

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
University Place Conference Center and Hotel
Indianapolis Campus
April 11, 2006
1:30 - 4:30 P.M.

Attendance

Members Present: Charles Bantz, Chris Bjornson, Julie Bobay, George Bodmer, Donald Coffin, Andre De Tienne, Erika Dowell, Ronald Finkbine, Mary Fisher, Michael Foos, David Fulton, Karen Gable, Barbara Hawkins, Adam Herbert, Dolores Hoyt, Elizabeth Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Debomoy Lahiri, Cathy Ludlum Foos, David MacKay, Anna McDaniel, Ted Miller, Keith Moore, Bart Ng, Harold Ogren, Ruth Person, Markus Pomper, John Ross, David Turnipseed, Rosalie Vermette, Maxine Watson.

Members Absent with Alternates: Betty Jones for Polly Boruff-Jones, Jim Baldwin for Giles Hoyt, Martin Spechler for Brian Vargus, Sharon Hamilton for William Wheeler, Betsy Henke for Alex Shortle.

Members Absent: Bruce Bergland, Jacqueline Blackwell, Roseanne Cordell, Jennifer Delaney, Brian Fife, Eyas Hattab, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Bob Kravchuk, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Michael McRobbie, Alice Merz, Joseph Near, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Una Mae Reck, Michael Renfrow, Nakisha Robertson, Paul Rohwer, David Vollrath, Michael Wartell, Gary Wiggins, Nanci Yokom.

Guests: Simon Atkinson (IUPUI, Co-Chair, UFC-RAC), , Brad Wheeler (Chief Information Officer), Becky Porter (IUPUI), John Graves (BFC Office), Barry Thomas (Management Advisory Service, Bloomington), Maynard Thompson (Office of President), Dan Rives (Associate Vice President for Human Resources), Judith Palmer (Vice President and Chief Financial Officer), Troy Brown (IUPUI), Amy Warner (IUPUI), Bob Martin (IUPUI), Steve Keucher (University Budget Office)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
March 28, 2006
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/minutes/03.28.06.htm>
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Adam Herbert)
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Theodore Miller)
4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(President Herbert and Professors Ng and Miller)

5. Integrated Image Initiative (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Lisa Townsend, Executive Director, University Marketing)

6. Search and Screen Policy for Senior Administrators (45 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller, UFC Agenda Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U13-2006.doc>

7. Update on Revisions to the Policy on Intellectual Property (15 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Simon Atkinson, Co-Chair, UFC Research Affairs Committee)

8. General Education at Indiana University (30 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller, UFC Agenda Committee)

9. Status Report on 18-20 Retirement Plan (30 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Vice President Judith Palmer and Associate Vice President Dan Rives)

10. Faculty Composition Report (20 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Theodore Miller, UFC Agenda Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/FacComp.htm>

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: This meeting will please come to order. We have the first item of business is the approval of the minutes for March 28. Are there any corrections to those? Do we need to vote on it? All those in favor, is there a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 28?

BJORNSON: So moved.

HERBERT: Is there a second? [Second] Any discussion? Hearing none all those in favor please say "aye"[aye]. Minutes are adopted. Bart do you want to comment on some other minutes that we have?

NG: Sure, the minutes for the February 28th meeting, apparently we had some problems with some missing tapes and Molly is trying very hard to reconstruct the minutes and that will be ready for you for approval in the fall. That will be the first thing we try to bring back to you for your approval.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

NG: I also want to point out to you there is a change in the agenda for today. Item #6 Search and Screen Policy for Senior Administrators that will not be an action item; that will only be a discussion item. The Agenda Committee had a discussion on the policy and some concerns were raised as to the coverage of the policy. Mainly, if it is to be applied to all senior administrators that will in fact create a lot of problems about authority and what not. So we have decided it is best for us during today's meeting, we're going to have a discussion so that everybody will be informed of some of these concerns. So we can in fact even use this opportunity as a first reading of a new version of that policy. We are trying to limit that policy so that it will only apply to senior academic administrators.

The executive committee also heard a report from Chancellor Charles Bantz of IUPUI on the Division of Labor Studies. As some of you recall that issue was raised in the last University Faculty Council meeting and the DLS faculty also circulated certain documents and asking for the help of the UFC and so the Agenda Committee today met with Chancellor Bantz and actually discussed the issue with Chancellor Bantz and we will, well if anybody has any questions you know you can ask the questions during the question and answer period.

Ok, we also have a talk about a general education curriculum, intellectual property, and the faculty composition report. All of these are items that will be on the agenda and we will have an opportunity to discuss them. So that concludes my report from the Agenda Committee.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HERBERT: Thank you. Let me just bring up a few things from a presidential report perspective. First of all, I think most of you are aware of the fact that the Board of Trustees had a meeting last

week and they approved the admission standard policies for both Bloomington and IUPUI. Our plan is to bring all of the other admission standards for remaining campuses to the Board at the May meeting. So that what will happen is that we've now had the second reading of the IUPUI and Bloomington so those are now approved. We'll have an opportunity to have the first reading of all of the other campuses policies at the May meeting and then we'll come back to the June meeting for the second reading and approval by the Board. So those are moving along very well.

We also at the meeting last week took up the issue of peer institutions for both Bloomington and IUPUI and that was the first reading on those. We'll have an opportunity for additional input on those. The peer reports on each of the regional campuses will occur also at the May meeting so that by the June meeting, all these will have been heard and we'll be able to ask the Board to take final action in approving the peer institutions for all of our campuses. I must tell you that the board was very impressed with the work that Vic has done on that and you'll be hearing more on that. I just wanted you to have a heads up, to give you a sense on the timing perspective as to what will be happening.

So what that means essentially going back to the Mission Differentiation process is that the Board has approved missions for each of the campuses and it has approved the policy for the establishment of graduate programs. Within that context by the way, IU East was authorized to offer its first masters degree program. That occurred within the framework of that new policy and again, by the end of the June meeting, we will have mission statements, graduate program policies, admission standards, housing policy and peers, approved by the Board. I think it's been a pretty productive year with regard to all these matters and I appreciate the work of the UFC in helping to facilitate the completion of all of these efforts.

I have not yet seen the feedback yet with regard to peers for the campuses. But if what we get back based on the input from each of the campuses is as comprehensive as what we received for Bloomington and Indianapolis, I think that we'll be well on our way. Let me tell you also, I mentioned housing a few moments ago. I do anticipate making a recommendation to the Board with regard to housing that we will again come forward with a very clear policy. It is my view that it's important for Indiana University to have more than two campuses with housing. So my intention is to recommend that at least two if not three of our campuses should also be designated as potential residential campuses, subject to the requirements that will be set forth in the policy related to that and assuming that the pro forma could be worked out. That obviously has some very significant long term implications for those campuses and for the university at large. I think it's an essential next step.

The other thing I just want to share with you is that we're currently engaged in conversations that are arising from a grant from the Lumina Foundation. Essentially what they're doing is funding an effort to create a strategic direction for higher education for Indiana. I'm not sure how all this is going to play out. The Central Indiana Corporate Partnership is involved in this, so is the governor's office. I had a meeting with David Shane a few days ago, the governor's policy advisor related to education. We'll have a couple of additional conversations but over the course of a couple of hours we had a chance to get into a number of very important issues. We did talk about Mission Differentiation as part of that, the relationship between the four-year institutions and Ivy Tech. I did raise the issue of reciprocity agreements and will over the course of the next

few weeks put forth a proposal to the governor's office. It may also come up in the context of this discussion of Hoosiers for Higher Education. But a model that would recognize the fact that several of our campuses that are located in very close proximity to other states, that are normally impacted by reciprocity agreements or the absence of them, that we must have a different model that affords us an opportunity to respond to the needs of those national economic clusters. So I'll have that proposal prepared over the course of the next weeks.

I've begun talking with a few legislators and so far there has been some interest but I have to have formal Board approval to do some of this. So that's why I'm not going into a lot of details. I just want you to know that it is an issue that I think we have to deal with and my hope is that when we come back in the fall, we'll have some of the political basis covered for this. I think long term if we can pull off this basic idea than we'll be in position to enhance the possibilities for enrollment growth on the campuses.

