

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**September 21, 2010**  
**Kelley School of Business – CG 1034**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS:** Randy Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Geoffrey Brown, Joyce Byrer, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Michael Coleman, Angela Courtney, Nick D’Amico, Erika Dowell, Tony Fargo, Tom Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Don Gjerdingen, Mary Gray, Matt Guterl, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Neil Kelty, Susan Kovacich, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Sherri Michaels, Robert Noel, Mary Popp, Elizabeth Raff, John Raglin, Diane Reilly, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Debora Shaw, Richard Shockley, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, Herbert Terry, Sue Whiston, Tony White

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Robert Arnove (Joseph C. Miller), Jennifer Chaffin (Grant Simpson), Sarita Soni (Paul Sokol)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Arthur Bradley, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Andrea Ciccarelli, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, Frank Di Silvestro, David Estell, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Karen Hanson, Padraic Kenney, Eugene McGregor, Michael Ogden, Ranu Samantrai, Sima Setayeshgar, Laura Smothers, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Joey Tartell, Neil Theobald, Maxine Watson, James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** John Carini (Physics), Michael Carroll (Senior Associate Registrar), Chris Connell (Mathematics), Roland Coté (Registrar), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Jocelyn Karlan (Faculty Council Office), Ariann Stern-Gottschalk (Slavic/SWSEEL), Barrett Tenbarge (IUSA), Katie Tetrick (IUSA), Clair Wiseman (IDS)

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolutions for John M. Ross and Gerald Strauss  
John M. Ross: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B8-2011.pdf>  
Gerald Strauss: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B9-2011.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)
3. Question / Comment Period (10 minutes)
4. Program Review at Indiana University, Bloomington (15 minutes)  
(Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B7-2011.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/ProgramReviews.pdf>

5. Report and Proposals of the BFC Reform Task Force (30 minutes) [DISCUSSION]  
(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/RenvisonCover.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B6-2011.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/ConstitutionMarkup2.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/BylawMarkup.pdf>

6. Proposal to Revise the Bloomington Campus Calendar. (30 minutes)  
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs)  
[FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B10-2011.pdf>

### **Minutes**

**DOWELL:** All right everybody, let's get started. I gave an extra five minutes for people to hustle over from the Union, in case they were already on autopilot this semester, heading over to the Georgian Room. First let me give Karen's regrets, Provost Hanson cannot join us today: the chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities is visiting campus this afternoon and actually giving a talk opposite our meeting and she needs to be there to host and introduce—him? Not sure who the guy...hmm?

**GRAY:** Is it a him?

**DOWELL:** My apologies if it isn't. And she regrets not being here, I'm sure. But we will have some of these discussions again next week—next meeting—so she won't miss all of the discussion of the calendar by any concept.

**STEPHENS:** She'll find out.

**DOWELL:** I'm sure she's hearing anyway. So let's start out, we have two memorial resolutions. Tom?

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR JOHN M. ROSS AND GERALD STRAUSS**

**GIERYN:** John Michael Ross, past Assistant Professor in the Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies, and past Director of Development and External Relations for the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation passed away at his home in Waupaca, Wisconsin on February 28, 2006. He was 69 years old. John Ross was dedicated to the field of recreation and parks and had a significant impact on the field far beyond the academic community and Indiana University. Dr. Ross is remembered as a gentle man, noted for generously sharing his time and means with others.

John was born in Stevens Point, Wisconsin on October 9, 1936 in the “John Muir/Aldo Leopold” country. The love of the outdoors was central to his choice of employment and residency. He received his Bachelor of Science Degree in Conservation Education from the University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point. He received a Master of Science Degree in Recreation and Park Administration at Indiana University. He also completed advanced studies in accounting at the American Institute of Banking.

He was initially involved in banking: however, his love of the outdoors resulted in his becoming a Park Ranger Naturalist for the National Park Service and a Recreation Resource Specialist for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior. When he was a recreation resource specialist, he worked on legislation establishing wild rivers, reservoirs, and other federal recreational areas.

In 1969 John joined the faculty in the Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies at Indiana University in Bloomington. During his 29-year career at Indiana University, he developed and taught graduate and undergraduate courses including Dynamics of Outdoor Recreation, Tourism and Commercial Recreation, Fund Raising in Public and Nonprofit Agencies, Outdoor Artists and Writers, and Outdoor Ministry.

John Ross was the first Director of Development and External Relations for the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in association with the Indiana University Foundation from 1984 to 1994. John’s enthusiasm for the virtues of Indiana University resulted in a successful program in development and external relations. He was the founder and director of the Philanthropy and Americans Outdoors Workshops, a national training program in partnership building and fundraising. He was a Senior Fellow of the Eppley Institute for Parks and Public Lands.

Professor Ross was an active member of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance as well as the National Recreation and Park Association throughout his career. He served on numerous department, school and university committees and served faithfully in his community as well as his church. Community involvement was a vital part of his activities before and after retirement.

John and his wife Nancy were financially generous with their community, church, and school. He quietly and effectively financially sponsored research, faculty positions, scholarships, and innovative projects. They were particularly interested in projects that furthered research in promoting philanthropy and outdoor initiatives. Their generosity has touched the lives of many people.

This resolution is a permanent part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Perhaps the greatest testament to a scholar’s impact and erudition resides in what his pupils say about him following the conclusion of a course. In 1967, a student in Gerald Strauss’s History B353 class (“The Renaissance”) remarked in an evaluation that s/he had found the professor to be “a master of his subject; highly articulate; enthusiastic and dedicated.” Even after being subjected to Strauss’s thoroughness as a grader, the student “felt, for once, that I had engaged a mind and not just a red pencil.” (laughter) During his thirty years on the Indiana University faculty, Strauss had a far-reaching relevance to the teaching and writing of history. By the time of his retirement in 1989, he had proven

instrumental to the intellectual shaping of a generation of young scholars and had likewise established a commanding position for himself regarding the study of European history.

Gerald Strauss was born in Frankfurt, Germany, in 1922. His family immigrated to the United States in 1939 just as the Nazis plunged the world into war. During the conflict, Strauss served in the U.S. military. Afterward, he matriculated at Boston University, where he earned a B.A. degree in 1949. The following year he received an M.A. from Columbia University, where he also completed PhD work in 1957. During the Columbia years, Strauss taught as an instructor at the Phillips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire. However, his first professorial appointment began at the University of Alabama in 1957, where he was employed as an assistant professor for two years.

As a budding specialist in the history of Germany and the Reformation, Strauss began a tenure-track appointment at Indiana University in 1959. He rose through the ranks rapidly, achieving associate status in 1961, followed by a full professorship three years later. Over the next two decades, Strauss distinguished himself as a formidable historian of German history, publishing many important books and articles. He earned the rank of Distinguished Professor in 1983, a rare achievement for any university faculty members. Prior to this honor, Strauss also served as a Fulbright Visiting Professor at Trinity College of the University of Dublin (1961-1962), as well as a Visiting Professor at Cornell University (1964-1965). As a full professor, he revisited his alma mater in 1967, teaching a summer session at Columbia.

Along with his professional appointments, Strauss enjoyed many other accomplishments and distinctions. During the 1960s, he received three separate grants from the American Council of Learned Societies. Very significantly, he won Guggenheim Fellowships in 1965 and 1972; a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellowship was added to his credentials in 1979. Along with other honors, Strauss was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University (1975-1976, 1983-1984) and director of an NEH Summer Seminar for College Teachers (1979, 1981, 1986). He routinely won research support from various offices of Indiana University, including Faculty Fellowships in 1960 and 1971.

Similar to other scholars of his caliber, Strauss's reputation was substantially rooted in his research and published works. A cursory glance at his curriculum vitae indicates a prolific author thoroughly engaged with his subject. A deeper reading of his scholarship reveals a true leader in the field of European history and Reformation studies. His first book, *Sixteenth-Century Germany: Its Topographers and Topography* (Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1959) was published only two years after the attainment of the doctorate, and his second monograph (*Historian in an Age of Crisis: The Life and work of Johannes Aventinus*, Harvard UP) came out two years later. Several other books would be published during Strauss's employment at Indiana University, including *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Johns Hopkins UP, 1978) and *Law, Resistance, and the State: Opposition to Roman Law in Reformation Germany* (Princeton UP, 1986). When he was not working on a book project, Strauss busied himself with producing a steady stream of articles for periodicals such as *German Quarterly*, *Church History, Past and Present*, *Jewish Social Studies*, and the *Journal of Social History*. In many ways, he was a model historian, not only intellectually inquisitive but committed to the

regular release of his research findings to the larger world. Of his professional achievements, perhaps one colleague summed it up best: “There is not a more able, disciplined and important early modern historian than Gerald Strauss... He is virtually without peer among the social historians of Reformation Europe.”

After retiring from Indiana University in 1989, Gerald Strauss moved to Amherst, Massachusetts. Aside from being a first-rate historian, he was an amateur cellist and had little trouble finding an artistic home in local chamber music groups. When he passed away in 2006 at the age of eighty-three, Strauss was surrounded by family and friends. He is survived by his second wife Daphne Patai; his first wife, Alice Fellow; a son, Konrad Strauss; and one granddaughter, Chloe Strauss, of Bloomington.

