going on around the proposal at this point are that there is a committee for programming Franklin Hall with the – essentially for thinking about the space in Franklin, and working to – with the architect's office and with space planning to try and think about how best to use that resource. And there's another committee that is in place, and it seems to be growing bigger by the day that is working on how best to commemorate the memory of Ernie Pyle moving into this new space. And that's been a delightful committee to watch get up and going, and so, with that I think I'll turn it over to Herb.

TERRY: Oh, okay. Well, all I want to do is summarize for you what the University Faculty Council and Bloomington Faculty Council did following the policies that those two bodies have adopted on program reorganization, merger or elimination. I hope we have people here from both Journalism and from the College who can talk about what their policy committees did. As you know, the proposal was released on the 23rd of September. That sets three policies in motion simultaneously, it sets in motion the policies adopted by the BFC for reorganization on this

campus, and the policies of the UFC for reorganization of core schools, and written policies that the College of Arts and Sciences adopted several years ago, revised a couple of years ago, when reorganizations affect the College. I don't think Journalism anticipated being reorganized, merged, or eliminated. It didn't have any pre-existing policies about reorganization affecting them. The BFC and UFC policies basically require that we gather information from faculty, and we summarize what we receive, and we send those summaries to the president, to the provost of the Bloomington campus, to the chancellor at IUPUI, and to relevant deans. As Lauren noted, we got a notice out to the relevant faculty, all the faculty at IUB, most of the relevant at IUPUI, because they prefer that we work through their representatives on the Indianapolis Faculty Council. Those went out on Monday, September 30th because we knew this matter was coming before the Trustees on the 18th. We set a deadline of Monday, October 7th for the receipt of faculty comments so that we can get them summarized and then get them to the relevant folks. For the record, let me note the members of the committee that did this, because I think it indicates that we tried to choose relevant folks. Rachel Applegate, an associate professor of Library and Information Science at IUPUI joined the committee. She's a member of the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. From our Executive Committee, we appointed Claude Clegg and Don Gjerdingen, who can't be here today. But I also asked Ed Hirt, the chair of the College of Arts and Sciences Policy Committee, and Claude Cookman, the chair of the School of Journalism Policy committee to serve so that the activities of those bodies and our committee could be coordinated. We did receive one passionate complaint from a faculty member about the short deadlines here. The policy requires that this sort of notice and comment period be reasonable. That faculty member wasn't so sure this was reasonable. I think we would say from the standpoint of the committee that we got comments. People were notified. We would wish perhaps, ideally, for more time, but I'm actually grateful that the president released the report and we had opportunity to comment on it, and hope that if we do something similar we'll have more time in the future. We did not receive a large number of comments. There could be reasons for that. The College of Arts and Sciences Policy Committee quickly contacted the two departments in the College and the School of Journalism and invited them to comment as units. That probably blunted comments being received from many of the faculty in those units. We heard from six IUB faculty, one IUPUI faculty member, and one dean of the School of Informatics, who is of course also a faculty member himself. We beat our self-imposed October 11th deadline by one day, and got it to the president and the provost and others on October 10th.

I'm not going to summarize at great length the comments that were received. What we have done with those comments is indeed to summarize them, I'll answer questions if you have any, is to summarize them and to transmit them to the appropriate officers of the university. I'll hit a few highlights because I think they may be important. There was continued discussion of why the school was named the Media School. Some faculty aren't so sure that should be decided

right now, that you should let the faculty get together and discuss and see what might emerge. Others remained concerned that some variation of the word communication is not included, and they're fearful that this will not accurately convey what the school studies and what it does unless that's in there. There was concern about the fact that at IUPUI there's a B.S. program in media art and – arts and science, it's in the School of Informatics up there. And some questions were raised about whether students would be confused, and how transfers might work between students working in that B.S. program and coming into something at the Media School here. There was a lot of comment about the role of the humanities in this school, and it crossed all over the board. There were faculty members who thought the school as designed to drive the humanists out of it, and there were faculty members who thought that it is a humanities focused school, and that should be highlighted even more than it is at present. Social scientists see the word media studies as a code word for humanistic study – they don't think they fit in. Obviously there's going to be faculty thought about this if it is created. We recommended the following things in our report to all these folks; we did recommend some caution about naming the thing. We recommended that – well we expressed our expectations that, as the provost has said at our last Faculty Council meeting, that there are many, many things now to be decided about implementing this. We didn't use this term, but I thought of it coming over here, if this has been a top down process so far, it's now time for it to be bottom up. It is now time for the proposal to be handed off, after the trustees approve it, to the faculty for them to work on many of the details of how to get this thing up and running. We will mostly do it with faculty we currently have. There will be some hiring to be sure, but for the most part it's the faculty that we currently have who will have to implement this and they will – they need to be ac – you know, actively engaged in making decisions about how to do that. We noted the linkage between the concerns that were expressed about the blend, the appropriate blend of the College of Liberal Arts and professionalism in reaction to the report with what the president said in the State of the University address and again, argued for active faculty participation as that creative blend is carried out both in the school and generally. And we made an observation that there are many steps to go forward, one of which will be the designing of faculty governance systems for this new school if it is created. We know that's proceeding now with faculty governance in the new School of Global and International Studies, the development of a constitution there. We observe that it may not be the case that that's the perfect model for the development of this because of a variety of things. One other thing emerged somewhat later that I should report on just briefly. Because of the relationships with IUPUI, and because this involves multiple schools on this campus there was a part of the report that said that faculty who don't think they fit in this new school could work with the College to figure out where else they would fit in the College, and clearly that's going to have to be broadened to some extent, because some faculty on this campus may think they fit better outside of the College than within it. And clearly you're not going to transfer the IUPUI faculty

to the College of Arts and Sciences in Bloomington unless, of course, I suppose they wanted to go there. So I – we assume there will be some modifications of that language in – before the thing is actually voted upon by the Trustees. And that’s where it stands from our perspective. Now, do we have Ed? There he is. And I don’t know if Claude was able to clear his schedule or not –

BROWNLEE: He’s in class [comment indistinct].

TERRY: Okay. So, the College of Arts and Sciences Policy Committee worked on this. What can you tell us?

HIRT: Okay, welcome. My name’s Ed Hirt, I’m the chair of the College Policy Committee and basically, I mean I was on the committee – the ad hoc committee with Herb with regard to soliciting the comments more broadly. But the sort of policy that we have in place with the CPC with the College is to – our charge was to solicit position statements from the specific affected units with regard to, you know, how they felt about the proposed document and the merger more generally, and to be able convey this feedback to – to Dean Singell. So we received, you know, immediately after the document was put out, we sent out a statement to each of the affected units as well as to Informatics to sort of submit these policy – position statements. We received them back again the same deadline that Herb had instituted of October 7th, and both CMCL and Telecom as well as Informatics met that deadline. Journalism needed some extra time, and I think they sent their document directly to you and then forwarded it to us at the same time. So we just received that in the last couple of days. So I’m hoping that Claude was here to be able to give a little bit more credence to the concerns that they had. But just to sort of summarize some specific things, I mean, obviously each of the units have their own particular concerns that were expressed unique to their units. For CMCL the big – the biggest issue that they had was that they are comprised of three sort of constituent units: the rhetoric and public culture, the performance and ethnography, and a film and media studies. And their position has been that each of these three units have a place in the new school and that, you know, they’ve been able to work a very interdisciplinary unit themselves to be able to sort of take advantage of these different approaches and would like to see all three of those represented in the new school. There’d been some debate through the different iterations of communications about this just in terms of whether all those units would fit into the new school, and so that is a lingering kind of concern that was expressed by this unit. For Telecom the biggest aspect that they focused on in their position statement was just uncertainty in terms of the nature of this document. How much we should take it sort of literally and the quote that they had was, “Should this be considered an artist’s rendering of the new school, or an architect’s final plan?” So, from their perspective they really wanted to have some

reassurance that the new school's structure and curriculum will be fully developed by the faculty in these units as opposed to, kind of, this is gospel this is how it's going to be.