Those are the major things that are taking place with regard to the Board. Maybe one final item and that is that during the meeting of the Board last week, one of the questions that Bart raised there was the status of the policy that you propagated related to evaluation of chancellors. And the Board indicated that it is giving that consideration and will be responding shortly. I think the chairman indicated that they want to make some changes in that. I don't know what those are right now. This is something that is being developed by the Board so I can't give you a lot of insight other than that they are concerned about some aspects of the policy as it relates to the process itself. But members of the Board themselves will be dealing with this; they have not asked my office or Robin to assist in the preparation of whatever their response is going to be. If I recall that the chairman or president was that it would be given back to the co-chairs in due course and it was my understanding that that will be very soon. So that's about all I can say about that but I don't know exactly how that's going to be written.

That concludes my report and I guess now we're ready.

MILLER: Could I add one thing? This is something that you didn't mention that happened at the Trustee meeting that I think is noteworthy to report to the UFC. Many of you will recall at our last meeting at the Northwest campus, we had a discussion surrounding the Conflict of Commitment policy. We went around and around with it; I'm happy to report that the Trustees did approve this policy last week. So the policy as we approved it at the UFC meeting in Gary was approved by the Board without change.

HERBERT: That was an important issue, thank you

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: At this point Bart, Ted and I are open for questions or prepared to listen for comments if there are any.

FINKBINE: Involving evaluation of chancellors, we had two separate issues. One is to establish a committee and then one then is which set of procedures they will operate under. So, will we proceed with the committee establishment?

HERBERT: We will create committees. The thing I just don't know right now is what they're going to say even about that and so—I did indicate to the Board that we do have chancellors that will come up for review this year; for next fall and so they do understand that. I've also indicated that there are some timing issues that have to be addressed in terms of selection of the committee members. So I think that was one of the things that prompted Trustee Shoulders to say that they would get back to us very quickly. So I am pressing that to make sure that there is an understand that faculty leave; some leave during the summer and so we don't have a governance process in terms of executive committees or agenda committees as the case might be or full bodies putting forth those nominees. Others?

AGENDA ITEM #5: INTEGRATED IMAGE INITIATIVE

HERBERT: Let's go to Item #5; Integrated Image Initiative. Is Lisa here?

TOWNSEND: I'm here.

HERBERT: Oh, okay. I didn't see you over there. Thank you. Do you want her to use a microphone?

TOWNSEND: Hopefully, you can hear my. I have a little bit of a cold and I so will try to speak loudly. I am Lisa Townsend and I am the Director of Marketing. I am the director of Marketing for the University and I am located in Bloomington but my office is an office that serves all of the institution. And today what I want to talk about is the Integrated Image effort which my office has been leading for the last couple of years. Some of you may already be familiar with this process but for those of you who are not let me give you just a little bit of background on this project and why it got started and how it got started and where we are headed.

This depicts the current state of affairs for Indiana University. This is how we look to the external world in terms of our visual identity and as you can see we are sort of a mess from a visual standpoint. We've got all kinds of marks that are being used. We've got a whole array of colors that are being used, a variety of type faces and so forth and without going into a lot of depth here let me just say this hurts an institution. This really hurts our ability to promote the Indiana University name. The Indiana University name is one of if not the most, valuable assets of the institution so we need to treat it with great care and we need to make sure that we are presenting a strong and unified visual presence to our external audiences when we communicate. So that's really the genesis if you will of this effort—getting our arms wrapped around this particular project. In a nutshell, our goal has been to bring cohesion to IU's visual identity while at the same time maintaining the individual personality and distinct character of each campus or unit so this is bit of a balancing act if you will. We need to do this again in order to strengthen the IU brand and again to maintain the distinctiveness of each campus and unit. We also need to clarify through this process, we hope to clarify, the relationships between IU's various

component parts. That is easier said than done because this is a very very complex institution as I know all of you are very aware and that is some of what I am going to talk about today in terms of the recommendations that are coming on at this time. Hopefully, you'll see in the final analysis a solution which is very simple and elegant but hopefully you'll understand behind that simplicity and elegance is a lot of work and effort has gone into creating that elegant solution hopefully. This process has again just quickly I think been a collaborative and inclusive one. We have had a policy committee in place that has been representative of the university, university-wide representation. We also have a public website that has charted progress of this initiative. This has been a research driven effort. We did hire some external consultant who came in and did a very thorough research analysis of the current state of affairs. We also conducted several hundred individual faculty and staff interviews and focus groups to really help us come up with some sound solutions as we go forward and again it's been an expert-driven process. We have had not only our the experts that we employed out of Chicago and both with incredible pedigrees if you will in branding; they have such clients as Sesame Street and Gerber, and Midwest Airlines and so forth. We've also relied upon the IU Communications professionals throughout the institution to guide this process.

What I want to talk about today is the recommendations that are coming out of this effort. First of all, we have made a decision about utilizing the block IU and the block IU that I'm going to show you, we're going to choose the block IU. Let me put it that way because there have been various different block IUs that have been used, some by athletics and some by various campuses. There are all kinds of versions of the block IU. So we've chosen a block IU that we're going to use henceforth. We're going to restrict the use of the seal to formal and official contacts. This is one of our most sacred symbols and we really need to elevate its use. We see publications for example where the seal is being used as an "i" or in other sort of artistic uses and we really need to stop that. We really need to elevate the use of the seal to usages like diplomas and formal communications and so forth. We need to refine and standardize our font or typography that we're using on various communications. Obviously we need to continue to use cream and crimson. What we want deeper than that and we've specified exactly what cream and what crimson we'll be using. And of course for the IUPUI campus, they will continue to use the Purdue gold and their mark. We're developing a signature system that I'm going to talk about and show you in more depth here in a few minutes. That again will help us communicate to our external audiences the relationship of our various units to one another and the campuses. And then lastly we have developed mascots for each of the five regional campuses.

With regard to the signature system, what I'm going to show you next are the signature recommendations that were made for each the campuses, for how we would handle university-wide and core schools—schools like the Kelley School of Business, School of Medicine—how we would handle IUPUI-specific schools and units and IUPUI does quite frankly represent an exception so that's why we're taking a little time to talk very specifically about that, how we would handle IU schools on the IUPUI campus, Purdue schools and then those units on the IUPUI campus with a dual affiliation.

This first slides just shows you what we mean by saying the signature, what are the various parts of the signature. The signature will always be comprised of some mark and that mark will either be the block IU or the IUPUI mark. And then there's three layers of information: primary,

secondary and tertiary, with the primary position being separated and elevated by a horizontal rule. There is another version of this by the way. This is the vertical arrangement that we have and then we do have a horizontal arrangement as well which looks very similar to this. So in terms of campus signatures, what we would have is, for example, IU Kokomo, Indiana University Kokomo down at the bottom right-hand corner. The mark would be employed and then Indiana University Kokomo would be the primary position, likewise for Indiana University Southeast. IUPUI of course will continue to retain its mark. Indiana University Bloomington would have the opportunity to use either the Indiana University name or the Indiana University Bloomington signature. So either one could be utilized by the Bloomington campus. And then of course also if we're talking about the institution as a whole then we would also employ the Indiana University signature.

I'd like to now talk about the school and unit signatures and what those would look like. And here let's take the example of the Kelley School of Business that I'm sure as all of you are aware is a school which has a presence on the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses. So if I am the dean of the Kelley School and I have a communication that I want to send out under my name, I would employ the signature at the top left-hand corner here; Indiana University in the primary position and Kelley School of Business in the secondary position and then in the tertiary position, Office of the Dean. Hopefully that clearly communicates to folks or external audiences that this is from the dean and representing Indiana University broader than the single campus. Now if I were doing a recruitment publication for the IUPUI portion of the Kelley School of Business what I would probably want to do there is to employ the IUPUI mark if I want my audiences to understand that this is a program that resides on the IUPUI campus followed by Indiana University in the primary position and then the Kelley School of Business in the secondary position. And I realize this does get complicated. Lastly if I'm talking about something that's emanating from the Bloomington campus then I have a couple of different options at my disposal. Really, the only difference here would be that I could use either Indiana University Bloomington in the primary position or if necessary I could use Indiana University without the Bloomington reference and I could put the Bloomington reference in the tertiary position if necessary.

Let's talk about the School of Medicine. The School of Medicine is rather unique and we are actually treating it as a bit of an exception here. The School of Medicine is really the only university-wide school that also has a presence in communities where there is no Indiana University campus whatsoever as well as having a presence in communities or on campuses other than Indiana University campuses. So for example, the medical education center on the Notre Dame campus is an example of that. So all those things combined really make it very important for us from a communication stand point to clearly link the School of Medicine back to Indiana University. And so the School of Medicine will always use the block IU, they would always use Indiana University in the primary position and then utilize the secondary and tertiary positions for additional information as necessary.