He is greatly missed. This resolution will become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

**DOWELL:** Thank you, Tom. Let’s stand for a moment of silence. [Silence is observed] Thank you.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**DOWELL:** All right, I think I just have one item under Agenda Committee business today, which is an update on our approach to questions and concerns about the IU Health Engagement Program Initiative. The Agenda Committee has a draft charge that we are working on and we are working on recruiting members for what will be a sub-committee of the Agenda Committee. It’ll have membership from the Fringe Benefits Committee as well as—we hope—people with some expertise in the ethics and legal requirements related to healthcare cost containment. The charge will be ready to share soon but just to summarize; it asks the committee to compile faculty feedback and draft a Frequently Asked Questions document and report that to the faculty—make it available—to gather faculty concerns about the program and communicate those to relevant parties; and to outline and clarify the risks and benefits associated with such programs, including cost, privacy safeguards, ethical use of information, equitable treatment of employees; and to offer recommendations to the BFC on available faculty action and the proposed timeline we would have them complete their work this fall. Jack Windsor, who is the President of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, and I have also met this week with Neil Theobald and we are working on other kinds of means of faculty input. We are also working on how we are going to interface with other constituencies on campus—staff, particularly—about their interests so that we aren’t all working in parallel, but rather together. So if you have any comments on that, interest in the committee, people you think would be good to serve on it, feel free to send those along to anybody on the Agenda Committee—me, or Craig certainly—and we hope to publicize that before our next meeting so that they can get to work. All right!

## **AGENDA ITEM 3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

It is now our question and comment period. I am afraid that the absence of Provost Hanson leaves you with—

**GRAY:** [Remark indistinct]

**DOWELL:** —Yeah! With me as the person to ask questions of, which is less appealing probably than Karen. So does anyone have a question they want to bring forward to the Council as whole or to me in particular? Okay, very good!

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: PROGRAM REVIEW AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON**

**DOWELL:** All right, Item 4 on the Agenda is....is Padraic here?

**DETHLOFF:** He's in Warsaw.

**DOWELL:** What's that?

**DETHLOFF:** He's in Warsaw.

**DOWELL:** I did not know that. All right, do we have a lead person anymore, for program review?

**STEPHENS:** No.

**DETHLOFF:** You.

**DOWELL:** Me? Alrighty! (laughter) Okay, lucky I have a couple remarks to contextualize this document. All right, this is something that we talked about barely last week, the EPC statement on program review at IU-Bloomington. Immediately after last week's meeting, even though we brought it forward, Padraic and I spent probably fifteen minutes in the hallway afterwards talking about, 'What is this?' And is it a policy? What's the statement, and where does it go and what does it need? So a little bit of context for this and Sonya can weigh in, too, but basically the Higher Learning Commission, had as a requirement of its follow-up visit—its follow-up accreditation visit—in June of this past summer, the requirement that they wanted to see "significant progress toward a more substantial form of program review." So this is something that is a goal of the campus. The creation of a more robust system of program review will obviously involve lots of different groups: the Graduate school, the academic school, the faculty, and certainly the Provost's Office, Vice Provosts, administrators of all kinds—or many kinds. And I believe what we want to say about this statement today is that it should be viewed as a guideline for the part of the program review that asks, 'What are students learning?' And I know that it wouldn't be the end of BFC input into this process or the involvement of the Educational Policies Committee in the development of this more robust kind of version of program review. And I know that Tom—just today—suggested that this document, if approved in some way by the Council I suppose, could be added to the Bloomington Academic Guide, which is a place where not only policies reside but different kinds of guidelines or statements would be appropriately included, too, given some level of endorsement by this body. So now that you have had a couple of weeks to think about it, perhaps re-read it, do we have discussion on this program review statement? Or does anybody else feel the need who has been on the EPC or was involved with the development of this—Sonya, perhaps—to say anything else in introduction?

**STEPHENS:** Would you like me to say just a few words about why I asked EPC to look at this?

**DOWELL:** Yeah!

**STEPHENS:** This had already come up in the 2007 accreditation that there was no central campus oversight of academic programs. And there was concern that there was no central oversight of campus academic programs. We do have a policy, which is a policy that is a University Faculty Council policy and it's in the Academic Guide.

**DOWELL:** And you have it here today, actually.

**STEPHENS:** Right, yeah. It was there last time, too. And this is the policy as it exists, and it was refined, therefore in 1996? '93? 1993. When I talked to Padraic about this, he said things have changed a lot since 1993 in terms of what's expected of us, what the accreditation agencies are expecting of us, the way in which we think about teaching, and the ways in which we are expected to speak more to accreditation bodies generally, about what our students are learning. So the context for this is really that we have a policy—it's not applied as broadly as maybe it should be—let's put it that way—but the policy pretty much says that professional accreditation stands in for program review. But the document—the policy that we have—doesn't really kind of clearly distinguish between departmental review, which is what's done for example in the College of Arts and Sciences and a part of departmental review, which is curricular review. And so it seemed to me that since the University Educational Policies Committee had revised the policy, that it was a moment for the—since Bloomington was particularly affected by this policy right at the moment—it would be good for the EPC on the Bloomington campus to take a look at this and to say whether they thought it would be useful to develop guidelines for the curricular piece that might be in program review, or departmental review, however it ended up being passed. As Erika said at the beginning, it's very likely that this will be talked about more, and in a range of cases, and by a range of different offices and stakeholders. But it seemed to me that particularly we are dealing with it and the accreditations in it, the right place to bring it, in the first instance, was to the Bloomington EPC.

**GRAY:** Does that answer your question about coordination of the different bodies that have an investment in where this goes? Is there a plan for your office in terms of coordinating different stakeholders at this point or is it waiting on kind of moving this document and shaping the timeline?

**STEPHENS:** So Erika, it remains in a sense a report to the Provost because the school Deans will ultimately report something about their program reviews to the [remark indistinct] of accreditation and as they report to the Provost they would report to the Provost. At the moment, in terms of where we take this, I can tell you that after the EPC brought it to this body we decided that it would be a good moment to share it with the academic officers responsible for undergraduate education in all of the schools and so we put it on the Campus Curriculum Committee as a discussion item and for information, and we simply shared the EPC's proposal with the academic officers at that time. And nothing more was done with it, just the simple sharing of information. There will be this year an assessment task force that will meet and it will be a part of their charge to reflect on the HLC recommendations. So just to say something about the HLC recommendations and why we are where we are, I think the members of this

Council know that we were visited in 2007. We received a letter in the early part of 2008 to say that we were going to have a focus visit on the question of assessment and that focus visit took place June 30<sup>th</sup> of this year. If you have a focus visit there is always follow-up before your next accreditation and we have, as it turns out, the lightest touch follow-up in September of 2013, but we have some things that we must do, one of which, you mentioned, is to show significant progress on the question of program review. Because they saw the policy and they know how and how are we not implementing it, I guess. (laughter) So we have to do something about it. So that will be part of the charge to the assessment task force but it will also need to be looked at by the Graduate School because our accreditation includes programs at every level, not just undergraduate programs, though it might have started with our office but it really needs to go everywhere. And it really needs to be looked at carefully by all of the schools and the faculty in those schools but it seems – just to say it again – that the right place to begin with this was the EPC since this is about curriculum and program assessment.

**HENSHEL:** I guess the way I read these comments at the top they are looking for some assessment in the program review of learning outcomes. And I'm wondering what discussion there was in terms of how the units define the learning outcomes they are going to assess and I guess even more right now—at least in SPEA—we never define what our learning outcomes are and we certainly are never asked about that. All we are every asked is popularity issues, truly, and it does have great implications for assessment of courses both in terms of what we say upfront about what we are expecting in our courses and how we assess at the end. And so I was wondering what discussion you had about that and where you see this going in regard to this assessment of learning outcomes.

**STEPHENS:** Well I mean, Venkat [Munirpallam Venkataramanan –Editor's note] and I as co-chairs of the Gen Ed Committee will make a report to this Council later about what is happening in the General Education with respect to that, but this Council said that the General Education Program, for example, should be monitored and it should be monitored for its effectiveness in terms of the program as a whole and student learning in the program, as well as for the effect that the new General Education Curriculum will have on the units and so a subcommittee of the Gen Ed Committee is working on some of those issues, but one of the issues that you have is that you cannot monitor student learning—or show that you are effectively monitoring learning—unless you say what they will be learning in any course. And so in order to say what they will be learning you have to have some kind of competency or outcome stated and however individual units want to do that is really their prerogative. Nothing has been said at this time about what happens beyond Gen Ed, but if the Bloomington Faculty Council has in a sense mandated that for the General Education Curriculum we have such a monitoring of educational outcomes from an external point of view, I'm talking about accreditation, that it could be strange to say that we didn't bother doing it in the majors because, you know, we don't need to show you what they are learning in the majors because we've shown you what they are learning elsewhere. So that's a slight weakness in the system we have right now. Now those schools that are already being accredited are already having to do this to a large extent. I mean the Kelley School of Business has been working on this since their last accreditation and, I bet, have got assessment reports for each year over the last three years. The School of Social

Work has to define competencies and show them. So there are some schools which already have a lot of experience of doing this and others where it's just not being discussed or done at all. The College administration has been discussing it with CUE [Committee for Undergraduate Education –Editor's note] their undergraduate education committee, because there is a significant body of research that says that students learn better when they know what the expected outcome is. That if you can tell them what they are supposed to learn, they will learn it better. So transparency in what the learning objectives are helps the student and that's really why we should be doing it rather than because the accreditation agency says we must do it. I mean, the accreditation agency *does* say we must do it. One of the things the HLC says in core criterion 3A which is the one they came back to do the focus group on, is that program goals and learning objectives are clear for all programs and at all levels—are clearly stated for all programs and at all levels. So we fall a little far short of that. Now the National Institute for Learning Outcome Assessment says that 92% of institutions now do specify some learning objectives and measure them and report on those measurements. 92% is a very high percentage and we can say that we are doing some of that so we would fall into that category but we're a long way from being there. So, you know, I think that as part of a program review process that that discussion would have to take place—which school is going to do what and how the schools are going to approach it and what would the faculty like to see as the way of defining programs—because any of the faculty who teach those courses in those programs can define what the goals and outcomes will be.