Informatics is, I think President Terry alluded to, the biggest concern was that there's a program in place at IUPUI called Media Arts and Sciences that's housed within Informatics up there, right? And so they were just concerned about the overlap between the programs here and the ones there and, you know, would there be duplication of that? And so the representative from Informatics was really interested in just suggesting that they be at least a part of the planning process through this, particularly because there's going to be a certificate program, perhaps even an undergraduate major in digital media, and that they would like some say in that, just to make sure that this works to everybody's discernments.

But one of the things that we tried to do at – when we had our meeting yesterday, and conveyed the position statements – and so summarize them to the dean was to try and synthesize some just general issues. And I think you, Herb, alluded to several of them that got reiterated throughout many of these position statements. I think one of the biggest hurdles that the units saw was just the document itself seemed to really emphasize professional and vocational training, and that there was this sense of well, what role does liberal arts education have? How much is that going to be equally emphasized? Is there really a push that this is really just a vocational, kind of professional training program? And so, obviously the faculty were more interested in making sure that there was an appropriate emphasis placed on liberal arts and broad training as opposed to capitalizing on technology and more of these professional and vocational training issues over liberal arts training, and more fundamentals and coverage of that. Another thing that the units specifically talked about was the idea that the document itself didn't focus a lot on issues of scholarship and research. And so obviously faculty in these units were saying, we are scholars. This is what is most important to us. We want to sort of see and make sure that this is represented and this is, again, a focus of the Media School. And I will use a quote here from one of them that said, "The opportunity to produce great scholarship is a primary reason why we joined and want to stay at IU at the first place. So, obviously this is of paramount importance to us." So just come clarity in terms of that. The other theme I think, and again this is because who was the real target of this document was a little bit unclear – so is it really directed toward the trustees or was this broadly just sort of to encompass everybody, was the question of how much it represented fully the sort of attributes of all these different units? All of us obviously think our units are great and that we do so certain things well, so they would highlight things like the kind of graduate training that they do, the kinds of research which is done in their units and the positioning of graduates of the program, and what kinds of things they contribute to. And they just wanted to make sure that those things were understood, and that those things would still be reinforced in the Media School, that they'd be able to maintain connections they have with other people across campus and still be able to

train students for the careers that they have typically in the past been able to do. The final thing I think I would just like to comment on is – and again, you noted with one of the comments that was received about the time frame is that many people just sort of felt like, you know, yes we appreciate the chance that the document was released and we had to comment to be able to – to sort of give some – to incur our comments about this, but the time frame was really narrow, and this sort of sense that this was a very top down kind of process and that the idea that it needs to shift to a more bottom up and in the future, if there's other kind of reorganizations or mergers would there be a different time line that would afford more opportunity for faculty participation, and just the hope that that would happen in any future situation according to this. So I think that pretty much covers what we saw in the position statements that we received.

TERRY: I would add one other comment and I [comment indistinct] is also reasonable. Do we have anybody from Journalism?

ROBEL: Bonnie is here so is –

TERRY: Bonnie! Oh I – okay. Let's hear from Mike and Bonnie.

CONWAY: Yeah. First of all, our interim dean did not know anything about this until yesterday and neither did the members of the policy committee, so they did not know that we were to be here. So I'm only seeing this for about the second day so I can try to give some of the highlights from it, if that was what was expected here today from us. So this is from our policy committee. It's a four, five page document kind of looking at various things within the document. Going through some of the points here, one of the key ones is the characterization of the School of Journalism. It says that the proposal discusses the school solely in the context of its professional industry affiliations while the other departments are talked about by their scholarly approaches. Trying to make it clear that there's a lot of scholarship going on in the journalism school, and will continue to be in it and would be better if it reflected that in the proposal. Undue emphasis on technology versus fundamentals. The proposal seems unduly enamored with technology at the expense of fundamentals. Since technology changes fairly quickly, the idea is – the approach from the journalism school has been, we teach our students how to teach themselves to stay current with changing technologies. We present technologies as tools not as ends in themselves, and we focus intently on the fundamentals of journalism including identifying issues of importance, considering ethical issues, et cetera, et cetera... There's a section that's come up several times involving this, is the idea of a dean within COAS where this will be a school within a college, and how much autonomy will the dean have in – will – if being within the College does that make it more difficult to find a strong leader when it's not a standalone school or department? And also, could also this be hamstrung if it looks like certain employees don't report to that dean, but go around that dean and report to COAS

itself? Will that make it more difficult for this to be cutting edge or effective? A lot of concern for our colleagues at IUPUI. I think they have felt left out of this process altogether. There's concern for members, I think especially of Communication and Culture, who have been told they may not fit in this school. The idea that hopefully communication is a big part of what this does, and a lot of the scholarship with the people that we've heard are affected is important to the overall mission to media and communication, and there's more here in that. But that's pretty much a quick summary from what our policy committee put out.

ROBEL: Sure. I really want to reiterate my appreciation for all of the affected faculties looking at the proposal so quickly and carefully, and also for the spirit in which these comments came forward from the faculties. It was clear, especially with the School of Journalism comments, that they were in – but with all of the faculties I think – that they were in the spirit of let's make this the best possible school going forward that we can. I think that in all of the comments I saw a disconnect between the portrayal of departments or the School of Journalism in the proposal to the trustees and a hope or wish that the departments and the school could be represented and appreciated for what they are right now. And I – while I know that that's the nature of the document – the document is sort of looking for a word around particular kinds of educational programs, that it is clearly the case that each of these faculties brings to this school incredible educational programs, incredible scholarship and incredible thinking that has to be mobilized around the curriculum and around the ways in which the faculties can work together and work with the School of Informatics in particular, but probably other parts of the campus in order to build the best thing that we can build going forward. The Executive Committee spoke to me about the possibility of just assuring everybody that while the proposal talks in terms of faculties members' rights to move to another department, or work with administration to move to another part of the campus if that faculty member does not really feel an affinity for the mission going forward here. The proposal was written in terms of working with the College. I just want to be very clear that we will work with faculty members to find the right home, no matter where that is. There are certainly faculty members who are in schools other than the School of Journalism, and the College of Arts and Sciences that are interested in coming into the Media School. There are faculty members in the affected departments and the School of Journalism that might be interested in other kinds of affiliations. That was not meant to preclude any of that, and I'll go on record now on that just as I did with the Executive Committee. I do want to also say that I thought that Telecommunication's metaphor of an artist's rendering as opposed to an architectural plan was exactly the right one. You know, the proposal tries to walk a fine line between forward looking educational programs for the most part, places where we might build out, and the obvious obligation of our faculties to develop programs, educational programs and curriculum. You know, much less research, I mean that – that's obviously is everybody's individual obligation, but for the educational programs, those have to be built by faculty. And the proposal tried to walk that line, and to the extent that it