The IUPUI schools, how do we handle those? Again, as I said earlier, IUPUI schools are a bit of a unique situation because we do have both IU schools and Purdue schools on the campus. So we need to have a mechanism for handling both. On the top of that, here we have the example of how we can handle the school of the Herron School of Arts which is an IU school. Very similar

to what we saw with the Kelley School. The only difference really being we would use the IUPUI mark and not the block IU. But if we were talking about the School of Science which a Purdue school on this campus then what we would do is put School of Science in the primary position and in the secondary position, actually note that this is a school of Purdue University and the department information would go in the tertiary position. We also, on the IUPUI campus, have certain situations where it's important to make our audiences aware that this entity represents both Purdue and Indiana University. The Office of Admissions for example would have to do that and so in those cases what we would do is have the Office of Admissions or maybe it's the Office of the Chancellor in the primary position and in the secondary position actually have both Indiana University and Purdue University. Here we are showing slash separating those two schools, actually I think what we are going to do is use a dash instead and then in the tertiary position the departmental information as necessary. Last signature, let me talk very briefly about the Law School. The Law School is actually under a special case and that's why I wanted to talk about it very briefly. The Law School represents again another unique situation. Here what we have are two schools of different needs. Yet they compete in the same markets for the same students often times and often for the same funding dollars and so we need a mechanism to very clearly differentiate in the minds of our target audiences these two schools and so what we are proposing is that for the School of Law on the IUPUI campus that they would utilize the IUPUI mark and in the secondary position they clearly reference the fact that they are located in Indianapolis.

For the Law School in Bloomington, a very similar approach there. They would use the block IU; Indiana University also in the primary position and then the School of Law Bloomington reference in the secondary position. We think this will make it very clear to our external audiences, the difference between these two schools, one is located in Indianapolis and the other is located in Bloomington.

JONES: I have a question.

TOWNSEND: Sure.

JONES: Can, you go back one slide?

TOWNSEND: Absolutely.

JONES: Where you have tertiary and secondary, is the font different?

TOWNSEND: It is very—these are markups by the way. They are absolutely not finished. In fact what we're doing is we are actually developing a custom font, an IU font that we will own and we will utilize that font to build all these signatures. Yes sir.

FINKBINE: So are we redoing all business cards for a central office?

TOWNSEND: Well, it's a great question. What we will do—there will never be a day when we ask everybody to just throw away all of their business cards or all of their letterhead or whatever.

What we want to do is to replace that over time. As you run out of business cards and go to order more, we'll ask that you employ these signature guidelines. Yes sir.

DE TIENNE: Could you state the reason why Purdue University not in the primary position for the School of Science?

TOWNSEND: Yes. The reason why Purdue University is not in the primary position is because this is an Indiana University-administered campus.

DE TIENNE: There are often cases where the School of Science collaborates with the School of Liberal Arts and they do much together. We put the School of Liberal Arts in the secondary position while this school is set in the primary position and I wonder how it's going to look.

TOWNSEND: Well I absolutely agree with your points and it's a great question but at the end of the day what we want to do here is to be clear in our communications and I think we're doing that and yet we also want to remain cognizant of the fact that this is an IU-administered campus. So taking all of those things into consideration this is our recommendation but I think you make a great point and one of the—this is not a done deal. Yes?

D. HOYT: Say you have someone looking at that from outside of our intimate knowledge of it would be really at sea because they would see IUPUI and then Indiana University and wondering what is the PUI for and the same would happen if they were looking at it from the School of Science perspective, it would be utterly confusing where now at least we're identified with both of those things together. So I think it's more understandable. It took something like 15 years for the Indianapolis Star to figure out who we were and finally get the initials straight.

TOWNSEND: One of the things, you make a very very important point, one of the things though that we're trying to do with this identity system is to build equity and greater understanding in the IUPUI mark per say. So overtime by consistently employing this kind of signature system what we think will happen is that IUPUI mark will take on more and more meaning so we're not—we don't always need to go back to the drawing board and spell that out completely again. I think that's—you've been moving in that direction for quite some time already.

TURNIPSEED: I have a question, how do you handle Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne?

TOWNSEND: They are not going to be handled. It's a great question, he asked how IPFW's going to be handled by this signature system and quite frankly they are not. They are not under the administrative umbrella of Indiana University and therefore were not part of this effort.

HERBERT: Lisa, you have a question over here.

BALDWIN: I just want to make a comment. I'm very, I need to choose my words here. I'm very upset about all this. Being on the original Policy Committee, a lot of this was not what the committee advised and the advice is worth exactly what it is. I guess we've been told what our

advice is worth. But the thing that bothers me the most, we're seeking clarity but it seems there are more exceptions than rules. How does that affect clarity?

TOWNSEND: Well, I've shown you just a couple of the most...

BALDWIN: Well I've got a whole folder of them and not just the four you are saying. Compare the School of Science with the School of Liberal Arts, and you never know if they are in the same place. And the School of Liberal Arts is in the tertiary position and the School of Science is in larger font in the secondary positions. They're both schools on the same campus. Why is one given more prominence simply because it's a Purdue School? And the idea of putting "A Purdue School" is like putting a footnote on the stationary. This is stationary. Why do you need stationary with footnotes?

TOWNSEND: Well, thanks Jim, for that feedback. This has been a very very complex effort and you're right there are some exceptions.

BALDWIN: But the problem is though, I've been here since 1979 and we've been working toward developing our image as IUPUI, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and the units have been involved in connection with that. I get the feeling that a lot of this is going to set us back 15 to 20 years and I see what you're saying but I know what I'm looking at. I'm listening to you and I know what I'm looking at and they don't match.

TOWNSEND: I'm going to disagree with you there. We've talked with the folks at the IUPUI campus, their marketing office and I hope its fair say that you all are very much on board with this effort and going back to one of the earlier comments, this is indeed a very complex process and so there are going to be some exceptions. Let me also say one other thing and that is that what you're seeing here today needs to be driven by the university organizational policy. This cannot drive university policy; it's the other way around. So what we're trying to do here is to represent the university in hopefully as accurate and clear a mechanism as we possibly. Yes, sir?

SPECHLER: Well I think it's fair to say after the Indianapolis Faculty Council meeting about this, there was almost an armed rebellion where most of us do not like the comparative aspects of these things and we do not like the idea that devices that are used on another campus cannot be used on our campus. But you know in the weeks since then, I've had a couple of thoughts; I'd like all colleagues to think about it this way, no one is going to see all these devices on one page. The comparative thing will not be seen directly. I think the thing for us to concentrate on is whether our school and our campus is properly identified. Identified fully, correctly and with dignity and I think that's the most important thing because on any particular piece of stationary, and any particular publication and any visiting car or whatever, you're only going too see your— someone will only see one of these things. So it's not the comparative thing that anybody is going to see directly. The most important thing is whether your institutional affiliation is properly presented.

TOWNSEND: I would agree with that.

LAHIRI: I am from the School of Medicine and I think the School of Medicine, although it has

been mentioned, belongs to IUPUI [unclear, some comments lost].

TOWNSEND: I think I understand the question. Your question is what do we do if we've got more information than will fit in the primary, secondary, and tertiary. Keep in mind that this is just one small element of a communication and so for example, if this is on a piece of stationary, there's still a lot of other room in your return address or whatever to incorporate that other information. So for recruitment brochures or marketing materials there's lots of room to incorporate other additional information beyond what is contained in this signature. Every piece of information does not need to go into that signature.

LAHIRI: What about a center within the School of Medicine so that would be under department?

TOWNSEND: Well I think in that case what you need to do is you need to make a decision about what is the most important information and plug that in and maybe you don't put the Department name in the signature but you simply reference that center.

HERBERT: I should probably from a parliamentary perspective call on folks to ask questions.

TOWNSEND: I'm sorry.

HERBERT: It's no problem, you started, I didn't say something initially.

COFFIN: From what Marty said a couple of minutes ago, I gathered this had been discussed intensely at IUPUI...

SPECHLER: Very extensively.

COFFIN: From my position as someone from one of the regional campuses this is the first time I've seen this and I wonder if just in order for our faculty to be more informed about this, if it would be possible to get this PowerPoint presentation up on the UFC website so that people elsewhere who are not in this room and have not had the opportunity to have the kind of discussions that have apparently been going on at IUPUI and I would bet in Bloomington too. So if we can get more faculty involved in this?