**DOWELL:** Herb?

**TERRY:** Without Padraic here it may not be possible to get an answer to this question but given Sonya's presentation, I'm wondering where the language of circular B7-2011 came from? Is this statement one that, if the Higher Ed Commission saw it, they would say 'Oh, that's a good response to our concern?' Did we get this from other institutions that have not been similarly questioned about their statement of and role of learning outcomes in program review?

**STEPHENS:** This document is, I think, a result of the EPC discussions at which I wasn't present.

**TERRY:** That's why I said that without Padraic here we might not be able to know that.

**STEPHENS:** Yeah.

**DOWELL:** Yeah, I do think we have the answer to that, unless...

**STEPHENS:** I mean it changed over a period of time, I think, Craig it's fair to say that it went through various iterations.

**DETHLOFF:** Yeah, it's been evolving for about a year.

**TERRY:** Right, I can just think of many different ways to state this and I'm wondering if we are producing one that when they come back in 2013 or whatever they will say that still isn't good.

**STEPHENS:** Well, I think to come back to Erika's point, if this is intended as guidance—

**DOWELL:** —I mean to me it seems like the way I've heard it described is part of a process.

**STEPHENS:** So if the EPC were to...I think it was helpful to us on Campus Curriculum Committee to see what the Educational Policies Committee had come up with as guidance for the curriculum piece of departmental program review, that this is what the Educational Policies Committee would like to see if we were going to do curricular review in the context of the program departmental review. That's my understanding of the document—is that fair? It could be shared with the other committees and groups that are looking at it.

**DOWELL:** Right, and perhaps that's what we need to do with this document today, is say we're okay with this being shared as an expression of faculty perspective on the curricular aspect of program review. Tom?

**GIERYN:** Shared for purposes of review or shared just as an informational matter? One of the things we know is that if documents like that don't have an institutionalized existence somewhere they are easily forgotten.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** You could put something on the BFC website. Sonya could put something on hers. Another place would be the Guide, which is the repository for all of that.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** The policy is a UFC policy that we are playing with here and unless you want to amend it—and that would require going to the University Faculty Council—I suggest that we put it in as a narrative interpretation of the policy in addition to all of those other ways of publicizing it just so it has a place in the Guide. People can actually turn to it if they really want to know what this policy requires. We did the same thing last year, as you recall, for religious observances. There's a policy and we also had a longer statement giving more detail, consideration of particular scenarios, and I propose we do the same with this.

**GRAY:** These guides are—

**ARNOLD:** In the EPC we discussed the language quite a bit and basically this was the most neutral language we could come up with, language that would be more universally accepted without any controversy—God knows—(Coté's voice fails, laughter) Maybe I shouldn't have opened my mouth! (laughter) That's okay. I think that Tom's point is the spirit of what the EPC was trying to do, trying to get into as a kind of an addendum or interpretation or whatever of the UFC policy, and the idea of formalizing the concept that we need to have some measure of assessment and some measure of learning outcomes. Period. That's it. There were representatives from most of the schools—or from many of the schools—on the EPC who reviewed this and there were some concerns with the language at first and the language was changed and modified so that those schools that already have in place some type of assessment or process for determining learning outcomes wouldn't be offended by this and it doesn't go against what they're doing. Understanding that there are a lot of programs that undergo

professional accreditation where there is already a lot of assessment going on, and this is not new to them, this is, in fact, very routine. And we tried to keep it at that point, at that level.

**STEPHENS:** Can I just say one other thing which is just to give you another piece of context which is that there will be I think, probably, a university-wide raising of this question, too, as a result of what the president said in his state of the university address and the committees that he announced last week. One of the things that was said then is: what are the students learning and how do we know that they're learning it? And he said we can't wait for others to ask us all these questions, we must address this as a matter with some urgency ourselves. And so one of those new directions in teaching and learning is precisely supposed to address the question: what are our students learning and how do we know they are learning it? So I think it's quite likely we'll hear more about this from that piece of this and university-wide rather than Bloomington Faculty Council.

**DOWELL:** Any other discussion? Is this something everybody feels great about and we want to just have a motion to include it in the Academic Guide as an expression of...?

**GIERYN:** Erika?

**DOWELL:** Or do we not do that, I mean...

**GIERYN:** There may be some minor stylistic changes just to make it conform to the type of language of the Guide.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**GRAY:** Or we could pass it in spirit, or we could certainly endorse it in spirit. I mean, I think the tough thing is this came to the Council at our first meeting and Padraic was really was presenting this as a document looking for our endorsement so that we have a public stand on the issue of assessment, so that things don't just keep moving forward without us having some sort of statement that elaborates where we stand on this issue. So the value of some sort of public endorsement of the spirit of this document that perhaps tweaks the language would be that we would be on record, and for me—the EPC has been working on this for some time so I really value the work they've done—I think this document reflects a lot of hard work and coordination with other constituencies so I would love to see us be able to move on this because I know Padraic and the committee put a lot of energy into this.

**DOWELL:** Randy?

**ARNOLD:** Yes, it sounds like we might potentially endorse it, but it could go to other constituencies who might want to modify it slightly, would it have to come back to us?

**DOWELL:** I don't think so, I mean I think, this isn't a policy so I think it would be a one-time statement of our intention or our feelings about how this should work and that would be it. And then if there were further elaborations of specific policies that would be a separate issue, I think.

**SHOCKLEY:** So I move that the Bloomington Faculty Council endorse the EPC statement on Program Review at Indiana University.

**DOWELL:** Why, thank you. Is there a second?

**ARNOLD:** Second.

**DOWELL:** Randy. Any discussion on it then at this point? Additional pro/con?

**BIELASIAK:** I mean what exactly—I'm still wondering—is the purpose of this? I think I'm voting for apple pie and motherhood. (laughter)

**SHAW:** That's exactly it!

**DOWELL:** That's right.

**BIELASIAK:** For students learning and great, since that's what we do I'm fine with that.

**DOWELL:** That may be what we are doing. But I think, you know, that the existing language on program review or the assessment of this question is a small part of a one page policy of the UFC and it seems to me it's worthwhile to have something a little richer, even if it is not particularly meaty in some ways.

**STEPHENS:** I would just like to say that I think that if this Council endorses it, it sends a very strong message to the schools that this is what the faculty would actually like to see have happen. That you would actually like to have [remarks indistinct], so I think it's important this comes from you first which is one of the reasons I was keen for the EPC to discuss it. So I don't think it's just voting for motherhood and apple pie. I really do think you're endorsing something that you believe is important and that sends a message.

**DOWELL:** Yes.

**BOLING:** The question for me is that if we can vote for apple pie, do we get a taste of the slice later down the road?

**STEPHENS:** Absolutely!

**DOWELL:** I think so.

**BOLING:** I think I can go with that.

**DOWELL:** Sue?

**WHISTON:** I'm a little confused and so I want clarification. I think what we are doing here is monumental from someone who has just written an accreditation self-study with all the accompanying documents—ended up being 934 pages. (Someone whistles) Hence, we needed to document competencies, learning outcomes, and so it is not an easy process by which; one, as a program, we have ten faculty comes to agreement on what our goals are and what our expected outcomes are and then how we actually measure student outcome. So I don't think

we should take this lightly. So I don't think it's motherhood and apple pie at all. The other thing that I think is important to consider is, are we saying that we agree this should be done every five to seven years? Am I reading that correctly?

**UNKOWN MALE:** Yes.

**STEPHENS:** Well, that's the policy. The policy is that it should be done every five to seven years.

**DOWELL:** That exists at the university level.

**WHISTON:** That exists?

**DOWELL:** At the university level.

**WHISTON:** Really? (laughter)

**DOWELL:** Yes. It does. I know. Yes, Geoff?

**BROWN:** Well, I want to follow up on that comment because it is very important. We're either doing this in spirit and there are couple of possible outcomes, one of which is that it will be honored in breach, which is not really what we want, or it will be done in a serious manner which means we are really creating for our colleagues and ourselves an enormous amount of work. Did the EPC actually do any analysis of what it might actually mean to do a credible job on this?

**DETHLOFF:** I don't believe that they did any sort of analysis as far as—do you mean estimating or gauging what would constitute a credible job?

**BROWN:** I guess what I'm saying is, I don't really have a very good sense of what honoring this means. I mean, it's one thing to vote for it but I don't really know what it would mean, for example, to my school or to other schools to really meet the spirit of this. That's the thing. I think what you said was very important, and I'd like to understand it better.

**DOWELL:** Diane?

**REILLY:** I agree. It strikes me as something of an unfunded mandate. Because for those of us who are in disciplines where there is no general agreement on what the basic content knowledge or skill set or disciplinary desire is for an outcome, this is going to be hugely complicated and controversial. I doubt we'll be able to get even our faculty of ten people to agree on what we're supposed to be accomplishing with our degree. And then it's not something that can be tested since we don't have a licensing process for our profession, this isn't something that can be tested without us instituting a new program requirement for our students and that is very intensive and time consuming. So I agree that I would like to know more about how this is supposed to work.

**DOWELL:** Mary?

**GRAY:** My understanding from the EPC is that this really brings BFC into that conversation directly, and in many ways puts us at the beginning of that conversation. So accreditation mandates to start thinking about learning outcomes and to start figuring about how to assess those, that's a train that's coming. That's coming at us, and this document interjects the BFC, I would argue in a fairly powerful way, that gives very specific guidance as much as that can be specified at this stage, so that we're really at the beginning of the stage of 'what does this assessment look like?' to be able to answer the accreditation review that's expecting that from us. In a lot of ways I'd say we are noncompliant and we don't even realize that we are noncompliant. How much we want to comply is certainly a question and the EPC is taking it up and saying this is what complying would look like. It would mean really taking it to the units, letting the units do that kind of evaluation, being in a pretty heavy dialogue with other stakeholders. So I think the tough thing is that we don't know what it's going to look like, but this document puts the BFC in a position of being very much in the evaluation from the get go. If we don't have a statement, we just effectively default to the UFC statement, and we're not participating. And I think we mostly haven't been participating in this conversation. So I think that—for better or worse as the Parliamentarian, I guess I'll pull that—what this does for us is to allow us to have a statement and a place to work from that has some committee members that have been pretty arduously thinking about the possibilities and where it could go and now, in many ways, are on the radar screen of folks who are going to be making these decisions so it's whether we want to be part of that decision-making process or have it land on our doorstep down the road.