didn't manage to do it completely as well as it should, I want to be clear that that is everybody's belief going into this. That this is – the faculty needs to be the primary driver behind the shape of the educational programs to come. And with respect to Informatics' role, the one thing that I have asked going forward with respect to the curriculum is that there be faculty members from Informatics on the curricular committee because the connections do seem quite deep and important. There are going to be places in which the – I'm confident we'll have to do hiring and they may well exist at the intersection between the new school and Informatics, so – or they may exist in other areas but I – Dean Singell has been clear that he is happy to do that and to include faculty members from Informatics. I've asked Informatics for recommendations and they have been – they've centered around a couple of people pretty consistently no matter who I ask. So I think we're in pretty good shape here.

TERRY: I've had one think. I think we've learned something about this process of our policies here. Our policies were written imagining that it would be possible to propose a merger, reorganization, or an elimination where all the details would be decided. There would be this proposal and the faculty would look at and then they would say nay or yay, and that would be the end of it. These are more evolutionary sorts of things than that. So I rather – and remember that we created a campus policy here a few years ago, made a major change. Used to be that the BFC only got involved if a program reorganization, merger, or whatever involved multiple schools. And then we looked at that a few years ago and we said, hey, it's often the case that reorganization even within one's school will have an impact on other schools because they rely upon it for some reason or another. And we opened up the BFC's engagement. I imagine that we'll work in good faith with the College and elsewhere going forward and that probably the BFC's engagement with this creation, this school, is not over, that there will be further needs to consider as we go forward some of the implications for the campus of various decisions that the faculty or the administration may make going forward. And I just hope we have a good active dialogue going forward in the creation of this, and for that matter, the creation of the school of Global and International Studies. Both of those are not just intended to be resources of the College silo. They are intended to be resources of the campus, and I think to make that work we have to work with the administration to have an engagement of all those here who may be concerned. And it was interesting to me that we did get comments from two or three people about this proposal who are not people with a stake in this particular horse race. They read something about it, and they said, oh, you know, I either have something to say about it or, guess what, it affects me and nobody seems to have thought that. So I hope that we can continue to promote that going forward.

CALLOWAY–THOMAS: I would like to ask Professor Hirt a question. At what point did the members of the College Policy Committee get involved in examining, scrutinizing, reacting to the document that came from the provost's office?

HIRT: Same as everyone else. We got it when it was released at – then we just kind of followed about in our charge to be able to solicit the position statements at that point.

CALLOWAY–THOMAS: And has Dean Singell at any point had a discussion with the members of the Policy Committee regarding the document?

HIRT: Yeah.

CALLOWAY–THOMAS: At what point?

HIRT: Well, we waited ‘til we got the position statements to be able to convey the feedback, and then got some dialogue going with him about that but we had told him that that was definitely what we were planning to do. So we had our meeting yesterday.

ROBEL: Thank you. Other discussion?

MCGREGOR: Just a puzzle with regard to the structure and the thinking about what we think is a nested feature. I mean, when you think about, how would you create a powerful school, various names – but in the communication, journalism, media area – and then you think about the president’s vision of having very large and powerful professional schools that then would have a lateral connection to them – the liberal arts if you will. So the student could come in and have some really interesting choices. The – does the idea of a dean reporting to another dean, does that concept strike anyone on the Committee as problematic? That is, who would in some way cap the prospects for this new institution that one is then going to then design from the bottom up process? Just a – it’s a puzzle about how you pull that off. But –

ROBEL: I think it’s the same puzzle that we face in SGIS, and I think we’re fairly close to the end of a process there and we’ll see how that goes, but I’m hoping that we can use the SGIS process as a way to really learn about the – we should be able to learn from that as we go into this new effort, I think. John?

WALBRIDGE: I’m – I’m in SGIS so I’d sort of like to reiterate that it’s the – that – I mean just sort judging by private conversations by faculty involved, the sort of general feeling I get is that the model isn’t going to work and that sometime, we talk vaguely about five years, that SGIS will have to be hived off from the College because you know, the buck doesn’t stop with the dean. At the moment we have a fairly strong minded dean, but – our dean of the College, which complicates things a bit further. But then there’s the, you know, the final decision is not at the person who is responsible for the unit and there’s not a lot of evidence that that model is working yet in SGIS.

ROBEL: We don’t have the dean yet.

WALBRIDGE: That's – for instance.

ROBEL: Yeah.

WALBRIDGE: We have an –

ROBEL: I do think that one thing that we learned from SGIS is that you need to start your dean search right away, and that it really should – it should happen fast because it's important to get your leadership in place. Other questions? Well, I do really want to thank the BFC, the UFC, and the policy committees of both Journalism and the College for moving so quickly. I also want to thank the faculty of these – of these three faculties in advance because this is a move that is going to require that people are at their most collegial, at their most collegial. And I know that every bit of change, even change that isn't as big as this, is time consuming and takes a toll on people in terms of having to balance their interests and their personal trajectories against the community writ large. I have a huge amount of confidence in the faculties of these – these three faculties – that they will be able to do this and do this with collegiality and do it with vision. I've had an opportunity to work with every group of faculty at this point around this proposal in one way or another. I've gone over the rather voluminous history of the discussions in this area, and I do believe there's a lot of reason to feel hopeful about this, and particularly to feel hopeful for the faculty leadership we'll get here. So with that I turn it back to you. Do you have any –

TERRY: – I don't think so –

ROBEL: – concluding remarks?

TERRY: – I don't think so–

ROBEL: Or should we move on to General Education?

TERRY: Well I guess I have a question. Do you anticipate that there will be revisions in the proposal before it goes to the trustees?

ROBEL: Well the trustees meet at the end of the week, and so – and I got the various comments just –

TERRY: Yeah.

ROBEL: – just now so –

TERRY: – now you have the short deadline.

ROBEL: Yes. I'm thinking the only thing that was really, actually, more than tone, had to do with the statement about whether or not faculty members could choose to go elsewhere. And on that I'm on record in every way, shape, or form I could possibly be so... And I'll make that clear to the trustees as well. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 7: GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

So let's move to the less contentious area of General Education. [Laughter]. I really – welcome to Dennis Groth who's serving as our interim vice provost for undergraduate education. The Council asked him to come and talk about General Education today and so, and he's joined by Professor Favret. Thank you for coming as well. So, may I turn it over?

GROTH: Thank you very much Provost Robel and President Terry and the Council. We're pleased to be here to provide an annual report on General Education. I guess I would need to apologize to Provost Robel in advance, I've purposefully left a portion of my comments at the end to be provocative, to move the BFC and the faculty at large to engage not only in thought about General Education but some of the directions, and to participate in the strategic planning process and help us move forward on this. And I think it's a very important time for the faculty to consider some of this information. Mary and I are the co-chairs this year, and we're reporting on last year's, really on the status of General Education through last academic year. But we will also presenting information concerning some of the early directions, early indicators we have on the incoming class this year as well, which I think are incredibly important for everybody to understand.