TOWNSEND: You know, I think that's a great idea. My only concern is that I would not want this to get into the hands of the media, for example, prematurely until we have an opportunity to work with through all of these issues. and then when we were ready as an institution to roll this out publicly, that we do so in a very concerted effort and we not let the media get ahead of us and turn this into a story about logo or something that is not.

COFFIN: I would just like our faculty to hear the same sort of information as people on other campuses have and at this point I don't think we do.

MCDANIEL: In thinking about Marty's comment, does this represent our school? [Tape 1 Side A ends, some comments lost]...university-wide school and we are headquartered on the Indianapolis campus and for us to use IUPUI...

TOWNSEND: Because you're a university-wide school, you would actually have the option of using either the block IU or the IUPUI mark and that decision would be based upon what you're communicating and who you're communicating with; if it's a communication coming from the dean, it would make sense to use the block IU. If it's a recruitment piece specifically for the IUPUI campus, then it would make sense to use the IUPUI mark.

FISHER: But people need to know that the school is based at IUPUI; that they need to know.

TOWNSEND: And that information can be carried in the body of the material as well.

HERBERT: Yes, Ron?

FINKBINE: Yes, what's the enforcement going to be here? We're going to have a new center of some kind of studies pop up next month and how are they going to turn around and make a report if they can't turn in any paper work until they get approval from somebody on each campus. It sounds like with the integrated image, we don't want too many people heading in different directions but if control is also centralized then things are going to slow down.

HERBERT: Well the bottom line is once the policy is promulgated, it will be enforced. That will have to occur at the campus level and I'll personally hold the chancellors accountable for assuring that all units on their campus are complying with the policy.

FINKBINE: That will do it.

HERBERT: It's going to be very clear. Let's come down this way.

BJORNSON: I would like to suggest that if you email the PowerPoint show to Kelly Kish, Kelly can email it to the presidents of the faculty councils on the regional campuses so that it doesn't get out into the public domain but still give a chance to talk about it.

TOWNSEND: Excellent suggestion.

HERBERT: It will be done this week, right?

TOWNSEND: Absolutely, I'll do it this afternoon.

HERBERT: Very good.

JONES: My question has to do with what is the process if we have any opinions that we could express about this or is this a done deal or what is the process to get this ready?

TOWNSEND: First of all let me just say the process to date, we have tried to be, again, I think inclusive. We do have a Policy Committee meeting this afternoon and we have members of the Policy Committee in the room and we'll be discussing all of these issues there as well. It is our hope to finish this process up by the end of the semester. So I think there's plenty of time still to take these kinds of concerns into consideration and incorporate them into the final guidelines.

JONES: Who makes the final decision?

TOWNSEND: This will be presented to the Board of Trustees and they will be signing off on this.

JONES: Thank you.

HERBERT: And I'll decide with the President of the Board as to when it's going to be put on the agenda. I think we have two questions but we've exceeded the 15 minutes allocated for the discussion. Mary why don't we start with you, do you still have—Mary Fisher, do you still a—I thought I saw you raise your hand.

FISHER: Well, no, I'll abstain.

HERBERT: Okay, I see two questions, so we have one here and one here.

MACKAY: I can appreciate the potential effects of what you're suggesting. But I think there might be some areas where the effects will be more negative. So for example, or cause confusion. So for example, everybody is aware of the Wharton School. Not everybody knows that people associate it with the University of Pennsylvania. The Wharton School may have more market value by going by its own name. The same would be true for the Kellogg School at Northwestern. Business schools compete on the basis of their names, not the institutions to which they are affiliated with. Was there any consideration with this?

HERBERT: Before you deal with that, let me just tell you, let me just tell you that the Board of Trustees has made decision with regard to that and what we have been directed to do is to assure that any school that has a name, that it must be associated with the university. So, as you will note and look at all of the commentary about the Jacob School of Music, it always says Indiana University Jacobs School of Music. When the letterhead comes out with regard to the Kelley School, it will be Indiana University Kelley School of Business. That's a Board decision. Question over here, this will be last one.

VERMETTE: I'm from IUPUI and I'm really concerned about branding us with the IUPUI and not spelling out our name underneath. It's really provincial-izing us. If you get outside of Indiana, some people may know what IUPUI stands for, but whenever we are reported on in the US News and World Report, its Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis never IUPUI. We do a lot of stuff with international programs. We are developing a great name internationally. Nobody knows what IUPUI is. So to brand us only with IUPUI and to refuse categorically to write out our name underneath it is really more than setting us back, its killing us. And if the Board of Trustees doesn't understand that maybe they should talk to some of us

from IUPUI because we've worked hard for the last 35 years and to have us relegated to IUPUI and nothing else without even saying what that stands for is truly an insult.

TOWNSEND: We didn't come up with this in a vacuum. We actually did this in close collaboration with the marketing office from the IUPUI campus and I am going to toss that one to you guys to address.

BROWN: We talk about the length of our name and people don't understand if you say IUPUI but research told us that before we used the IU red and the Purdue gold they really didn't understand what happened here. So I would argue that I don't believe we're going backward but we are absolutely going forward. We have never, in my history, I have been here 10 years, the schools have never been identified with IUPUI. IUPUI in this situation is clearly identified.

NG: That's not true. What you said is not true, I have to take this stand and saying what you said is not true. I'll just leave it at that.

BROWN: Well in the marketing realm and focus groups with actual students, high school students they absolutely did not understand what we stood for they thought that it was an IUPUI degree and until we separated those colors and marked it just those letters IUPUI we were not understood clearly.

VERMETTE: Can I follow up on that? I don't mind the IUPUI. I would just like us to be spelled out underneath so know what IUPUI stands for cause your doing focus groups inside Indiana and maybe inside Indianapolis basically. There is a world out there and we are trying to get into the world.

BROWN: And don't forget that it's just a mark. There are other opportunities to explain who we are maybe in the first paragraph of a sentence.

HERBERT: Ok, I think that the messages have gotten through, Lisa. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

AGENDA ITEM #6: SEARCH AND SCREEN POLICY FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

HERBERT: Let's now go to item #6 as Bart indicated this is now a discussion as opposed to an action item.

NG: Ted, do you want to take this one?

MILLER: Well alright, the Search and Screen, you have a document U13-2006. We have had a discussion of this search and screen policy here previously and it has also been discussed at the campus-level at certain places. You will recall that the origin of this particular effort was a communication to the faculty from the Board of Trustees in which the Board indicated that they felt that our search and screen procedures were not what they might be. And they asked us to

evaluate our search and screen policies and think about revising them. You will also recall that currently we have a university-wide policy for certain positions. And then we have campus-level policies relating to other positions. One decision that was made was to attempt to have just a single policy that would apply to the university and the campus levels. A second decision that was made was to try to include in this policy, you can see the title of it, Policy for Senior Administrators, a single policy that covered search and screen for all Senior Administrators whether they were academic administrators or not. That second decision was made I think because of an interpretation that was made of the boards letter to the faculty. It seemed to us that they were encouraging us to have a single policy and that really explains why we have been going down this particular path. Now in the Agenda Committee meeting, just an hour ago, in discussing what is here in this circular, the President basically expressed the view that he was not sure that this was the thing that we should do. That is to say to try to combine academic and non-academic administrators into a single policy. And he essential has taken upon himself to go back to the Board and to discuss this matter with them and explain why he is not sure that that is a good idea. Now I am not sure exactly what is going to happen but out of this may come the idea that there will be two separate policies.

So today, because of this change of view, we want to discuss the language that is here but we want to try to take it as a policy if we can as a policy that applies only to the academic administrators. And try to see whether today in here if this is as offensive as some of the earlier material was to this group. So that's kind of how we are going to try to approach this today. Now in terms of the changes that have been made, the part of this that has been changed the most is the part under the section title Exceptions to the Search and Screen Policy. You will recall that in the initial version of the document there was language about the emergency appointments, exceptional appointments, and so forth. Several categories of these exceptions to the search and screen policy that has been changed and the only exceptions that this version here now contemplates are acting and interim appointments. Now, we recognize, I think, that emergencies do happened and that there maybe things that could be viewed as exceptions. And to deal with those situations what has been put into this policy is a sentence in lines 14-15 of the document that's back on page 1, 14 and 15, and that sentence basically says that if there is a situation that requires some deviation from what this policy says about search and screening that the appointing officer should in fact consult with the appropriate faculty leadership, with the affirmative action officer, the President indicated that he wouldn't mind having his title put in the list of people to consult in this particular.

HERBERT: I did make that observation.