**DOWELL:** Other remarks?

**BIELASIAK:** I guess my question would be, is it sufficient? It's not that if we want it or not, if everybody wants to.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**BIELASIAK:** The question is: is it a sufficient signal in itself or do we need to address some more substantive issues that need to be included? Let's not preclude that we adopt this today and then maybe we need to revisit it at a later point.

**DOWELL:** Certainly.

**HORNE:** It seems to me that if we pass it in spirit, again, it seems to me that the details would be better worked out at individual school levels. The other thing—I did a great deal of this at the institution where I previously served but I want to reiterate—it is an unfunded mandate, but it is coming. And the question is: are we going to take part in it? Or are we going to just essentially foist it on various administrators and then complain that we were not included in decisions that they made? If that's going to be our complaint then we must take a stake in it and yes, assume more duties, for which there is probably—

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** —no pay—

**HORNE:** —you know, little joy in it.

**DOWELL:** Okay, Geoff.

**BROWN:** I'm sorry, I don't have my reading glasses which makes this a little hard, but my mistake. I'm curious. I don't see—other than the BFC passing this—what work the BFC is assuming. It seems we are assuming on behalf of the units, some things. Is that correct?

**GRAY:** I'm sorry, I missed the very last part?

**BROWN:** It seems like this BFC/EPC statement is the BFC assuming or assigning work to the units of the various schools. It's not the BFC taking on any work as far as I can tell. Did I miss something?

**DOWELL:** I think that's true, but this isn't a policy. This isn't telling anybody to do anything yet. It's taking a stand on, I think, what we want this work to look like when we have to do it. And the way other people have phrased it—that it's coming one way or another most likely—this is our chance to say sort of up front these are some broad outlines of how we think it should happen. Our vote today is not saying that it even will happen this way, you know? It's saying that this is what a committee that spent a lot of time thinking about it thinks is a good statement of overall faculty sentiment on how we should evaluate student learning. And a vote today would be some kind of an endorsement of the statement. If we're not ready to do that we can table the issue or have a vote and not endorse it at this point in time, I suppose.

**WHISTON:** Or could I suggest a friendly amendment to the motion, in that we endorse the statement but add that we like the Bloomington Faculty Council to be involved with this process as it proceeds forward.

**DOWELL:** Certainly.

**WHISTON:** It would have to be by the person who—

**SHOCKLEY:** Sure. (laughter)

**WHISTON:** I think—Parliamentarian—isn't that right?

**GRAY:** I think so, so it has to be.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**GRAY:** [Remark indistinct] has to accept that.

**DOWELL:** I think he said yes.

**GRAY:** He's winking yes.

**DOWELL:** He said yes before. Alright, well we have plenty of other things to talk about today, are we ready for a vote? To restate the motion that we, the Bloomington Faculty Council, endorse this EPC statement on program review at IU Bloomington with the expectation that the

BFC will continue to be involved in discussions relating to assessment of all kinds. All in favor?  
[Aye] All opposed? And there are abstentions to report? One, two...

**[NONE OPPOSED, 2 ABSTENTIONS]**

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: REPORT OF THE BFC REFORM TASK FORCE**

**DOWELL:** Okay, thank you. I'm getting a little dizzy with my chair here. Sorry, I'm a little light-headed. All right, we have basically a second discussion—which I expect would be relatively short—of the reform proposals of the BFC Reform Task Force. Basically to see if you have other comments that you want to put forward in the time since we discussed it last week. At the end of today's discussion the Agenda Committee proposes that we forward the document to the Constitution and Rules Committee to take the proposal and the report, as well as the comments of the Council and some of the particular areas that we've been focusing on, as areas that we have concern about exactly how they work and then for that committee to work, over this course of the semester, and bring in early November to the Council a final version of the revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws which we would then actually vote on. A vote of approval from this body would then set in motion a time period for the faculty at large to have a remonstrance period for the changes that were suggested and then if there was nothing, that's an opportunity to call a meeting to vote it down kind of before it even gets started, if it passes through that kind of 15-day waiting period then the changes would be subject to a vote by the faculty at large, so every member of the faculty, and every change would be accompanied by a pro and con statement for people to sort of read through and understand the thinking behind any changes proposed. So today we're talking more generally about concerns: what things we think are good. The concerns that came up last time to kind of summarize—we seemed to have some major concerns—talked about nominations how the nominations for president would work. We talked about a popularly elected president and getting nominations from the faculty who would decide who the end candidates would be. Would there be a primary vote? Would that be the job of the nominations committee as it currently stands to take those nominated and make up a ballot one way or another? Another key issue that was brought up, term limits; we're expanding or proposing to expand the Agenda Committee into an Executive Committee which would then include membership of certain committee chairs. Certain committee chairs would be members of that committee. So it opens up the ways for people to serve on that leadership committee by being elected, but also by being the chair of a committee. Are there extra issues relating to term limitations to prevent someone from chairing a certain committee and therefore being on the Executive Committee for a couple of years and then be elected and be on the Executive Committee for a few more years and then going back to chairing an important committee and be on the Executive Committee for a few more years are the things we want to look at in that regard so that would be a key thing for, I think, for the Constitution and Rules Committee to take a look at. Not something that's probably easily worked out in a body of this size. There was a lot of talk about exactly what is the composition of the Executive Committee and is it too big? Are the right committee chairs included? Is that a good way to go? etc, etc... I'll start our conversation by throwing out another question that someone brought to me earlier today. They were surprised that we didn't propose any changes in the frequency of meetings of the Bloomington Faculty

Council. It was certainly something that we discussed and so if anybody has thoughts on that certainly throw them out, but I think in the end we decided that we didn't want to disrupt the current schedule of meetings but it was certainly possible that we would try to communicate to future Executive Committees that there's no crime in cancelling a meeting if there is really nothing to talk about. So, let's just open this up for some discussion and if you have opinions on the proposed way to move forward and have the Constitution and Rules Committee actually look at this stuff in a very detailed way, please let me know. And bring that out here, too. All right! Okay.

**GRAY:** Herb's got one.

**DOWELL:** What's that?

**GRAY:** Herb's got one.

**DOWELL:** Oh, Herb, yes?

**TERRY:** Since last meeting I've been reflecting on the proposed changes and the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee. I think by and large those are good ways to address problems that the committees, both of them, have had in recent years. As long as the committees overlap which is what is proposed here and as long as both have a liaison to the Executive Committee which is also what is proposed here, I think it will keep the BFC more attached to both planning—from which we've been awfully divorced—campus planning, and the budget which we have been more integrated than with planning generally but it's still not perhaps obvious. So for what it's worth, given that I've served on or chaired the Budgetary Affairs Committee often over my years here and worried about the decline of the Long Range Planning Committee I think the proposals they've made here are sound. Actually what I'm most uncertain about is the—as was raised in the last meeting here—how exactly you would make the ability of the Council to overrule the action of its Executive Committee at its next session effective, especially if in many of these instances the Executive Committee might take action at the beginning of the summer? Others, certainly, might rely on whatever it was that the Executive Committee had done and would then find themselves faced with a repudiation of that by the Council later. I think the best answer I can give to that is that I'm in favor of it and support letting the Constitution and Rules Committee chew on how we do this—

**DOWELL:** —Right—

**TERRY:** — some more and see what they come back with because I think we must find a way for the Council to act that nimbly. But, boy, do I see some problems in the idea that the Executive Committee could act in good faith, people could rely on them in good faith, and then the Council—which actually might represent a different group of people than were represented in the Executive Committee the year previously—would come through and undo it. So to me that's one of the most troubling things yet to be worked out. The other thing I would point out is that this still has to be coordinated to some extent with the committee that is working on the reform of the UFC and whether or not the Bloomington head or elect or whatever it is would have some automatic position at the UFC. That's still making the rounds.

**DOWELL:** As soon as it is done we'll be ready to jump in and...

**TERRY:** I guess I would add something else. For the third time in recent years I've polled the members of Arts and Sciences "D" about a matter pending before this Council and, you know, believe it or not I've actually found that useful. Now I have little in common with some of the units—I'm in Telecommunications—I have little in common with some of the units that are somewhat arbitrarily throw in Arts and Sciences "D." But at the very least I'm about to leave the Council forever, you know at the very least I find it kind of useful to have a subset of the Council that I think of as the ones I represented and I also think of as in some way having elected me. So I have a little reluctance with the idea that the Council should be more or less elected at-large although representatives will be parceled out some way or another into electoral units. Again I would just like Constitution and Rules to think some more about that and come back with thoughts that they would recommend.

**DOWELL:** Jack?

**BIELASIAK:** I may have missed it because I just skimmed through this, but I don't see a formal requirement for the Executive Committee to report back to the BFC, and I guess I would urge us to put some language that—

**TERRY:** Page 10 of the Bylaws, Jack.

**BIELASIAK:** Page ten?

**TERRY:** Kind of almost in the middle.

**DOWELL:** That seems to be related to the first question you raised about—

**BIELASIAK:** Right, so it might be already in there, but I just wanted to make sure that we have a formal mechanism whereby the executive—though I still don't like that terminology but can't think of anything better—

**DOWELL:** —to notify the Council—

**BIELASIAK:** —to notify the Council about what action it took and that there be some again, mechanism whereby the Council can revisit the issues. That doesn't still address the issue that Herb raised which is that if there are some disagreements, how do you deal with that? I think that is an important one.