There is a slide deck that I apologize, I just got to Maresa right before the meeting. I was cut down, my typing ability in half due to a wrist surgery last week, so that's available and you may make that available to the BFC for sure, even though there may be typos in there. Blame it on the surgeon, not on me. There's a number of – I'm going to try and go very quickly. We have a number of – we report always on GenEd by the numbers to give a set of facts. We're going to talk about monitoring and assessment of General Education. I'm going to go back and talk, just a little bit again to remind people about the Senate Enrolled Act 182 from 2012, the statewide General Education Core, and talk through some directional indicators, some threats, and finally leave it to you to discuss the opportunities and answer any questions that we have. If you could see what I see, what I have are number of dashboards available to me right now, which I intend will be published to the faculty so that you will have access to them online and interact with the information we currently have about General Education, and ask additional questions. So I'm trying to pull from a lot of the information sources we have to present a picture for you of the landscape of General Education.

First of all we know what the trend has been over a number of years with beginner enrollment. This Fall we enrolled 7,604 students, which was down slightly from 7,613 students last year. All indications are that that size class is going to be more of the norm than anything else as we move forward. In addition to the new beginners, there's an additional 950 transfer students, and 350 intercampus transfer students. So about 13,000 students there in total. That's just up slightly by about 2 students from last year comparatively. So holding pretty steady. I want you to remember some of these transfer – not the numbers – but even though that transfers are occurring, some of what they're bringing with them is having an – will have an effect an increasingly larger effect in General Education completion on the campus. The number of beginners in Fall of 2013 that are entering with sophomore status – this is students with 26 or more credit hours – is 604 this year, which is up 50% from last year, and up 260% from 2009 when we were voting on General Education. You'll see it in the slide. Of the top 25 courses this year in enrollment for the Fall, 14 are General Education courses compared to 17 of the top 25 last year, and 14 of the top 25 the previous year. It's clear General Education courses are highly enrolled but seats are still available. In terms of the very top courses and how they are counting towards General Education requirement, composition, English W131, continues to be the largest number with 7,715 counted over the 2011 through 2013 cohorts, followed closely by Math M118 Finite Math at 7,475. It scales down to Psychology 101 at 6,100, and Math M119 calculus at 3,900, and economics at 3,642. We see an increasing number of students that are taking General Education courses even though they in – particularly in the math foundations area – even though they have already satisfied General Education in some other way. So, for example, there are over the last two years 587 students have taken finite math even though they didn't need to satisfy General Education requirements. For example, they might have taken AP calculus and gotten AP credit for it, but needed finite math for a degree requirement somewhere. By the end of the first week of classes for this Fall, approximately 30% of the Fall 2011, which was the first year of implementation of General Education, of that cohort, have completed all General Education common ground requirements, compared to 6% for the Fall 2012 cohort. The Foundations requirements, so if you start breaking down the requirements of the General Education have been fulfilled by nearly 90% of the Fall 2011 cohort, and 70% of the Fall 2012 cohort. The General Education World Languages and Cultures is the area with the second highest completion rate at 60% and 35% respectively, and the Breadth of Inquiry area is 58% and 19%. More than 40% of the Fall 2011 cohort and 17% of the Fall 2012 transfer cohorts have completed all General Education common ground requirements. Foundations has been completed by 80% of the Fall 2011 transfer still enrolled, and by 65% of the Fall 2012. English Composition has been completed by more than 98% of Fall 2011, and more than 95% of Fall 2012 transfer students currently enrolled. Over the last two years and including this fall we have had 14,435 articulations of AP credit applicable to General Education requirements logged so far is the area with the greatest number of articulations at 4,879, followed by Natural and

Mathematical Sciences at 4,617, and Math Modeling at 1,676. Students in the Fall 2011 through Fall 2013 cohorts have arrived at IUB with credit for 4,754 ACP courses from IU Bloomington. This is the Advance College Project dual credit program, and 796 ACP courses from IU regional campuses. The enrollments in ACP have increased substantially again this fall, so these numbers will continue to rise as we move ahead. English Composition is the area with most ACP credit from Bloomington followed by Natural and Mathematical Sciences. For regional and ACP credits, Social and Historical Studies and English are the areas with the most credit. We don't have the full transfer coursework actually in for analysis yet for the Fall 2013 cohort, because it doesn't actually show up on their transcript 'til the Fall semesters, so these numbers are at the bottom in terms of what you can expect. They'll actually increase. For intercampus transfer students IUB General Education requirements are being fulfilled mostly by credits from enrollments at IU regional campuses. It's not very surprising, but it's what's happening. For— with regards to summer enrollment, the Fall cohorts 2011, 12, and 13 logged a total of about 2,600 summer enrollment courses applicable towards General Education requirement. In the IU regional summer courses amounted to about 2,335. Again, Natural and Mathematical Sciences and the Social and Historical Studies are the largest contributors there. We've done a lot of work to start looking at assessment, and we've begun triangulating and trying to utilize the goals of General Education along with some of our survey data through the National Survey of Student Engagement to report on learning goals across the curriculum over time. So we — we've found in terms of writing clearly and effectively, more than 40% of first year students and seniors choose quite a bit and vary little as their experience on campus hadn't contributed to their strengths in that area. Similarly, with analyzing quantitative problems. Thinking critically and analytically, the majority of first year students and seniors answered, "very much" or "quite a bit" as well. We're trying to use this information to provide evidence of learning from ways that we're already collecting information. Students progress in General Education by fulfilling Foundations first. That's what the data is telling us. Enrollments at IU Bloomington represent the largest today source of credit towards the requirements and our student surveys, NSSE in particular and we're working on a new survey, a survey on engagement in research university that we'll weave into this analysis as well, show positive trends in areas of importance to General Education.

The number, as I said before, the number of students who entered as sophomore — with a sophomore status — has increased. The share of students who enter as second semester freshmen has increased also from at about 14% compared to last year, and the share of students who enter as sophomores has increased as I said before. And we'll know more at the end of the semester what the impact of all transfer credit will be. Want to talk a little bit about monitoring an assessment, a little bit more specifically. The General Education Monitoring Subcommittee, which was tasked by the faculty of Bloomington Faculty Council to develop a monitoring plan, an assessment plan for the General Education put together a five year initial