MILLER: Well anyway, that sentence is really the thing that is in there now to deal with these unusual circumstances which previously had a bunch of text associated with it and it just didn't seem to be working very well. So that I think is the major change in this. We're recognizing that there are some exceptions but we really don't want to go too far into the details of how those exceptions should be dealt with.

If we start then, there is a section titled Applicability. Here we are trying to define the officers that this policy would apply to and I think we have come to believe that this idea about the Presidents and Chancellors and Provost cabinet maybe that's language that shouldn't be there

that's kind of a fuzzy idea. It's actually not clear who that represents and so in our Agenda Committee discussion, we were thinking about stopping the sentence there in terms of the list, after the Dean title striking this "cabinet" idea. Well with regard to 14 and 15, the way that this is written now it seems to apply that if we are going to have some variations from search and screen policies that the approval of the faculty governance body should be sought. We are thinking that it would be more appropriate to insert language about the executive committee or the agenda committee of the faculty governance body rather than have the President come in here and tell us about the exceptions that he wants to make, maybe we should do that offline if you will. And that's something that would be included in a couple of places in this document where there is reference to appropriate faculty governance bodies. I think we would want to focus on the executive committee.

The other thing that is true about the search and screen policy is that if you look at the Academic Handbook, you have some material from the Academic Handbook, you will notice that there is a special section in the search and screen policy that pertains to the President. That is to say that the Board of Trustees has its own ideas about how the President should be, what the search and screen procedures should be for the President. In our list of applicable officers, I think we would want to take that President item out of there recognizing the Trustees really are the group that will decide how the President will be chosen. Now the current statement in the Academic Handbook pertains to the President is one that basically says that the Trustees will use the faculty policy as they search for a President; whether they want to continue to do that or not is kind of up to them. This policy in other words would not apply to the President's position.

Search committee size and composition you'll recall one of the ideas in the Trustee's letter to us was an idea that they thought smaller rather than larger committees would be appropriate. They in fact think that committees larger than 9 would be not useful. You will see language in here that we are recommending committees from 9 to 15, so we are willing to overlap with the Trustees idea about size, but generally speaking, if we talk about committees of five, there is just not much comfort in the faculty that have been involved in these discussions over those kind of numbers. We are trying to resist a little bit making these committees accessibly small.

Much of the rest of this is fairly similar, it has been reorganized a little bit, but I think the ideas under Principles and Requirements, Diversity and Affirmative Action, Confidentiality, Due Diligence, Search Committee Procedures. I guess the one point about which there has been a lot of discussion is the Confidentiality and there has been a lot of searching for the right words to describe exactly the point at which the names and information about the candidates would be made public and you will see that there is, on line 63, 64, 65, this is some new language in here trying to describe that, we may or may not have it to everyone's satisfaction. I think we are closer maybe than we were previously. Okay, I think I will stop there as an introduction to this and be happy to entertain your comments and questions.

SPECHLER: Ted, I think on the whole this is very good work many improvements here. I think the President is right that there are certain senior appointments which may bear indirectly on the research, especially on the research and teaching mission, but are financial, technical, matters of maintenance of buildings and grounds those are very important professional matters but where faculty don't have any particular expertise in knowing how to find the appropriate people. I think

he is probably right that those out to be spun off. In respect to the numbers, Ted you probably know as well or better than anyone, how difficult it is to convene a faculty committee in its full numbers. We should perhaps remind the Trustees who have a different experience and a different kind of calendar that when you have a committee of 9 and you call a meeting there may be only 3 or 4 or 5 people there, they have other commitments and then it won't be a very satisfactory meeting. I do think that the higher number is quite appropriate in order to get a reasonable quorum and diversity of opinion in those kinds of decisions. I also agree that the Provost's cabinet and so on ought to be up to the Chancellor or the Provost whom she or he wants to choose. It is their matter just as it is in the United States.

HERBERT: Could I raise one, I just noticed this. This is a policy issue that I think you have to deal with on lines 89 and 90 references made to the length of time that the maximum interim appointment can be made as you see it must not exceed two years from the date of appointment. Then in the next bullet 91-93, it says that a search committee must be appointed for a permanent replacement within 60 days of the appointment of an acting or interim appointment. So on one hand the previous one 89, 90 says it could be for a period of two years. So what this means then is that even though a person is going to serve for two years, lets just use a hypothetical case, you have to appoint a committee within 60 days so he will be acting from that period of 60 days until the end of the 2-year period. Is that your intention?

WATSON: Well I think the sense of it was we didn't want an interim appointment to last for more than two years and to ensure that a search committee be selected. We want the interim's appointments to be as short as possible so that we get a new replacement as quickly as possible and two years gives the search time to unfold if it needs it.

HERBERT: The key thing is whether or not you want to have a search committee operating for 22 months, if the appointment in fact be for two years.

HAWKINS: It's written very specifically to say that it would be appointed. It doesn't necessarily mean that it will have its work done before those two years. And right after that on line 92 and 93, there is this encouragement that the acting or interim appointment could be made permanent by being one of the applicants. The notion is to limit interim to no more than 2 years and move right away towards the process of trying to put in a permanent individual, the acting or interim might also fall into that process.

HERBERT: Just a policy question of whether or not you want to see a committee that may actually have to be in existence 22 months potentially.

HAWKINS: We could change the 60 days part simply to a different time frame.

HERBERT: It's not something I have strong feelings about I am just raising it so that you can think about it.

MILLER: I would say one of the issues surrounding this would be whether the interim appointment is actually made for a specific period of time or not. Many interim appointments are simply announced, ok there's an interim appointment with no fixed length so under that scenario

getting started makes some sense. On the other hand, if we actually do have interim appointment made for a fixed period. Well then I think this line maybe should be altered.

HAWKINS: Though that's when you go back to line 14 and 15, same variation if you have made it for a specific amount of time. You go back and you alter this.

MILLER: I think we can probably clarify this.

HERBERT: Just to make sure there is no ambiguity.

BALDWIN: I think the sense of this is that must not exceed a period of two years or until the permanent appointment can be made.

WATSON: The idea is that the permanent appointment needs to precede the end of two year period not within the two years.

BALDWIN: Somebody resigns, an interim is appointed, a search committee is appointed; they are not hiring for necessarily two years in the future they are hiring to get the person in here at the earliest possible time. Therefore the person holding the interim appointment should know that their interim position is a maximum of two years but could be least if a permanent person can be found.

JOHNSON: I tried to make the point that you just made at the Bloomington meeting last week and to me the point seems to be that if you know that the interim appointment is for two years to have a committee appointed and not doing anything for awhile seems quite the waste of time. Whereas the section below that before the guidelines saying that the committee should be appointed at least one year before the expected start date could cover that as well. You know that after a year of this two year interim appointment then the committee starts.

HERBERT: The key thing I think is just that it's just important if you have something that might be misconstrued in terms of intent that we deal with that.

COFFIN: Speaking from the situation on campus that essentially had an interim vice chancellor for academic affairs for 10 years, I prefer making any language which makes it extremely difficult to have an extended appointment of interim vice chancellors for anything. I would be in favor of any language that requires the search to start as soon as possible after the announcement of a vacancy in that sort of a position. I recognize that there may be times for example when you may want to take a very serious look at what the duties of that position are going to be and that might create some difficulty getting started. But I think that can be handled with other kinds of language. I really really feel uncomfortable to say okay we have a vacancy in the chancellor's position and we are going to appoint an interim chancellor for two years and start the searching a year and half from now. Unless you are going to redefine what the chancellor is doing, I think the search needs to start as soon as possible and if takes two years to complete—I've been on a search committee for two years to find a vice chancellor for academic affairs. It's not fun but it's doable.

MCDANIEL: Although when you first read this it does seem that there are two statements possibly in contradiction with one another, but would this not be the perfect example of when one might be requesting an exception, for this type of appointment? Any variation has to be approved by the governance body and the affirmative action officer. Would this basically if we knew that someone is going to be appointed for two years, we would ask for an exception for this committee to review?

HERBERT: I think that was that was also made over here and that may be the answer to it. I just think that it just critical that bringing this forward for final approval that those kind of issues have been thought through and you are comfortable with the wording. Are there other comments?

LUDLUM FOOS: It seems like there's kind of a gap somewhere. Some people are talking as if you would appoint an interim person for as long a period as possible. I would interpret the two years as saying not every search for an upper-level administrator is successful the first time around and so you are going to need enough lead way so if you start as soon as possible it may take two years. It may very well take two years but it seems to me that to assume the person is going to be in that position for two years doesn't make sense to me. Again there may be an exception where you may want to do that, but the norm is not assuming that an interim is going to be there for two years. It's until you hire someone.