**GRAY:** Can I ask for a clarification on that? Jack, do you mean you'd like to see the CRC come up with a very specific process for that notification? Like within days?

**BIELASIAK:** Some required notification be enacted the next or two or whatever meetings after. If it's summer we obviously don't have that time requirement, it may be after the first or second meeting, but within the first two meetings, whatever the language.

**DOWELL:** And there could be certainly a time requirement I think if some action in due course took place during the summer. I mean, people still hold office during the summer even if we

don't have meetings and if there was something bad enough that the Executive Committee did and people were mad about it I'm sure there could be...

**BIELASIAK:** How about impeachment?

**GRAY:** We can write impeachment rules.

**DOWELL:** Something can be done. Other comments? Do you have something, Brian?

**HORNE:** First of all I would say it always drives me crazy in groups like this where some group of people – this one a group of five – have put together a great deal of time and it's put before the group and by the end of the time of consideration it's picked to death like carrion at the side of the roads. Now I'm very grateful that you all put in the time and I appreciate it, and I don't really have a complaint or a qualm with it. I just have one other issue that is tangentially related that we touched on last year when I was on the Agenda Committee and that is just the place of –almost the reputation of—the BFC or the place of service in the larger community. And to me it's tangentially related, in the fact that I think that service should be more highly regarded by administrators, frankly. And this is one side of it to me. I don't have a solution to it, that you should be remunerated for your time on the BFC or...

**GRAY:** I'm keen on it.

**HORNE:** I'm sorry? (laughter) Let's vote on that right now! I don't know the solution to it, but to me I don't like the idea that it's something that, you know, it just doesn't occupy I think for people and committees and for a group of people that make important decisions which some faculty think affect them or not, I'm sorry these fringe benefits issues they affect them, retirement issues they affect them, they do and, you know, decisions are made that affect the quality of their lives and they ought to be held in higher esteem. The solution to that I don't know, but if you are going to put in a great deal of time—as you all have—on the issue I would like this group as a whole or the group of the five of you at some point or some other to address that so that it just is held in higher esteem because it is important. And I don't really... From a great number of people including an associate Dean of my school who told me "your service just doesn't matter," I think it should be held in higher regard and I would love to see that issue addressed in one way or another. But thank you all for the mountain of work you've done.

**DOWELL:** On behalf of the group, thank you and we came into it clear-eyed. We knew it would be discussed and changed. Other comments before it goes to the Constitution and Rules Committee? Randy?

**ARNOLD:** Yeah, I think this was brought up last time about the chairs of the four standing committees that would serve on the Executive Committee is there a concern that those may or may not be elected because, I mean, this will be representing all of the faculty in some cases but some of those four may have been nominated and accepted the responsibility of being chair without serving on the BFC—being voted to the BFC. Is there a concern over that or is there a way we could rectify that by sort of designating that there is always a co-chair that is an

elected BFC member who could serve in that role at the Executive Committee if another co-chair is not. I mean I certainly see the benefit of having people who are not elected BFC members as chairs of those committees, because there is a history there that is important.

**DOWELL:** I think that our current documentation, if I'm not wrong, requires that the chairs of committees, at least one of them, be a member of the BFC—be elected already. That has not always played out in practice but that would make it perhaps even a more important issue in a situation where a committee chairmanship would also bring this added level of responsibility. Okay, unless there is anything else I think we should have just a very short break for, there is still some more popcorn left, and then we'll come in slightly rejuvenated and talk about the calendar.

## **BRIEF RECESS**

### **PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS CALENDAR**

**DOWELL:** We're almost there? Okay! Alright, we are going to take on our last item on the agenda, Proposal to Revise the Bloomington Campus Calendar. Tom, do you want to get us started?

**GIERYN:** Like a baaaad penny. I'm just really pleased that this became the last agenda item for the meeting today. As you recall from discussions last spring, the Provost convened a task force in January to examine the possibility of changing the Bloomington academic calendar, specifically looking at two issues; the possibility of a new fall break and also the possibility of making Labor Day a holiday from classes. The task force began its work and quickly moved with the following premise: no change to the academic calendar would or could make everybody happy. (low laughter) And I have personally received abundant evidence of that in the last three or four days in my email box. April 20, 2010, a landmark date in the history of the Faculty Council we voted to make Labor Day a recess from classes. At the same time the Council charged the task force to continue its work during the summer by examining the possibility of additional changes. We did meet over the summer. Long and hard we considered issues that were raised by the Council in April. We consulted with the diversity of constituencies in academic units, as well as in the administration. In particular, we listened to two parties very carefully. One were representatives, again, from Biology and Chemistry—as you recall those two departments because of the schedules of labs and discussion sections—had profound difficulties reconciling broken weeks with their pedagogical needs and objectives. We learned, for example, that in effect these departments need fourteen daily slots on at least four days a week and that the classes are booked from 8:30 in the morning until 9:00 at night. The facilities are full. There's not a lot of flexibility to move things around. The second constituency that we learned a great deal more from over the summer was the IU Student Association. They have representatives here. I am going to ask them to speak as soon as I am finished with my preamble. So, the upshot of this summer's work: we dump the previous proposal from last spring. We no longer want to start the fall semester of the Wednesday of the previous week. We no longer want a two-day fall break in mid-October on Monday and Tuesday, and we are willing to leave Thanksgiving week alone. All of those proposals, as you recall, created a total of

four broken weeks and that became—I want to say something about the straw that broke the camel’s back—but that’s too many breakings going on. So our solution, you have the new proposal: Start the fall term one week earlier on a Monday creating no new broken week. Take the full week off at Thanksgiving, reduces a broken week, ends—if I may say so—the hypocrisy that those have been taken widely and consistently as instructional days, and finally is a move that would ease the travel of students and faculty away from campus for the holidays. The third proposal is that we institute a one-day fall break on a Friday coming probably at week seven, maybe eight, as both a breather in the long run from the end of August until Thanksgiving, but also to create the possibilities for an activities day with a variety of other activities that I’m going to let the IUSA elaborate upon. This proposal does the following: it yields, at the end, two broken weeks. That’s a net gain of one over our present calendar. The broken weeks are the one created by Labor Day and the one created by the new fall break. Secondly, it increases the instructional days by one, from 72 to 73 in the fall semester. We still have 74 in the spring. However, my third point, there is increasing symmetry between the fall and the spring, if you see MLK Day and Labor Day as equivalents, if you see Thanksgiving full-week as equivalent to spring week, we’ve moved in the direction of greater symmetry. That was an issue of importance to some academic units. And finally, for what it’s worth, we are in sync with Purdue, IUPUI, Ball State, and four other CIC schools in terms of the start date that is one week earlier than at present. Because we propose to move up the fall semester one week, we needed to do something about summer, because if we did nothing with the summer schedule we would have created an impossibly short time between the end of summer and the start of fall. So our final proposal is to create a new summer session consisting of three four-week modules, twelve-week total. This is no different from the proposal from the spring. We simply have a little more detail and much of the detail is found on this simply gorgeous chart that Mike Carroll from the Registrar’s has. The only difficult thing is you’ve got to read it from top down, something like a scroll, rather than sideways, so we can talk about that more in detail. Let me tell you what we tried to do and the problems we faced with respect to the summer. Our goal was to balance two things: on the one hand we wanted to increase the flexibility for units in terms of scheduling classes, giving them more freedom to book classes when they felt would work, for themselves or their faculty, for their students and at the same time increase the desirability of summer classes for students. We wanted to grow this market. We needed to balance both of them, however, with a desire to reduce as much as possible student scheduling conflicts that would result from overlaps in courses being offered at the same time, day, and so forth. If it were a free-for-all and up to the units we would have a lot of those conflicts, so we need to impose some scheduling constraints and what we did is impose very few. The start dates for courses would be restricted to the beginning of one of those four three/four-week modules, or smack in the middle of the summer session, so there are four possible start dates for classes. The duration, in terms of number of weeks, would vary, you can fit four-week, six-week, eight-week, and twelve-week classes into this summer session. And yes, there would be some overlap, much as there is already overlap during the fall or spring semester. Class times could be varied as well, and this is really the beauty of Mike’s chart. You can begin to see hypothetical arrangements in terms of the length of classes, depending on the number of weeks that they’ll meet ranging from twelve weeks on the left to four weeks on the right, and also a function of the number of days per week that they meet so you can see what happens.

To take the categories in the darkest blue, those are classes meeting for six weeks, but the difference is that one meets—on the left of those two dark blue ones—meets for four days and the one on the right meets for five. You can see the possible scheduling issues. And finally to introduce a little structure, we divided the instructional day into four periods of time, with a proviso that all classes would do their best to fit into only one of those. Obviously, if you have got a class that needs to meet for a longer period we could work that out but the norm would be to try to keep it within one of those four periods of time—again—to reduce overlap and prevent student conflict. This new plan, with the summer being shorter, creates almost three weeks—not quite—but almost three weeks between summer and fall. This is enough time for lots of good things to happen including classroom repairs, welcome week orientation, and so forth. Several issues that came up before or came up during our deliberations are not addressed, that is, we sidestepped—some would say we dodged—these issues. One is, whatever will happen with welcome week and orientation? There are many concerns that it is too long, welcome week, that it is an invitation to get started on a career of partying for our first year students, that it's not dense enough with activities to occupy their attention. We've decided that this is not a charge to the Calendar Committee to deal with. There are other bodies that should address that problem in other ways. Likewise, we dodged the issues of whether or not Saturday classes would be a possibility, whether we should change 'free' or 'dead' week—that week just before finals when major assignments aren't due—and whether we would change final exam week, none of those issues were considered. So, I've got a ton of responses, both positive and negative, I'm not going to go through them now though we could talk about them as much as you'd like. Our judgment as a committee or task force was that none of these objections were showstoppers, that is, the proposal that we are presenting does not sacrifice instructional integrity or sacrifice any other aspect of the academic mission of the university. It doesn't mean that everyone will agree that this is an improvement; it simply says we don't have a showstopper argument that would tell us basically as a task force not to make this recommendation, okay? So we leave it in your hands, this is an exercise in faculty governance. This is, in fact, one of the areas that affects us all, that BFC is charged with responsibility. I can say this in conclusion: if you want a change—and that's not obvious—but if you want a change because you believe we can do better, this is probably the most workable plan. A lot of people have worked a lot of weeks on coming up with a plan. This seems to be the best one that we can come up with. So I'd like to turn it over to representatives from the IUSA, Michael Coleman and Katie Tetrick.