plan for assessment in which 2011 and 2012, English Composition and Mathematical Modeling would begin assessment. In 2012 and 13 World Languages and World Cultures would begin assessment, and this year Natural and Mathematical Sciences; 2014 and '15, Arts and Humanities, and 2015 and '16 the Social and Historical Studies, as well as the Shared Goals. These are just the beginning of the assessment activity for these areas. It then is an ongoing, annual expectation of the committee that assessment will occur and be reported. Now, prior to the meeting there was a question that came in to the BFC and it was forwarded to me to ask a question about assessment. And it was really to speak about the – what is the possibility of, and what are the challenges associated with aggregating assessment information across courses, and in fact across courses in different disciplines within the General Education area? It's exactly what we're doing today, we're assess – we're performing – the faculty are performing assessment across multiple sections of the same course in the Foundations areas of Composition, and in the Math Modeling area aggregation across different course – multiple sections of the same course – and different sections of different courses simultaneously with that. What we are working on clearly is the development of a culture of assessment. It was mandated by the faculty when the General Education was established, and it is further an expectation of the higher learning commission that the faculty can articulate what we want students to learn, how we are to measure what students learn, and then reflect upon what we learn in a feedback loop to that process. Now, as we started ramping up to the diversity of the World Languages and World Cultures areas we realized, I think pretty quickly, that we didn't have the sufficient infrastructure to support at scale the assessment activities of the faculty and their courses. So everybody who would have received late last week and e-mail notifying of the availability of a new software product called iRubric, which is helpful to faculty as they assess, and it has been used by the composition area for the last two years in a pilot form and we're pleased to make that available. Not only for faculty to assist in General Education assessment, but in assessment overall in their courses should they choose to do so. I'm going to report very quickly on some of the, by the numbers, the assessment of Composition and Math Modeling because we have those numbers today. There's roughly 90% - no 93% - of students in the Composition areas, meet or exceed the standards of the General Education program from a learning goals perspective. It is broken out entirely by the faculty in the report, and will be reported back to the GEMS committee in much more detail. This is fed back into the committee to actually look at increasing the number of sections that are using iRubric, now that we're past pilot with that and also really importantly I think it demonstrates the value of assessment as you look at developing evidence to – to inform how you approach changes to your curriculum. In one department they identified that, although the vast majority of students were meeting or exceeding all of the objectives, that the lowest level of achievement was in the area of integrating research with the Composition, with the writing experiences they were doing. So they were actually looking to feed that back into the course – courses in terms of helping

support the students better integrate research with their writing. I should say in the area of composition that the requirement is that passing with at least a “C-” satisfies the requirement, and as reported by the faculty from the departments doing the assessment that the data from the assessment does align with the grade outcomes in the course, which is nice to know that it does that. For Math Modeling, where it has a different approach than the Composition area, and it is up to the faculty how to decide how they are to assess. The – we’re running roughly in the – in last year 68% to 67% of students meeting or exceeding the minimal expectations and – of the assessment instrument. Unfortunately, this data does not align with the course outcomes, and I think it’s been the – faculty have identified some issues in how they’ve been collecting the data or managing the instrument across sections. And I think that’s again an important lesson here, is that you look at the data and you react to it and you take action on that. I think it’s very important. I wanted to remind everybody about the statewide General Education Core, Senate Bill 182 from last year. This is going to come up as I go through some more numbers at the end of the talk. This is a legislation that very quickly mandated that there would be the establishment of a statewide General Education Core. It’s identified through a set of competencies by which every public institution will certify their students as having met, should the student met should the student transfer to another institution. And if that student transfers in say to IU Bloomington then we will waive the IUB General Education and grant them 30 credits of work. The individual course by course articulations will occur as well, but they’ll get the 30 credits and no longer be required to do General Education at IUB. They still would be required to satisfy all requirements of majors which might require them to take additional courses that are counting in the General Education as well, much like we’re already seeing.

ROBEL: I suspect that you’re on the verge of being provocative [Laughter].

GROTH: I’m going to get there! So, just some more numbers and there are charts in the handout, in the slide deck that you can see. We know 30% of students have completed General Education from the first cohort. I think for people that were around on the BFC when we passed General Education, it was the expectation that largely students would have their General Education completed in the first two years and we’re not seeing that. The number of – the percentage of students who have completed General Education before coming onto campus, these are new beginners, is not zero. It’s not very big, but it’s not zero. So that’s quite interesting. In terms of having Foundations completed, as I said before, about 81% of the first cohort and 65% of the second cohort, 16.3% of the new fall beginner cohort have completed Foundations before stepping onto the campus. In terms of the Breadth of Inquiry, which is of course, the areas of Arts and Humanities, the Social and Historical Studies, and the Natural and Mathematical Sciences, just over 50% of the first cohort in 2011, 18% of last year’s fall cohort, and 3 and a quarter percent of this year’s cohort have completed the Breadth of Inquiry. Again,

this year's cohort before they appeared on campus. Composition. 93% of students completed Composition from the Fall 2011 cohort. 85% of the Fall 2012 cohort had completed Composition and, 46.64% of the fall beginner cohort for this year have completed Composition before coming on campus. In fact, the number of fall beginner resident students is 50.52%, so it's an interesting number. When it comes to Math Modeling, 85% of the Fall 2011 cohort have completed the Math Modeling requirement, and 74% of 2012 and 22 and three quarter percent of new beginners this fall have completed Math Modeling. The number of resident students is about 27% or 28% in that particular number. In terms of directional guidance, what do we see? We see that the number of beginner students with significant portions of General Education completed will increase through AP, through ACP, and I need to remind the faculty that dual credit is not solely IUB's domain. There are rising numbers of offerings from the regional campuses, and from Ivy Tech. We've recently become aware of Ivy Tech being in the process of offering a 30 credit General Education certificate that is the state wide General Education Core, for high school students to be finished in their fourth year for free. The statewide General Education mandates 100% transfer, and it mandates the waiving of General Education. Even if IU competes aggressively over this dual credit space, the credits from IU will be gone. There's also at the same time a rising influence of online education which has the potential to cut into General Education, and perhaps a little bit more... scary? – is the influence of credit where we cannot actually determine whether it was online or in person.

So, onto the threats now. If you haven't figured out some of them yourself [Laughter] I ask you to kind of close your eye and imagine a point in time when we see a substantial increase in the number of beginner students with significant portions of GenEd completed prior to their IUB matriculation. It's already happening, it will continue to happen. Please don't ask me to guess what the percentages will be next year. All I'll say is they'll be higher. How high? We'll see. Imagine a point in time when online coursework is used increasingly to satisfy IUB General Education requirements, and that IU – that online course work is not from IUB. And, as I said, that there will be courses that will be online or delivered through other means that will be difficult for us to disambiguate. It will show up on the transcript, and there's been plenty of writing about credit laundering operations and things like that that you – higher education can expect in the future. Imagine a point in time when students who do enroll in Foundations courses, whether it be Composition or Math Modeling, are taking them not to satisfy General Education requirement, but perhaps to satisfy a remediation requirement. And imagine a point in time when exploration will be discouraged. This is, of course, in reference to the House Bill 1348, and the degree map legislation, and the time completion – completion time and efficiency is privileged. Now, on the positive side, in going over the weekend with this with Mary, I have a blank slide on the positive. And she said, "Does that mean that there's nothing good to say?" And I – she – I think she understood in the end the point was its' really a call to the faculty to consider the direction to – what are the opportunities? I strongly believe that

there are tremendous opportunities. They may not be what they envisioned when General Education was first thought of those many years ago, when we were here on this same – at the BFC discussing it. Is it the case that General Education moving forward – if we knew then what we know now would we have thought of it in different ways? I think the answer to that is obviously, yes. We are always informed by the information that we have at hand. And I would encourage everybody to send e-mail, either to myself, to Mary of course, or to the undergraduate experience: iub-sp-undergraduate@oncourse.iu.edu. And we look forward to many of your great ideas. And I have a number of people to acknowledge in terms of their support for putting this report together, Michael Lundell from the office of the vice provost for undergraduate education; the team from Bloomington Assessment and Research: Linda Shepard, Julie Tyge, Mike Sauer, and Stefano Fiorini; the chairs of General Education Common Grounds Subcommittees: Kathy Smith, Kevin Pilgrim, Jonathan Michaelsen, Tom Brush, Peter Todd, and Margot Gray; members of the IUB General Education Committee and I'm sure there are other people in the room, I – it's a large committee so I won't name all of them; members of the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee– the GEMS group; faculty members in the Departments of Mathematics, English, and Comparative Literature, especially Kevin Pilgrim, Dana Anderson, and Jeff Johnson who coordinated the assessment efforts to date, and of course our past co-chair Sonya Stephens and Venkat. And with that I'll close the report, answer questions if there are any.