MCDANIEL: Right.

HAWKINS: I've worked with the group that tried to get this crafted and we very purposefully put items as separate rather than continuous paragraph in order that we don't get into this too close proximity and conflict. There were some very specific principles and ideas that I think you articulated them nicely in terms of what we were trying to do. I want to go back to the notion that I agree I don't think that this policy works for presidential searches. It was originally back under Applicability some language that talked about the positions bearing directly on the teaching and research functions. I think we could easily craft this policy and a companion that specifies what we would do with presidential searches and those people that don't fit into those categories. But we could move this one along for those who do pertain to those senior positions directly bearing on the teaching and research mission.

HERBERT: Other comments, if not thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #7: UPDATE ON REVISIONS TO THE POLICY ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

HERBERT: Let's go on to an update on Revisions to the Policy of Intellectual Property.

ATKINSON: So we discussed the Intellectual Property Policy at the last UFC meeting. At that point, it seemed like we were coming to a consensus. What has intervened in the interim period is a discussion by the faculty in the School of Informatics on the Bloomington campus and this essentially centers around the handling of software in the Intellectual Property policy. You will

remember that the policy we discussed at the last UFC meeting defaults to software being treated as a University Work. And the intent when this policy was drafted that way by the original committee was that this was the best way to facilitate open sourcing of software and group projects. There is a significant number of people who disagree very strongly to that approach to defining software. Right now there seems to be a consensus emerging on the Bloomington campus that it would be best to rewrite the policy so that software, unless it is patentable, will be treated as a Traditional Work of Scholarship; that the university would not claim ownership in that particular software. A disadvantage of that approach is that it makes open source more complicated because it requires groups of developers on group projects to enter into specific agreements to allow that. I say that this is an emerging consensus on the Bloomington campus because this issue really hasn't been discussed to my knowledge outside of the Bloomington campus. I don't think to my knowledge that the faculty in Informatics on this campus or in Computer Science have been involved in this discussion to date.

I think therefore the consensus is to defer action on this policy until next years UFC. That will give more time for a further discussion involving more the interested parties in exactly how this software issue is best handled. There are also some other issues that have come up in the interim. I have been contacted by a number of people with various issues with other areas of the policy but I think at the moment the main area of disagreement concerns the handling of software. I will take any questions or comments. Ted's been intimately involved in these discussions and attended the meeting with the Informatics faculty and I think Kelly and maybe others here. Perhaps we can have a short discussion that will help to guide some redrafting of the policy over the summer.

MILLER: Well let me just say speaking for myself that the Policy on Intellectual Property is a very very important policy for the faculty. We have an existing policy. It is not that we are without one now. We have an existing policy. I think its fair to say that there have been concerns expressed more or less continuously about this software issue as this policy has been reviewed in various places over the entire year. The meeting in the School of Informatics, it seemed like it was just enough to kind of push us over the edge in terms of kind of saying maybe we really should think about this some more. I'm not sure if there is anybody out there that thinks that if we don't approve a new policy in this area now that we are somehow doing great damage to the university. I hope that there isn't anything like but I really do think that we need to give this some more time.

LUDLUM FOOS: Just to supplement the comments of the School of Informatics, I had disseminated the policy as we discussed it at the last UFC meeting to my faculty the day before hearing that things were being rewritten and I got a response back from one of our computer science faculty members very passionately and eloquently and at length saying it needs to be treated as copyrightable not as patentable and he cited a number of websites where discussions are going on. So at least one other campus besides Bloomington has been hearing comments like that as well.

OGREN: I was just wondering if Ted or someone could remind us what the present policy is on software, in a few words.

MILLER: No [laughter].

OGREN: That is copyrighted or patented?

ATKINSON: The present policy is largely to treat all software as patentable. So anything that's patentable is treated under the current policy. Other software is essentially ignored by the current policy and that's one of the problems that redrafting this has tried to deal with and as you can see it's one of those areas that they can step into it it's difficult to get out of that area.

OGREN: So you don't really have a very well defined tech policy at the moment.

ATKINSON: Well, I think probably the whole treatment of copyright in the current policy is a problem and so the redraft addresses that. The other thing that I should have mentioned earlier that I think has become contentious again is the area of online courseware. That was an issue that was raised at the Bloomington meeting. So the question would be whether to continue to treat online courseware as part of the intellectual property policy or to develop a separate policy for it.

HERBERT: Are there any other questions of Simon or Ted?

MCDANIEL: I was just wondering if as we're looking at the policy related copyrightable software versus Traditional Works of Scholarship and joint ownership of the same, if the definition of I forget the term you use, Extensive University Support would also apply to this. In other words, has there been to some extent some university support that wouldn't qualify even if its not patentable software but for copyrightable software.

ATKINSON: I think that's right.

MCDANIEL: But it would be non-traditional works of scholarship...

ATKINSON: It would be a University Work.

MCDANIEL: The ownership would reside with the faculty member but it would be a joint ownership.

ATKINSON: The area that's really important is software that faculty develop as part of their academic work, which if it were a book or a piece of music would be treated as traditional work of scholarship.

MCDANIEL: Unless it uses Extensive University Resources.

ATKINSON: Right.

BANTZ: I would like to make only one observation because this is important issue, the fact that this very seriously needs to be worked out; it does have a pressure time that we should not underestimate. Currently a number of people that have reported to me that we have are at a comparative disadvantage of recruiting faculty under our current policy. The new policy is more

generous to the investigator than the current policy and if you are an investigator who believes you are going to win the great lottery of research and hit the next \$400 million dollar revenue patent, it disadvantages you enormously. And so at least one dean has reported to me that they have negotiated with someone who actually has read our policy and sees that as a reason not to come because they are at the point of, they believe, making a breakthrough discovery. So I think we need to give the time to this issue but I do not think we should be sitting here next May having gone through another year of recruiting disadvantage as an institution.

ATKINSON: I think that's exactly right. One of the dimensions in redrafting the policy was to correct some of the disincentives to faculty to come here and the revenue distributions in the new policy are designed purposefully to aid in recruiting and in retention because the allocation of funds to the creator's laboratory that only stays within the creator's laboratory as long as the creator is at Indiana University. So I think there are some good provisions in this policy and it's my opinion that will really improve the handling of intellectual property. So if we can smooth out the software issue over the summer, I hope we can have time to settle this in the fall.

MILLER: That certainly is our intention, is to do it quickly in the fall, as quickly as we can.

HERBERT: Any other questions for Simon? If not, thank you very much, I appreciate all the hard work.

AGENDA ITEM #8: GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: Now we turn to Ted for the 30 minutes discussion of general education. I want to say that up front because everyone knows we have a time frame certain to discuss it.

MILLER: We have a document that we are going to distribute. Let me start sketching out what seems to me to be the structure of the situation regarding general education at Indiana University. As many of you know, on your campuses there does exist a campus-level general education program. In fact I think it's fair to say that on all of the campuses of Indiana University except for Bloomington, there is something that most people look at and say well this is our approach to general education. I'm happy to report to you that Bloomington is working on developing such a program. Of course we've done this before and failed on three or four rather notable occasions over the last ten years or so. But we have a new effort. We have a somewhat different idea of how to go about it. We certainly also have more intense interest in what we're doing, coming from the president, coming from the Board of Trustees. I think everyone involved understands that there's a good bit of interest in this subject.

So I'm hopeful that in Bloomington we are going to be able to solve this rather elusive dilemma during the next academic year. So that is one dimension of the problem. Now the fact is that many of the campuses have been pursuing their general education ideas for years and it's also true that the approaches to this are quite different across the various campuses. My own feeling about this, that particular aspect of the situation is that that is quite appropriate. I really think that an effort on the part of the faculty to somehow restructure general education into some common form on all of the campuses—I'm quite convinced that it would fail, first of all, but I think it

would be a huge mistake to even try to do that. I really do believe that the reason that we have faculty appointed on our various campuses is so that they can do the stuff that faculty are supposed to do [Tape 1 Side B ends... some comments may be lost]

Now, at the same time we do have interest and have had for a number of years as many of you know, coming from outside the university as well as inside, interest in regard to how the university deals with transfer students. And one of the things that I would like to try to do is to develop a mechanism that would facilitate transfer of credits from one campus to another in Indiana University. This is the purpose of the document that you have now, it's called the IU Common Curriculum Policy. What this document does—now this is a work in progress. There's nothing on here that has been voted on by anybody. It's just an idea. But what it says is that there should be and the way this is described, it's a relatively small component of every degree program, should be structured around some of these basic categories of things that we find in almost all of the degree programs already; writing, arts, humanities, social science, natural science, that there should be a component in every degree program that is offered within Indiana University, surrounding those categories and that on each campus the faculty should sit down and structure a curriculum that is attached to those particular categories. The decisions that the faculty make on their various campuses might well be different in terms of the kinds of courses that would be attached here. There obviously would be a lot of similarities but it wouldn't be a completely similar thing across the campuses.