**COLEMAN:** Again, my name is Michael Coleman. I want to first off start off by saying that I am glad I can be here the whole meeting, I actually have class in between the meeting, but my Professor James Madison in the History Department let me out, he said that, "good students have special occasions when a greater priority necessitates missing class." (laughter) So he allowed me to be here. I want to also thank Tom for chairing the committee this whole summer and all the faculty who sat on it along with Katie and myself. And I also want to say that IUSA fully supports the Calendar Committee's proposal, and I want to introduce the rest of our representatives. We have Neil Kelty, he's the Chief of Staff for IUSA, and Barrett Tenbarge, who's the Chief of Internal Affairs for IUSA, but now I'm going to turn it over to Katie Tetrick who has been heading the task force on IUSA with the discussion of fall break so that she can

talk about a couple of things that IUSA wants to address, and the work that she's done with Tom on the committee.

**TETRICK:** Like Michael said my name is Katie Tetrick, and I am the Chief of Fall Break for IUSA and Michael and I served on the Calendar Committee so we've heard all of the ideas and proposals and we think that this is the best proposal. As IUSA we represent the student body and we feel that this is a really great proposal because it's reassuring instructional integrity, but at the same time it's still maintaining the well-being of students. So I just want to go over briefly a student's perspective from the fall break proposal on the table. Tom said that we could speak a little bit about the idea of an activities day in October, and we think this would be really great to have this Friday as a day that we could have service events, cultural events, or an opportunity for prominent speakers to come to campus. It would be a really great thing for the university and we think it would be better to see this as kind of an activities day versus just a day off from school. And like Tom said even for students it isn't as big of a disruption to the academic week as a Monday and Tuesday in October would have been. The full week at Thanksgiving definitely minimizes confusion for students, and I can speak firsthand, I think all four of us can, that the majority of students and faculty currently are failing to recognize the Monday and Tuesday before Thanksgiving as bona fide instructional days and it's really difficult to respect these days when some of your teachers are cancelling class while others are holding class. So that just eliminates confusion and alleviates stress on the students whether deciding to go to class or just go home if you don't have class all week, but then your teacher on Tuesday at 4:00PM has decided to have class it's kind of hard to make that judgment call and obviously it's easier for students to travel home for the holiday. And then in general the symmetry between the spring semester and fall break; currently the fall semester has thirteen consecutive weeks and the spring semester has seven, so by breaking up the fall semester more evenly this makes it less academically draining on the students and we would see the symmetry from this proposal in that sense of schedule and routine kind of alleviates confusion for students as well. I think everyone can benefit from a source of schedule and routine. And as far as the summer modules go I think, for both faculty and students, the switch from fourteen to twelve weeks would really provide a greater opportunity and flexibility for students to register in summer courses and hopefully we would see registration in these courses go up.

**DOWELL:** All right, let's open it up to the Council. Randy?

**ARNOLD:** I just wanted comment on behalf of Chemistry, and I haven't heard a perspective from Biology, so I won't speak for them, but I will say for the Chemistry Department this proposal is far better than the one that came forward in the spring. With having only a Monday off and only a Friday off in the otherwise consecutive weeks in the fall semester it really allows for labs to function in a pretty much normal manner as they do fairly well in the spring. For example, there are only maybe one or two Chemistry lab courses that actually use Monday through Friday for the lab. Many of them—and I'm teaching one right now that has eighteen lab sections—but they all meet Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, so the week that has the Friday off would not impact that lab course which is wonderful. Then there are some other lab courses that don't use Monday, but might use Tuesday through Friday, for example. We do use Friday. We have labs that go from 8:00AM to 6:00PM on Friday, but many of those labs that

meet on Friday do not also meet on Monday so having two broken weeks is really sort of a mental issue, at least for Chemistry. I don't know if it's different in Biology, but this is just a wonderful proposal and I really appreciate the work that the committee did in hearing us and listening to our concerns and adjusting the calendar accordingly for that.

**DOWELL:** And Beth, you wanted to answer for Biology?

**RAFF:** Biology has many courses that use all five days so from Biology's perspective, it's still a two broken week calendar. I think that Biology—there are still people in Biology who are mourning Labor Day so—but it really is difficult. One of the problems could of course be alleviated by more classroom lab buildings and when that happens, you know, we could do it, but Biology's situation is much more crowded because we actually cannot meet the demand for labs. We have 1400 majors plus we also have majors in other sciences in our labs. So I think Biology would prefer not to change the current start date and only have Labor Day as its one broken week and take off Thanksgiving, because Thanksgiving week—as the students point out—is kind of a loss, since there are only two days there and it's difficult for the labs. The labs really can't meet then. I think the other issue, aside from calendar issues, which lots of people have brought up, is that moving the start date back does eat into the faculty research time and that's an issue for faculty.

**DOWELL:** Geoff?

**SPRINKLE:** Please forgive my ignorance, when it says summer courses may range in duration from two to twelve weeks, you could do two, three, four, five, six, seven...?

**GIERYN:** No.

**SPRINKLE:** Okay, so maybe two—

**GIERYN:** The evens; two, four, six, eight, twelve—actually we skipped ten—(laughter)

**SPRINKLE:** Well, it just says: may range in duration from two to twelve, so maybe a little bit of a—I just read that as could be anywhere from two to twelve weeks and so not being involved in the process... The other thing is, if we are looking at the graph that you gave us, why don't we fix the number of minutes and then back into class times? Does it just creating too much of a scheduling problem? I mean, it seems odd I guess that you would have, you know, one six week session that has 2,000 minutes and then the other has 2,040. Why is there the discrepancy in the actual minutes across?

**CARROLL:** We looked at what currently happens today, both in summer and in the regular terms, and that inconsistency exists. And so what we tried to do was build a schedule that made the most sense that tried to achieve that minimum number of minutes and especially with the longer classes, build in enough time for instructors to take the kind of breaks they thought they needed to take. So if you have a two hour class—I know here this shows a couple of potential ideas for what an in-class break might be but that may not be what the instructor chooses to do.

**SPRINKLE:** Yeah, it just seemed to me, again—again, not being involved in the process—it just seemed odd to get a twelve week section that has 2,400 actual minutes versus an eight week section that has 2,000 and you know, you’re looking at six plus hours of difference in instruction time, and so is it—?

**[MALE SPEAKER]:** —Pardon me—

**SPRINKLE:** — from a scheduling or an optimization—?

**CARROLL:** Part of it comes down to having a schedule that fits together well so that we use the rooms well, and then the number of days the class meets per week, so once you start adding that number of days in the jumps are significant and it can make that kind of difference.

**SPRINKLE:** Okay, and then just to be clear on, again, the weeks. It can range so you can go two, four—can you go three or—?

**CARROLL:** I think two, four, six, eight, twelve—

**GIERYN:** Two is highly unlikely, although there are some intensive courses, it’s almost impossible to do it, you just want to meet the class that often, but four weeks certainly is a module and it’s there and we’ve plotted that out. Six would be ideal if an academic unit wanted to run two successive summer courses of equal length, they could do it over a twelve week period. The start for the second one would of course be in the middle. Then you could do an eight, by coupling two four-week modules if you wanted to run two eights in the summer you’d obviously have a third overlap. Ten, we’re not looking at that really, and twelve would be if you want to run a course for the whole summer.

**SPRINKLE:** Sure, sure, okay.

**GIERYN:** And the reason on the variations—these are hypothetical. Mike is giving you possibilities here. We have a University Faculty Council policy that says about 2,000 minutes—

**SPRINKLE:** Oh, is that all?

**GIERYN:** No, less than 2,000 minutes, roughly, [unintelligible speech due to overlap] a little short there, but it’s a UFC policy—2,000 minimum. For a three credit course.

**DOWELL:** Diane?

**HENSHEL:** I would like to make two comments. One from SPEA’s science faculty perspective, because our classes are Monday/Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday, our labs are Friday, and sometimes Saturday, and sometimes Sunday, and now we’re forced into Thursday as well because we don’t have enough lab time and space. There are field, as well as lab courses, which also introduces a point about the issues with the summer sessions—there needs to be a chance to do four hour courses—I mean four hours at once—because you can’t go into the field without four hours, it just doesn’t work. It takes a while to get there, and then you need to have time in the field, time to get back so that’s another issue. We also have, because we have a 2-2 course load for scientists as well, it really does cut into our research time not to have the longer

time in the summer. And I have heard that complaint actually not just from SPEA people, from other people too, they have emailed me and been concerned about their research time in the summer. I have a proposal that I've been wondering if people would consider then, is whether we would be allowed to take our actual teaching load in the summer as well as in the spring and fall and that would allow us then to rearrange our teaching time, so that we have a longer research time, if needed. And so I would like to throw that into the pot, if possible. (laughter) I know it's a late date but I won't be here in the spring.

**GIERYN:** Wow.

**HENSHEL:** It's a serious question, it really does, you know, enable more flexibility for research.

**GIERYN:** I don't believe that's a call for the BFC.

**HENSHEL:** No, I understand that, but that is a problem with, I mean, we are getting more and more pressure to produce on our research and we are having more and more difficulty with doing it because of time.