ROBEL: Jim?

SHERMAN: Thank you Dennis. Recently I had the opportunity to read the Commission for Higher Education's, I guess it's their interpretation of Bill 1384 –

GROTH: – Guidance

SHERMAN: – and it was a little bit chilling to read it. Now, you made reference to it at the end and I just wanted to expand on it a little because the Commission on Higher Education's take on it is they want these maps to be as specific as possible with as few as courses, in a sense, as possible so that students will kind of know exactly what road map they're taking and I – you did mention it – but do you feel that there's some implications for our General Education policies of following what the degree roadmap will require?

GROTH: I think there are implications of everything that the state puts forward. I think if you had – for people that had seen drafts of the guidance, and there was a, there was a draft, it was the penultimate draft where there was a comment speaking about the, sort of the – I guess the weakness of choice would be the way I would characterize it. Where they talked about, for example, something like – and one Indiana Institution has over 240 classes – class choices – in the area of arts and humanities and students get to pick two! And there was like emphasis in

there – an exclamation point. And I think that we pushed back at that very effectively, I think it was a bit of a – could be interpreted as a concern. Of course our – the data at Bloomington suggests that we value that choice. I – clearly the faculty and the students value the rich offerings that are provided not only through General Education, but through other elective offerings. In terms of graduation rate and completion as having the best completion rates of the publics in Indiana we – maybe we can do better and I’m certain we can improve our rates, but that piece of evidence alone doesn’t suggest that that’s a barrier to completion. It might even suggest that it provides the rich experience that we value at Bloomington and does not get in the way of their completion. I think that, if you tie together the statewide General Education Core legislation, the degree map legislation, and the pathways legislation, the push towards moving more and more college credit into high school for accessibility and economic reasons, to push for completion sooner rather than later. There are good goals embedded in those initiatives that are mandated by the state, and I think we are being very creative in how we approach those to leverage not only the strengths of Indiana University and Indiana University Bloomington, but also preserve the richness of the curriculum. Now, as I said the direction on General Education is moving independent of the degree map legislation, more AP, more ACP, more transfer work, less at IUB. I think to the faculty the question is, at what point does IUB General Education not really represent IUB General Education?

ROBEL: Right. And actually I want to say that was the most gently provocative presentation. When I met with the deans last week and the way I think I put it was, if all your 100 and 200 level GenEd courses were gone in ten years, what would be – how would you move forward?

GROTH: Yeah –

ROBEL: – And so...

GROTH: – I do agree. I think that is a – there is a very apocalyptic view of it. You could look at it – but you could look at a 25% hair cut on credit hours and budget and all of that, and faculty and it is not simply about undergraduate education. These programs also support graduate education and faculty scholarship –

ROBEL: Right. [Comment indistinct].

FAVRET: Right. Right.

GROTH: And its, so it’s a rich ecosystem here that we have built and we need to recognize that.

CALLOWAY–THOMAS: Is the issue more challenging for us at Indiana University Bloomington, or is this a concern for example of the other institutions in the state?

ROBEL: It's a – can I take that one? When I presented this to the deans and obviously people are talking about this and at every provost meeting you go to, this is not an Indiana-centric issue. This is not an IUB-centric issue. It's an issue for everyone in every space of the higher education ecosystem. You know, if you look at this world from the perspective of the regional campuses, I would say that that's a much more existential – more immediately kind of existential threat – than the one that we're facing. It's a reason why we really have to be able to articulate the value of a residential experience in a very sharp way, I think. But I do think that if you think about this in the longer term, and you think about the kinds of approaches that are becoming national approaches to undergraduate education, you know, and you think about the opportunities in that space for companies like Pearson which is the company that's selling through Ivy Tech the 30 credit hour General Education course, you can see that this is not something that's going to go away quickly, or at all. So it does require a lot of thinking on the part of the faculty. So I put it to the deans, we could try to build the moat and I can articulate the strongest case for building a moat, and still understand how unconvincing that's going to sound to constituencies in the political world. We can think about doing nothing, and that is that inexorable trend that Dennis was talking about, or we can think about taking this whole space on – head on, and what are the implications of that? So with that cheery note I saw you back there, and then up front.

SUGIMOTO: – So I apologize in advance if this question is too peripheral. But every conversation about undergraduate education seems to start with a number of matriculating students and the percent increases, and growth is always considered as a positive outcome measures. But we know that acceptance rates are indirectly correlated with the rank of institutions, and so I'd like to know if our acceptance rates are decreasing, if not, then are our standards dropping? And as this comes back to a larger conversation about being a residential research university. It's a larger undergraduate class, how does that help us improve our residential culture? Does a larger undergraduate class improve our research culture? And coming to the GenEd thing, I actually – if a significant portion of our GenEd – our students are coming in with the GenEd completed, if you very highly qualified class than that's an opportunity.

ROBEL: Right.

SUGIMOTO: That gives us a chance to take those students farther to grow more. I mean all of the concerns are about remediation. But if we're selecting a very elite core of students than those problems suddenly turn into opportunities. So, I want to ask sort of about you're notion of acceptance rates about matriculation, about optimal sizes of our undergraduate, and particularly as we move forward in the strategic planning process, what we'd like to think about that in terms of optimizing it.

ROBEL: Right. That's probably an office of enrollment management question –

GROTH: – right –

ROBEL: –and not an undergraduate education –

GROTH: – right – I don't have those specific numbers. It is the office of enrollment management that would report that. But we do know that this year's class which was roughly the same size as last year is of higher quality according to metrics that were used from an admission standpoint.

FAVRET: But I just want to add something about the placement tests. So if they're fulfilling the GenEd Foundations through an AP test, it used to be they'd have to get a 4 or 5 in order to qualify, and now the state in its wisdom has lowered that to 3. So that's actually not good. We don't have any say over that. We don't get to – so they're getting a credit and we don't get to verify the standards for that credit at all. The standards have been lowered.

ROBEL: What we can do is build processes to follow those students to see if they're succeeding in later courses, which is the big question about that.

GROTH: Yeah. As I said there are tremendous opportunities here. There are some scary things that might happen, and there's kind of a worst case kind of scenar– a bad way, a negative way of looking at it, which is the students are coming with this credit and we don't believe they are really prepared according to that. That happens today, it's been happening forever anyways. It might just happen in a larger proportion with some of this type of credit. But I think there's still the opportunity to think about the undergraduate experience in ways that provide opportunities for exploration and taking advantage of the richness of our curricular offerings. It may not be through General Education, perhaps there's other ways of doing it.