So on each campus there is a curriculum that is called the IU Common Curriculum. Students come to the campus, they go through the IU Common Curriculum at the end of which they are certified as having completed the common curriculum. If they then transfer from that campus to a new campus, their certification goes along with them so that when they arrive at their new campus, they go into a degree program on that campus, that campus also has a common curriculum, that degree program also has a common curriculum element. The certification that they have from their previous campus comes along with them, that degree requirement is satisfied by the work on the other campuses and then they go on and do the other stuff that they have to do to satisfy the degree program on that campus. So this is an effort to carve out a piece of each degree program that a person could do on one campus, be certified, take it to the other campus and without question have that requirement satisfied and then off they go.

I really do believe that this is something that it would in Indiana University's—in the faculty of Indiana University's best interest to do if we can.

HERBERT: Are there comments?

SPECHLER: Well, Ted I think this so-called common curriculum policy is a very very minimalist approach that does not excite my enthusiasm whatever nor do I think that every campus in Indiana University will come up with something respectable. You make the—you talk of two polar opposites actually. One is this distribution skeleton which I think is minimalist to the point of disappearance. On the other hand something that's not practical for our university which is a list of common courses and substance which we would be decades in developing and we couldn't stand. So that's out of the question. But I really do think that our Educational Policies Committee could do much better with this by developing a more detailed list of the

capabilities and the areas of interest that we would expect a young person to have gone through before graduating with an Indiana University degree. So I'm just not satisfied with this personally at all. I think it's just tossing it off on the campuses. We've spent a lot of time at IUPUI developing principles of undergraduate education and I would recommend it to you and to any other campus to look at it as a way to kind of compromise between what I would think as a fair skeleton we're talking about and an infeasible this of common courses of true core curriculum such as they had at Columbia University.

MILLER: Well, Marty, I appreciate your complimentary tone but I think you misunderstand my intent here. I am not trying to describe a curriculum that is the sum and substance of the general education curriculum on every campus. I'm trying to define a component of the general education program that would be common across the campuses and therefore transferable without question. On every campus I'm sure to the extent that this stuff is part of the general education there will be other stuff that is also in the general education program. The idea here is to try to find a subset, the intersection if you will, of all the general educations across the campuses, something that's common to them all although I've already been told that this is not common to them all. But still, that's really what I'm looking for, is something that's common to them all that we can focus on as a transferable element. I'm not trying to say that this is what general education should be in its sum and substance. I'm quite happy with the various approaches that have been taken on the campuses; South Bend, Southeast, people are working on this. They've got very nice elaborate ideas about general education but in part what they have in their general education is stuff like this. And so what I'm looking for is kind of the common part that we can use for a very practical purpose to help our student who are transferring around in the system. As we know, they encounter difficulties when they transfer and I'd like to try to give them a little help in this regard.

Now I'm also not knocking the principles on undergraduate learning. I am not knocking that at all. But I do really think that from the point of view of transferring, if there is no curriculum, then it's very difficult to deal with transfer issues. There's got to be a curriculum. A number of the campuses I know are following IUPUI's lead with an interest in the principles of undergraduate learning and I'm not sure, maybe others will as well. But to my way of thinking, really, if you just think about IUPUI in isolation, the principles of undergraduate learning are fine. But if there's really no curriculum attached to them, then it seems to me that when you start talking about moving around the system, there are some issues that do come up.

HAMILTON: Ted I think your focus on transferability is really admirable and I think that that's definitely something we have to think about as we move forward. When I was reading your proposed policy, I was reminded of a quotation from a student at the University of Michigan. It's often quoted in the greater expectations book and it says "So you get here and they ask what courses do you want to take, what do you want to major in? And so you say oh, that's what it's about; courses and majors". So this is sort of a direct quote "you take a little this, you take a little that, you get your card stamped and then it comes, graduation. And you get this piece of paper, this transcript and all it is is a bunch of courses. It doesn't add up to anything, it doesn't mean a thing". Now what I think is, and it's not lacking in here, because it's implied when you say the faculty is encouraged to use the general education template. I have a sense here that the cart is being put before the horse in here. I think first of all, we really need a strong statement we all

agree on and this is what general education is about. This is what it's for, this is why it's important, this is how it relates to the major, this is what an IU graduate, no matter which campus, knows and can do. This is how we prepare our students as citizens in a rapidly changing global society. It doesn't have to be those words.

The work that Betty Jones my colleague and Bill Wheeler who I'm substituting for this year, have already developed some pretty powerful and effective language in that way. I think as we all know, the devil is in the details. But I think we have to know where we're going and why we're going there before we put a group of forces together to help us get there because really we know that the courses are kind of the vehicle by which we get to our goal. But they are not the goal in themselves. It's what are students going to do. We know that any course that we teach that is information based is obsolete by the time that information is up, most of the time by the time the textbook gets published. The information is less important than the intellectual skills of what you can do with that information and how you're going to apply it and so on.

So while I really applaud the impetus and the concern of transferability, and I think that whatever we develop we have to be mindful of that, I really would like before, if there's any kind of policy on actual courses on or even areas of courses that we have a strong statement "IU is all about... whatever the faculty says it's about for general education." We have an opportunity here to get IU on the map for a very serious, innovative powerful poignant statement about general education. And I would hate for it to come after something like this. I really think we need the goal before the mechanism to get to the goal.

MILLER: Well I would just, my view of the situation is that the campuses in their individuals ways are well down the road to developing their own general education programs. The idea that we are going to have an overall Indiana University general education program, I just don't see it as a feasible option.

COFFIN: I tend to agree with what Sharon said. I also have and I actually am very attracted to what IU South Bend is doing with sort of their interdisciplinary set of core courses although I'm not sure that's the kind we want to get into. But I look at this and I think transferability is extremely important but I look at this and I think the difficulties that that entails not just between campuses but between programs on individual campuses. Individual programs, for example, are very likely to have requirements in the arts and humanities and social sciences but those might be specific course requirements. In business for example, they are requesting or requiring people to take one semester in psychology and one other social science course. It might well be that there are other programs at IU Northwest that require six hours in social sciences but they might require two totally different courses, so if one changes majors on a single campus you might have a certificate that says you have done your general ed stuff but they still are going to have to take additional coursework as they change majors and if they change campuses the problem is likely to be more exacerbated even if you have this transferable certificate that you completed the general education core. You see I think one of the problems that is going to come out of this is that students are going to transfer between campuses and they are going to go into a program and people are going to say that is nice but that's not the courses you had to take here for the major. But they are going to say that I have this certificate that says I have my general education and I think this is a huge conceptual difficulty.

MILLER: Well I think the certificate would say that they would have the common curriculum. It would not say that they have the general education because the common curriculum is a part of the general education only.

COFFIN: Ted I didn't say what the policy would say but what the student's would say when they walked into your office. And I think to try to persuade students that this is not a general education requirement and it is not a fulfilled general education requirement, it is more difficult than you think it is and I think we have to think very carefully about how we go about this. As I said, I like the transferability part of it but I'm looking at some of the practical difficulties of this thinking. This is not going to solve it.

HERBERT: Are there other comments?

HENKE: I was just going to comment on what he's saying. I definitely agree with that because as a student you're transferring and it seems like the assumption is that your core curriculum is stamped and you can go and transfer easily. Well typically you are going to have required courses that you take in that first and second year that might be major specific that are prerequisites. It's not a common thing that everyone finishes all their general ed courses within those first two years and that's all they study and then they start all of their major courses so how would you adjust if you are coming in with maybe only twelve of those core done does that defeat what this is suppose to be? Do you know what I mean?