**GIERYN:** If I could respond to the quick question, courses can extend beyond the two-hour limit, if you need a four-hour class. That was intended to be a guide to prevent overlap but we understand.

**HENSHEL:** Okay.

**DOWELL:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I have a question I suppose Roland [unintelligible due to background noise] I have worried a lot about whether the summer session flexibility would produce something that is actually workable for students, that they can put together some combination of courses in their major and General Education courses and other sorts of things because when I survey my summer students, they are not all taking courses in my department. We can avoid conflicts in my department but we can't avoid them with other things that they need some way or another. So my question in part—is there a way we can actually sort of try this out? Model it somehow? Actually find out what happens if we ask units to create these summer sessions, and then is there time to bail out from this if we discover it just won't produce something that students can make work. And not just around their classes, I raised this question with a number of my students and they were interested in how it would fit with off-campus internships that they complete in the summer, summer jobs on and off-campus, a whole bunch of things. So I have this feeling that it would be really nice if we could actually find out what this would look like before we are at a point of no return and must actually offer that and discover that it doesn't work. So I don't know what the answer to that is. The other thing is— I surveyed my constituents—and I found the things that to some extent correspond with SPEA and some extent Biology. What I learned is that we have a lot of places, not in the sciences, that because faculty don't like to teach on Friday, do Monday and Wednesday, or Tuesday and Thursday lectures and then cluster all of their discussions on Friday. And like the sciences, then, they find broken weeks cumbersome and now their problem is with this fall break Friday, okay? The

majority of the people I surveyed did not respond. So that either means that by and large a hundred and some people don't care, they don't get the emails or something, but everyone but one of the twenty or so who did respond had some objection to the Friday only fall break proposal. Either it was here's another 'Now-what-am-I-going-to-do-because-we-are-losing-my-discussion-sections-on-Friday' or it was skepticism that this would turn into an on-campus service and engagement thing and that, in fact, it would simply be a three day, or four day, partying binge, or that my students—actually, I tried it out on them—didn't see any advantage to this because, as they put it, once you get beyond your freshman year you don't have Friday classes anyway, so you are not giving me a break. I would rather have Monday off was their response, about a hundred and some of them. They didn't think this was of any value. I heard from many folks who do international research, one way or another, that the loss of research time was a serious problem with moving a week earlier, although I've looked around and there are outstanding universities with good anthropology departments that seem to start about the same time. I assume they could accommodate that. There was unanimous support for the Thanksgiving recess changes that for any of reasons that the students pointed out, faculty decide to hold classes and sort of get dumped on by their students for having done so and it certainly creates problems for the students. A few people observed that if we got rid of the fall semester Friday recess, we had exactly symmetrical semesters and they argued that that made it much easier to take instructional materials or visual materials, complex things that you might develop to use in modules, from fall and switch them to teach the course in the spring or whatever and that having even one day difference meant that you had to redo all of that packaging of stuff. So I came here deciding that what I would be most happy with would be all of this except 2. That if you start early— yes, you lose some research time and a bunch of other things—but you have symmetrical semesters if you have the broken week only for Labor Day one semester, and only for MLK day the other, it won't be the same week in each semester, but otherwise they're symmetrical. Thanksgiving seems to be agreed to by the people I've talked to and I would support it, and summer session is worth a try I think, if we can just make sure it doesn't blow up on us.

**DOWELL:** Jack, and then [remark inaudible]?

**BIELASIAK:** I just want to report what I heard from some of my colleagues, which is the starting point. I very seldom I have heard, I think, here from colleagues about issues that the BFC is discussing. But this time I did hear, and for obvious reasons, and one of the primary concerns, and this is not only from my department but other people doing international or foreign language or other kinds of research, that this was cutting into their summer research time and they wanted me to bring this up to the Council. I guess in general I think this is, as Tom said, the best we can do under very difficult circumstances so I do want to thank the task force for doing what I think is a very hard job and in general I would go ahead and support most of its provisions. I do have, I guess, a question on whether a two day fall break was considered and I understand the constraints that the labs have, but if you already losing Friday which is the time when most labs are being held adding Thursday, let's say, as an additional day that will provide more of a break and I know of a number of schools that do have a Thursday-Friday so-called fall

break and it seems worthwhile so just a clarification issue. Was it considered and if so, why was it rejected?

**COLEMAN:** Yeah, two days was considered, especially from our perspective as IUSA we looked at that, we actually looked at peer institutions, and Katie did research on a lot of them, and we saw that other institutions did have two days but we knew that there was a constraint with Chemistry and Biology and other departments with having two days and having that extra broken week and taking that away from different labs and different discussions [remark inaudible] but from a student's perspective, yes, that is something that we did look at.

**DOWELL:** All right, now Richard?

**SHOCKLEY:** Yeah, I really agree with Herb here. I like the spirit of the proposal with exception, Point 2, fall break. I think that the cost of this one day fall break is much greater than this document suggests. In addition to the various lab issues that were brought up, I know that in my unit, where we have courses with many different sections, Fridays are used as a day for common exams, and at the middle of the semester that's exactly when you want to have a Friday available for an examination. So I would prefer, while I like this proposal, I would prefer to see part 2 struck from it so that we give two full semesters to all of our students.

**DOWELL:** Yes?

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** I have a question. And I've talked to Tom about this—I'm sorry I'm from the Slavic Department, I direct the summer workshop in Slavic, Eastern European, and Central Asian languages—and we have the largest program of our kind in the country, and we bring in an awful lot of money and students to do this, and the point 4 seriously hinders a lot of our abilities in the summer to bring in students who are coming from peer institutions that are on the quarter system and that then limits our funding from FLAS and other sources. I presented these concerns to Tom and he said we can have flexibility and what I'd like to know is when we vote on this, how much flexibility can you build into point 4 or programs that don't fit this mold?

**GIERYN:** Generally that's going to be guided by whether or not the program during the summer involves students who are also taking other IUB classes and SWSEEL is an amazing program where students are discouraged from taking other IUB classes, and that gives us greater flexibility. You can meet all day.

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** Is that the sort of thing though that you can build into your vote? I guess that my colleagues and I are just very concerned that we have some sort of assurance that we can then continue our program.

**GIERYN:** I think that would be an administrative matter, pertaining to the summer session. It raises a fairly serious issue. For the last couple of years—I'm not exactly sure when—the summer programs have not been organized or managed at the campus level. The extent of campus involvement basically is to report the schedule of classes and how many students took them; publishing this [he holds up a booklet] from Roland's office showing how many students

took which classes. I think implied in this policy if we go, and taking the spirit of Herb in this, I think we probably need to include an administrative recommendation that we restore some sort of campus level oversight to coordinate among the schools what's going to happen during the summer and this would allow that administrative body to say it's okay for SWSEEL to meet all day for eight weeks, whatever you need, or even to spill over a week if it can be shown not to really affect anybody since these are people going back to their home campuses typically. Without that kind of centralized administrative oversight it is going to be tough to make judgments about when flexibility is going to be accepted, and when perhaps we have to rein it in. We didn't put it in the proposal because I'm not sure that's a BFC matter necessarily, but we can certainly add language to that effect.

**GRAY:** I was going to ask, do we want language that specifies where that oversight rests? Would it be your office? Where would that sit? So we know where we would be.

**STEPHENS:** After you got your [unintelligible]

**GINGER:** [unintelligible], are you volunteering?

**COTE:** No, it doesn't exist now, I'm not exactly sure. I mean, it doesn't exist for the regular semester either. It doesn't exist throughout the year.

**STEPHENS:** No, one of the things that we raised in couple of weeks ago was concern about, for example, being assured that students who were registering for the summer sessions could, as Herb suggested, put together a reasonable package of Gen Ed courses and other things that made sense for a particular period of time. So that they things they wanted to do weren't spread out at opposite ends, basically. And we talked about, in that committee, there being coordination between the academic offices of the schools to ensure that that took place. I think that's really where that coordination currently occurs. It occurs between the academic offices in the schools, and that's what the Calendar Committee took from it. Now Tom is suggesting that there might be a need and it was raised as a sort of question, but I don't think there has been any further discussion of it.

**COTE:** It happens within the network that already exists when the schedule is being built. When the courses are being planned, the schedule is being built, the departments know what is going to conflict with the other department's course.

**STEPHENS:** It might be for summer sessions, since not everyone is going to register at the same time, you might want to formalize that.

**COTE:** Right.

**BOLING:** It does seem as though that plan leaves—it addresses the question of what conflicts with something with else. It doesn't address the question of a program that needs to do something in conflict with the policy. I spoke up last time and said we have distance students who need as many weeks as they can get in the summer because they work and they can't compress their study time into a significantly shorter period. They are not going to conflict with any other courses that are on this other plan, but what I imagine happening is we set up a

course and somebody somewhere says, 'You can't do that because the overall rule is here's the pattern that it has to fall into.' To whom do you then appeal?

**COTE:** To what extent does SWSEEL currently have a pattern that fits the current schedule?

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** We have nine week, and eight week sessions—

**COTE:** There you go!

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** Yes, but then when I read this it says when I have eight and nine week sessions they have to conform to so many—

**GIERYN:** These are—

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** Those don't work. I need 180 contact hours.

**GIERYN:** I think that we've established that these are guidelines. They are designed to fit most situations but for stand-alone programs they're not. It seems to me that we can work on flexibility as needed. For example, in terms of a student who is working and doesn't want to commit to a full day of classes or even—you know—we are assuming here that, forgive me, but market economics would work things out, that students have demands and academic units are interested in getting those students into their classes. I would think that the academic units would look at this greater flexibility, jump on the opportunity to create an array of classes at different times just to do what Herb suggested, to experiment and see what the demand is. I think there will be a trial and error period.