SUGIMOTO: – I would just make the argument that we can't control what counts as credit. We can choose not to accept people who have AP scores of 3. So we do have a choice at the point of acceptance of whether we are accepting students who have those scores, so it's – we accepted them first in order to have to be required to take their credits.

ROBEL: That's true, we did and we – this is a more academically gifted class across the board if you just look at the numbers than the one before it so – and on just about every number. My guess is that people, students who take AP courses are not likely to be the most academically challenged of the high school cohort to start with. Let's come back up to [comment indistinct].

SPANG: I had a impressionistic point that builds very much off this, which is that we keep being told that the metrics are going up, the undergraduates are more and more qualified, and yet I find that a greater and greater percentage of them cannot write a sentence, cannot read an

article or even a basic text book, and when – so I’m teaching a discussion section for my big lecture course – and I got the papers and I wrote comments on them. And one of the students said to me, ‘That was so helpful, you wrote a little letter to me about my paper! I never got that before.’ And I’m really just horrified to imagine, I mean, this is a young woman who’s in the Honors College, she’s obviously gotten good grades. She’s never gotten any feedback on her work. And so I do think that in terms of what you can do in a residential context, and this relates very much to what you were saying, if you’ve got students who really care about their intellectual work, it doesn’t matter if they don’t know anything. But to build an environment in which really caring about it and wanting to get little letters about your paper is what you’re here for, that is what we could try and build more of and I think that would be really valuable.

ROBEL: Yes.

GROTH: Please send me e-mail that. We’ll incorporate that into the strategic plan.

SPANG: Little letters!

GROTH: Yes.

GRAY: I think I’d like to hear more about the potential problem of not being able to tell whether a course is an online, has been an online course, or a sort of face to face course. Because again this goes back to the issue of whom we accept and whom we don’t, and I would hope that, again in terms of the choice we have, do we meet this head on? Well, it seems to me that we could consider meeting it head on would be, alright we won’t accept a student unless they have a clear record of what is online, what is not online. I mean, before we decide what credit to grant, it would seem that that’s something we would really want to know about the student coming in.

GROTH: I don’t have the solution for you there. It is known – it’s a known situation, and it’s something that we talk about pretty frequently to sort of noodle through how that can be accurate. We can only control what we say. We can’t always control what other institutions say. So what comes across may not be absolutely clear.

GRAY: But as you say, we can control what we say. And we could – we could choose to say alright, we’ll accept you if you can demonstrate, you know, which of your courses are online and which of your courses are not. So it seems that we still have some say, you know in this – in this scary scenario.

ROBEL: I’m a little confused though about the premise behind your statement. Is – is the premise that online courses are by definition not courses that we would accept? I’m not sure what... ?

GRAY: No, I don't mean to imply that. I think what I mean is, I would like to know whether they are or not, before I decide what to do with them.

ROBEL: Other? Well, fun stuff to talk about as we move forward in this. The GenEd report only gets more interesting every year I think. So we have next a discussion of the proposed Indiana University Principles of Ethical Conduct, and I will turn this over to our president.

TERRY: I will only make one further reminder before I go on to that. We had a presentation scheduled at the BFC of David Johnson, the vice provost for enrollment management. I don't remember the exact reason, but for some reason or another we had to reschedule that. Working it with his schedule was difficult. Craig, do you remember when he is now scheduled to come back?

DETHLOFF: The 19th of November, I believe.

TERRY: So, you'll have an opportunity to raise some of the questions with David about enrollment management, and admissions, and that sort of thing at that time as well.

AGENDA ITEM 8: INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS CONDUCT

TERRY: What you have before you is to some extent working its way backwards through the normal channels of faculty governance, but let me urge you to be patient about that and hopefully let it happen. What you have before you is something that's been working its way from both the administration and the UFC for some time. It's intended to be a summary, useful for all IU employees. Notice that this is not just applied to faculty, it applies to everybody. The trustees have actually already agreed that they are happy with it applying to them. It will apply to coaches. It will apply to – coaches will have to treat athletes civilly – that should be fun. But it will apply to every Indiana University employee. The UFC Executive Committee, not more than a week ago actually, scheduled this for discussion at the upcoming in person meeting of the University Faculty Council, and it is frankly the hope of the University Faculty Council that it can approve this and put it in place after some, years actually, of gestation. On the other hand we decided that we would notify the campuses of what was going on, and invite the campuses to take a look at it. Should you decide that there is something so bad about this that it should not be adopted by the UFC, you can tell us to do that and I'll take that to the UFC when it meets. Unfortunately, Don Gjerdingen can't be here. Don was in many ways a compiler of this, which is useful, and that's what this is supposed to be. This is not new policy. This is, in fact, at one point this was intended to be kind of an interactive online guide to existing areas. There were supposed to be active links in here connecting it to all the sources from which these various ideas came. That was abandoned for a variety of reasons, partly having to do with our difficulty keeping links up to date rather than stale. And so what it is now is I think accurately summarized in the paragraph kind of right in the middle of the first page: "These Principles are

intended as a high level statement of values and expectations at Indiana University. The Principles themselves do not create additional or different rights or duties; rather, they help to promote an organizational culture that encourages ethical conduct and a commitment to compliance with the law and University codes, policies, and procedures.” Part of my academic life included teaching about ethical codes, and you can have a variety of them. You can have ones that are very specific and have very strong and rigorous enforcement mechanisms, or you can have ones that are somewhat general and just admonitions. This is somewhere in between. Here and there this places specific mandates upon people. Often it expresses a hope or an expectation. I hope that this document is one that will be subject to occasional review and revision because I think that new obligations and new ways of stating them will probably evolve as we go forward, but I think that this is a good starting point. Actually a masterful starting point at summarizing what we expect of our community on many, many fronts. So it’s open for discussion. I would hope that at the end there might be an affirmation at least that it is ready to go forward to the UFC for review and possible adoption, but if anybody has any fundamental objections now is the time to raise them.

WOOD: I have a question, not a fundamental objection. It states here that community members including students, faculty, staff, and volunteers are expected not to smoke or use tobacco on campus. And, in fact, tobacco is commonly used. Smoking is hard to get away from, even walking along sort of broad, usual pathways, and I’m wondering – and moreover it is the policy of the university PD, enforcement or the police, not to enforce this ruling, and so I’m wondering –

TERRY: – what this means? –

WOOD: – what its force is?

TERRY: Do you want to stop –? Let’s start on the campus policy and enforcing the trustees’ policy that these are non-smoking areas.

ROBEL: I think RPS gets more complaints about this than any other single topic. And it is a difficult enforcement question because we really don’t have smoking police. We have police. And policing on a campus like this is – is a fairly intensive occupation even before you get to smoking, so it is a big issue how you deal with smoking on the campus. It is a big issue. And it’s not one that I can say I have successfully grappled with. It – we could move I suppose the priority that the policy put on enforcing smoking, the smoking ban higher, but I don’t actually know what that would actually come at the expense of. So I – but I – if that’s the will of the Council, I’m happy to raise it with Laurie Flint and see what she thinks the tradeoffs would be there. It is a big issue.

TERRY: The policy that the campuses would be non-smoking was more or less announced by President Herbert and decided by the trustees some years ago. I think there was an expectation and certainly Lauren's predecessor had it, that it would take time to change the culture. And I think we have seen that. I do believe that – I understand problem within RPS and other certain things – but I think gradually we're making progress away from smoking in the state. It is declining. Slowly, but it's declining. That's one of the reasons again why I think this code doesn't have rigorous enforcement mechanisms. It states an expectation, a cultural expectation. It is the campus, the system, that this is adopted saying we do have policies on this. Let me point out that while this has no enforcement mechanism, many of the things that are mentioned in here do. And so it's not the case that if you adopt this it is all just a matter of admonitions to do these wonderful, good things. Sometimes not doing these get – the good things – will lead to rigorous enforcement, in some of the areas of our human resources policy, they can lead to dismissal. On the other hand the enforcement of the smoking policy has been difficult. But I think gradually, and some improvement. We also imagined that it would be self-policing too, that students would talk to other students, faculty talk to other faculty. And I certainly think some of that is happening, it's still less than perfect.

WOOD: There are, particularly smokers standing, you know, within two feet of the signs saying that you can't smoke here. There are a certain number of students, particularly international students, whose cultural expectations aren't affected by anything that has gone on at Indiana. It's frustrating –

ROBEL: – it is frustrating –

WOOD: – to me to have to walk, quite a bit out of my way, to avoid smoking and it's perplexing to have the situation where the area in front of the no smoking sign is littered with countless cigarette butts. I appreciate the difficulties.

ROBEL: It is frustrating. Let's see, Jim I think was next and then Brad?

SHERMAN: I just to reinforce what Herb said about the smoking ban. Now I'm as opposed to smoking on campus as anyone, but I think there's sometimes the misperception that if a rule or a law isn't enforceable that it's bad and shouldn't exist. Some are aspirational. We have requirements that all workers in restaurants wash their hands after going to the bathroom. That's a pretty good rule, but we don't have cameras in every restroom of every restaurant to ensure that they do it, nor would that be feasible. I think it does take time. I'm not sure I would be in favor of smoking police, who spent their time going around. And I think – I know I do – and when I see someone smoking near the psychology department I say please remind them that this is a non-smoking campus. I don't do it in a mean, argumentative, grab your

cigarette way, but I remind them that those are our expectations, and we hope that they'll abide by them. And I think over time we'll see it diminish and maybe go to zero. Who knows?

WOOD: I ask people just to move further away from the path, but it's not my experience that the situation is gradually improving.

ROBEL: Who was [comment indistinct]. Where is Bradley?

LEVINSON: I was hoping that you would provide a little bit more context. Maybe I missed it in your preface, but what was the actually body that drafted these principles, and what or from where was the charge coming?

TERRY: I may not have all of this right. Actually Tom may actually have better knowledge of where it came from than I did. I believe that it came in part from a campus policy task force. What's the name of it Tom?

GIERYN: The Policy Advisory Committee.

TERRY: Which is a system wide policy body. They thought it would be a good idea to have this. I think they really did, more than anybody, turn to Don to do most of the drafting on it. So it certainly has had input from this campus. It was a comprehensive effort to go through and try – there were – there are some other models like this at other universities, and I think Don started with some of them as well.

LEVINSON: Does that committee report to UFC? Is there sort of an analogous –

GIERYN: – no, it's a committee made up, as Herb said, of representatives from the overall university. Its purpose really is to review the full range of changes in policies, just to make sure that they're consistent, that they're clear, that they're justifiable. The argument that was presented focused on the desirability of having a set of these ethic principles in place. And I think that the general use of aspirational is extremely important. This is not going to help anybody unfortunately, Rega, tell somebody else to stop smoking. And would that I could insist that our faculty members be fair and respectful to others, it would make my life – in fact it might eliminate the need for my office. [Laughter]. But it's important and I think there was a discussion that there is a compliance aspect to this. There's an expectations that institutions and organizations of the size of IU with the public reach that we have, have in place these kinds of statements and principles.

LEVINSON: So is that hope in fact that beyond simply showing an affirmation through this body, that there would also be some kind of, shall I say, some kind of a public education campaign, or some effort to communicate these principles?

TERRY: I think we would try, and we would use Tom's office and HR, and others would use it to explain to new employees that this exist, and it's a good place to start with understanding what your expectations are when you become a member of this community. Whether we would succeed in getting every WFIU fundraising volunteer to read this thing or not, I don't know. But if indeed we make – we adopt it and we put it forth this is what our employees should know, I would think the beginning of their employment, maybe periodically thereafter we remind them that this exists. And that's what tends to happen in a corporate setting and that sort of thing as well. A corporation or a law firm or something like that, adopts corporate ethics, and generally says to their employees from time to time remember that we have this, and take a look at it.

ROBEL: Gretchen?

HORLACHER: I notice that in just one place there seems to be a link to a policy, a compliance policy. And that's on the first page where it's got the Code of Students Rights and Responsibilities. It looks like it's only – is there any – would it be a more helpful document for places where there are links that sort of available to insert them? So, for example, conflict of interest has policies out there, there are places where – I know this is not a document that's about compliance – but it might be a more educational document if it had some links up there to some of the things that are already out there.

TERRY: I think that might become the goal moving forward. We rarely change the Code of Students Rights and Responsibilities, and Conduct. And, in fact, I don't think we anymore print a printed copy of it. I think if you want to get a hold of it you have almost no choice but to go to the website. I think all the other links were dropped just because we couldn't solve the problems with many of them. I would assume –

HORLACHER: [comment indistinct] that says check such and such an office for the link to this policy. Something to –

TERRY: – I can propose that when it's discussed with the UFC.

ROBEL: That's a great idea.

TERRY: Yeah.

ROBEL: Oh, Jason?

JACKSON: My comment was kind of following similar sort of space. I agree, Herb that the problem of link rot is a problem here right? But I would hope that there could be kind of coda or appendix in which firm policies are identified by name so that we could go look for them. The reason for that is that the choice of the architects here is to, as we've been discussing earlier, mix some matters which are extremely firm in their compliance mentions, with things

that are aspirational. I worry very much that the things that are aspirational that are unenforceable, like smoking policies, are side by side undifferentiated by things like compliance with federal regulations and policies here about non-retribution for whistle blowers. If I understand about the failure to sort of make it work, [comment indistinct] but I would love to see a kind of companion document that would – firm policies which are not negotiable are identified as a source for this bright aspirational framework.

TERRY: Let me see if I can work that out and propose that – talk to the two of you.

ROBEL: And I don't want to cede the point that the smoking ban is simply aspirational. It is not. It's just a difficult enforcement question.

WOOD: President Terry expressed the hope that this document would be reviewed from time to time. I wonder if that is an expectation that might be included so every ten years we might want to revisit this document.

TERRY: I can take that the UFC, I don't think there will be terrifically objectionable.

ROBEL: Terrific.

TERRY: Is this anyone who wants this not to go forward at the UFC? [Silence]. Okay.

ROBEL: Thank you all so much. Believe me, we are adjourned.