**DOWELL:** Geoff?

**BROWN:** I actually have two comments. The first is I think you've done a good job with this. Everybody is slightly pained by some aspect of it, but nobody is just furious about it, which is probably a good thing. I mean, the fall break I will say I'm skeptical of, but I think over time if it turns out to be a drunken orgy we'd probably revisit it but if it turns out to be a useful thing we'll probably come to live with it. I mean I'm happy to go forward with it. The thing about the scheduling, I understood this just to be a way to make sure that the summer session could make sense but I don't believe we have any shortage of classrooms in the summer, it's not as if that is the, during the school year that's the problem in the summer that's not really the problem.

**COTE:** Right it's not just a question of classrooms themselves. It's a question of creating a schedule where students don't conflict. That's also one of the reasons for having some kind of patterns that can be respected so that, you know, that this class will naturally flow into these classes.

**BROWN:** But what you're saying makes perfect sense for people taking conventional courses but for special programs they're not playing in the system anyway, and if you're not competing for classrooms you don't have those constraints.

**GIERYN:** That is correct.

**BROWN:** That's the way I read it.

**STERN-GOTTSCHALK:** So we will have out classrooms space for SWSEEL?

**GIERYN:** It's actually at the point that the classrooms where Roland you're providing the centralized administrative control in terms of scheduling.

**COTE:** Right. We've inadvertently forced the conversations among the departments because we're finding difficulty.

**BIELASIAK:** I just have a slightly different question. Now you mention market, and I'm sure it's not part of your charge here, has there been any thought to the costs versus revenues of these changes, particularly in the summer school, how will it impact financial or will be it a wash and it doesn't matter?

**GIERYN:** We're hoping these numbers go up and in which case, yes, students are paying more and we are making more. What other costs?

**DOWELL:** Yes? [Indicating Barrett Tenbarge]

**TENBARGE:** Wanted to address real quick from a student perspective some of the concerns about the Friday is rather than, you know, the words of one of the faculty members is that Friday becoming a drunken orgy. I would point to Martin Luther King, Jr. Day as a very positive example of what that Friday can be. It can be a number of things first, especially for out of state students, it can be a well needed breather. Both in-state and out of state but it gives, you know, a concrete date for them, if they need to, to go home and visit their families. It can also be a Martin Luther King, Jr. Day type of event with social, cultural, academic events. Thomas Friedman is coming for the Themester this year, and, you know, in future years that could be a great day to host big speakers like Tom Friedman. So rather than it becoming, I think, kind of unfairly characterized as a potential drunken orgy, it could really be a great both learning day and kind of a much needed breather right in the thick of things for the week.

**BROWN:** I want to make a point of clarification (laughter) I didn't mean that I believed... I was taking the worst case view of it and saying if it's not an effective day, over time we will change.

**GRAY:** Yes.

**DOWELL:** Yes?

**SANDWEISS:** I applaud the symmetry and logic of the proposal, I think it's quite impressive and as a history professor it also relieves me of the cognitive dissonance of teaching about the significance of Labor Day around this time of year. But I raise this point for my now absent colleague to my right from the School of Education, because I said I would. She had a calendar conflict, which is simply to say that they, and perhaps they among other divisions, apparently rely upon summer internships and practicums as part of their academic program which she sees significant potential problems with in terms of shortening from fourteen to twelve available summer weeks. I would just ask the committee whether that was one of those many kinds of

complaints that came in that didn't ultimately break the bank or whether that is a really significant issue around the campus.

**GIERYN:** We have several programs that have requirements, whether these are driven by accreditation demands for degrees or just degree program requirements as they are written now. I didn't find any that couldn't fit into a twelve week summer. It's sometimes a case where the fixed period of time that you need doesn't map onto our twelve weeks completely but Speech and Hearing Sciences, for example, runs a lot of programs for their doctoral of audiology degree that requires both class work and clinical work. The difficulty was that they were trying to fit it into again thinking that you could only meet absolutely and only meet during one of these two hour blocks per day. That wouldn't work for them. So again the question was how many students in the doctor of audiology program are taking other courses during the summer from the full array and the answer was none. So individual units—this happens in the summer already as Roland established—individual units if their pool are people in their major and the courses are restricted to the major, are going to be free, more or less, to schedule things as they will. I mean, that's part of the flexibility. What we are concerned about is providing, as Roland again has said, some structure to prevent overlaps from courses that can be chosen by students coming down to Bloomington for the summer, picking one, two, or even three classes during the summer to minimize the overlaps.

**RAFF:** We have students here who have worked pretty hard on this and I would like to ask. So what I'm hearing around the room is that nobody doesn't like having the whole week at Thanksgiving. Although there are both problems and worries associated with other bits. What I wanted to ask the students if having the full week of Thanksgiving doesn't do it because it's late. Or, you know, if you have to choose between Friday in the fall and still having Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving, how do the students feel about that? I mean it seems to me what I've heard from all the faculty who've talked is that no one can usefully use a two day week in any of the lab courses, so we all sort of...you know. Then I know that there are some instructors who give exams on that Monday.

**DOWELL:** Lucky.

**COLEMAN:** As I will say, we want what's in the best of interest of the students and we feel that this proposal is in the best interest of the students but when it comes to either/or we know that Thanksgiving Break, having that whole week off, would be beneficial to the student body as a whole because people are able to fly out on that Friday or Thursday when class is over. They don't have to book tickets that are like \$400, \$500 and go home for a couple of days as opposed to going home that week. So we know that's in the best interest of the student body but we greatly support this proposal because we know why fall breaks are significant. They came into effect because of the suicide rates that were going up in different institutions because of the long drain that students were having when it came to going to school the whole time up until Thanksgiving break. So that's why we think that the Friday is necessary for students, but we will compromise because we know that with this body we will have to compromise because it has to be in the best interest of the faculty and the students but we are speaking on the student perspective.

**D'AMICO:** Was there any data that those trends about the suicide rates and stress levels? What's the—?

**COLEMAN:** Yeah, Dean Goldsmith actually did a—what?

**TETRICK:** It actually is—

**COLEMAN:** It is—

**D'AMICO:** Yeah, I believe it showed that there was not this kind—

**TETRICK:** I think, we had, it slightly goes up in October, but not enough for it to be significant.

**GIERYN:** And to say that we're relying on anecdotal and impressionistic evidence, it may be less measurable but no less real in terms of some of the problems that don't ever get reported as going to the Dean of Students' Office or to CAPS or to the Health Center or whatever, but never the less levels of stress may increase.

**DOWELL:** In the back?

**D'AMICO:** I did want to speak just in support of the proposal over all, though, especially from a graduate student perspective. When we talked about the proposal we were overwhelmingly in favor of this. A full week at Thanksgiving graduate students since really straddle the student/instructor side of things and we can see it both ways and actually we saw great promise in the summer proposal as a lot of graduate students are trying to do summer programs either in, you know, research methods or do other activities while simultaneously wanting to teach over the summer to help support ourselves. So we saw this as adding a lot of great flexibility to allow us to do these kind of multiple activities over the summer. I think it's a good compromise.

**GRAY:** Just that I was going to ask you if there was any feedback on the starting early. Because I remember from our last semester's discussion of this that was a concern for good for graduate students who teach languages. I know we bring in our students to do AI training, so this would mean coming in fairly early too for international students was there any feedback on starting early?

**D'AMICO:** When we discussed it in assembly and we talked about the early start date, the consensus was that it didn't seem to be that big of a problem for students in the assembly. And I think especially with the three week break between the end of summer classes and the beginning of the fall semester that actually—well, hopefully—it seems to me to give enough time to really get people here to do the training in a sufficient amount of time and still satisfy.

**DOWELL:** Well, Don, why don't you go ahead, and then Herb, and then we will be done.

**GJERDINGEN:** Yeah, I think this is a very good proposal, one thing I do want to raise about the Thanksgiving recess. We have a ton of international students. This will just affect them in a different way, they are not going to be able to go home and if anything there is going to be a longer period of time where they are on-campus without classes and I don't think that's a deal

breaker. I think it may be necessary kind of to do something about them and understand the different situation, when we have extra days here when you are on-campus you can see mostly international students during that period and it just may make it a little bit more acute for them.

**DOWELL:** Good point. Herb?

**TERRY:** I would like to see us get done with this. I do not believe we should ever adopt a calendar that has been changed on the floor in this committee or in this group. There are simply too many unknowns. So I would propose in our remaining moments that we get the sense of this body on these four proposals. And then come back for a second reading next time. With a concrete proposal that either does or does not—I think the principal issue will be—include this one day fall recess. So we have a very concrete proposal, it can be vetted with everybody during the remainder and be voted more or less up or down next time.

**DOWELL:** Well, I guess I'm willing to have a straw poll on number two if people think that's a good idea but— anybody care?

**TERRY:** Hurry.

**DOWELL:** Hurry. Well, let's just take a brief poll then. Who is generally in favor of keeping number two in the policy? The fall break, the one day? [Show of hands] Okay, so. There's reasonable support. Definitely the Agenda Committee will take that up about how we want to structure the vote next week, next two weeks.

**HORNE:** Herb asked Tom I believe, is there any way to make a mock-up of a possible summer calendar with these four-week modules, and I don't recall a response to that—

**TERRY:** Before we are stuck with it—

**HORNE:** Yeah, before we are stuck with it, so we could "bail out," I believe was the—

**GIERYN:** We obviously don't know how the academic units are going to respond to this in the venue of classes, okay? We consulted, within the last week, with all of the academic units, and we heard back and generally the response from the Deans was nothing but enthusiasm for the summer schedule. They like the flexibility. They saw things they wanted to try out.

**DOWELL:** Great, we are adjourned now, thank you.

**ADJOURNED: 5:31pm**