MILLER: Well I guess, I mean this is an idea. It's not something that I am asking people to vote on today. It's something that I would like to pursue. My inclination would be if this is a 20-hour program and if somebody starts on a campus and finishes 12 hours and then transfers then it means nothing. If those 12 hours transfer to the other campus and they fit in somewhere well that's fine but maybe they won't. If they finish the entire thing and are certified that I think could mean something. If each degree program has a common curriculum component it's a requirement for the degree to finish the common curriculum component. If you finish it and is certified to be finished, well then it is finished. You can go on to work on the other requirements.

HERBERT: Other?

JONES: I'm at a loss for the point of this. It just doesn't seem to me...it won't necessarily make a great statement about what IU wants to say about general education. I think it would take forever for us to get faculties to agree what these categories are going to be. I think a way to go about it would be more in the way of what Sharon has said about here are some common things that we hold all students ought to be able to do when they get out of here which would be rather generic and then allow each campus to define that on its own. So I don't see any point in this.

SPECHLER: Well briefly, of course, I do agree with Sharon Hamilton who has had a major role in developing through much work principles. I don't know, I think transferability is a secondary issue. It's important but it doesn't answer what the president charged us with a couple years ago, which was to make a real statement about what someone should know when he/she graduates from Indiana University. This is just a distribution thing. I very much hope that all the campuses

are doing much more than this. But has transferability been a major problem within the general education area. I am not aware of that. Maybe it has been here or there, I think every campus could certify whether what you have done before is adequate. I think that hanging it all on the transferability issue is diverting us from the real mission, which is to say what does someone need to know with an IU degree.

HERBERT: The one thing that I can tell you is that I agree with you that this ought to be based on what we as a faculty feel is fundamental to the receipt of a degree from Indiana University but is the case that the transferability issue is real in a political context. When I testify before the legislature the issue of transferability is a very real one and what legislatures say is help me understand this. A student transfers from one of your.... First they talk about transferability in the context of the community colleges and then a member, it has happened to me in both Houses, will say that there are students within the Indiana University system that are trying to transfer from one campus to another and you don't count the credits or whatever the message might be from that one individual. It is a matter that we continue to get beaten up on. At some point, this is one of the things that I said today, just be prepared, just as the legislature came back in this long session and mandated that we had to develop articulation agreements in specific areas. All this stuff is going to eventually appear in legislation and they are going to force us and we have no choice from a timing perspective even to get done what needs to be done. I wouldn't ignore the transfer issue because it is a real one within the political arena.

MILLER: Let me just say one additional thing, our Educational Policies Committee has for two years, since the President has asked us to talk about general education, the Educational Policies Committee has talked about general education for two years. I would say the main conclusion coming out of those two years of discussion is that each of the campuses likes its own ideas about general education—that is the main message. People on their own campuses like their ideas about general education and they don't want somebody else's ideas and I don't frankly see why we should force it on them.

HERBERT: Okay we have three minutes for this topic. Quickly?

HOYT: Could I just ask the question of transferability is it a problem more with the general education or more a problem of the majors, accepting credits for the majors as opposed to general education?

HERBERT: It's ultimately the latter. What's happening is as I understand it is that each individual school does its own thing and if a student changes majors or if they go from one campus to another they have to take additional hours because each school is doing its own thing and each campus is doing a different kind of thing.

MILLER: It's not a question of whether the credits transfer. They do transfer. It's a question whether they count towards the new degree and that's why this document tries to focus on a common degree requirement that would have some courses attached to it that would fit into the new degree program without that kind of problem.

HERBERT: Please?

JONES: One of the things I see as an issue here is how the unit that's receiving this student deals with those credits. There is an officer or someone in the unit who's charged with that responsibility and it's often one person in that unit who makes the decision and not necessarily the entire faculty in that unit that agrees to it. So I think there is another layer to this issue. We have lots of people who are making those decisions who may not be apart of this conversation or be on that page at all.

HERBERT: One of the things, I should be even more specific. The major concern I heard raised when I was being attacked was that Bloomington specifically would not accept courses from the regional campuses and apply them toward degrees. Hours they would count but there were problems with regards to specific courses and so one of the benefits of doing something like this whether it is this shape or some other is that if there is an agreement among all of the campuses that there are things that you do on your campus that will be accepted elsewhere as meeting a, whatever you call it core or whatever that would make a big difference. The other part of this is the Trustees are concerned about time to degree. The number of hours its taking and this is one of the challenges that we have. They are looking at statistics that show graduation rates within six years as well as numbers of hours toward degrees and it's a problem. They've zeroed in on IUPUI for example, as Charles knows, because their view is that it is not unacceptable that any campus in Indiana University would have a graduation rate that is below 30 percent. So the question they ask is why, what's going on, and then they look at...in fact now what is going to happen is we are going to have all the data now that we have a institutional research office so there is going to be greater accountability on all of this. I think we can't just put our heads in the sand and there are some issues here that we are going to have to address in a responsible fashion as a faculty.

VERMETTE: Can I just ask a question Ted, in response to this too? You said if they have only completed 12 hours and they transfer that maybe it's worth nothing. Did you over exaggerate it because if those hours fall within those categories shouldn't they be accepted in those categories and the person just has to finish the 8 other hours on that new campus?

MILLER: If they finish the 12 hours, I guess the way that I would see it is that they would take those 12 hours to their new campus and they would be evaluated in the way that they were evaluated and some disposition would be made, but it would be up to the people on the other campus just what would happen.

VERMETTE: What I'd like to see as an advisor, I would like to see that if it looks like a social science course and it smells like a social science course, its attributed in the social science area rather than being undistributed. That's what gets to me. When they bring in courses they will put them all in undistributed and it's up to an advisor, if the advisor is sharp enough to catch the fact that there might be some overlap. But I think if you could mandate that courses look like social science or humanities be actually recognized as such and placed in the right categories immediately when a student comes in rather than have a long list of undistributed, that this would be really worthwhile. But I think that the advising could be helped if it were mandated

that if it looks like one of these courses and it acts like one of these courses it should be one of these courses.

HERBERT: I think you've had the last word, unless Ted you want to conclude by indicating what's next according from your perspective.

MILLER: I'm fine. Well it's the end of the year. We have the summer to percolate these thoughts and we will see what happens.

AGENDA ITEM #9: STATUS REPORT ON 18-20 RETIREMENT PLAN

HERBERT: Ok. Thank you. I think that was a very good discussion. Next item is status report on 18-20 Retirement Plan. Vice President Palmer and Associate Vice President Rives will lead this conversation. How do you want to proceed? If you want to sit down you can come up here or if you want to stand maybe over there some place that everyone can.

PALMER: Let me make sure, do a voice check here, is everyone able to hear me alright? Okay, if I start to slip away please raise your hand. I'm going to be joined by Dan Rives, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, and Steve Keucher, Assistant Vice President and University Budget Officer, in this presentation. This is an update on the 18-20 program and let me introduce it by simply saying that this is not to discuss any changes at all in the benefits. This is simply to give you an update on the financing and where we stand.

For those of you who may not recall some of the work that we have done earlier with 18-20, I am not going to go back to the beginning of time except to say that this program was created and established by Chancellor Herman B Wells in 1959. It served two purposes as Chancellor Wells conveyed the original thoughts about this program with several of us. First and foremost, Indiana University even at that point in its history was struggling to keep pace with faculty salaries and compensation and this was seen as a program that would be helpful in doing so by giving the faculty an additional guarantee of retirement income. That was closely related to a concern that existed at that time that frankly faculty did not necessarily have the resources in all cases that they needed for a reasonable comfortable retirement program and for some of you may remember the state of Indiana was just about a few years before that entering into Social Security as a program. So there were two reasons. The only thing that wasn't really considered at that time, and this is not a negative, but the fact of the matter was many retirement programs like this in the public and private sector where not funded. It was conceived to be a pay as you go program and no one really thought about down the road after faculty had met the requirements of being involved in TIAA-CREF for 18 years and for being an employee of the University for 20 years that they would have to come up with a lot of money. That fell to all of us to figure out how we were going to fund the major load of recipients that will be passing through the 18-20 program. I'm not sure and you may if you think about the history of IU if 18-20 was just a set of criteria just dreamed up like someone in the finance world advised Chancellor Wells that that was a good number, but I find that there may have been some connection with the founding of the University in 1820. You see I have lived with this program way too long to say things like that.

Let's now fast forward because there were changes made in this program during the 1980's and at that time there was a review made involving the federal agencies that would look at this for tax purposes and it was determined that the University should not and could not make further changes in this program or we would put ourselves in some risk with the program. So in 1999 when we looked at what future costs of this would be, and frankly the burden that it would represent to us now and over the course of the next several years as we reached the peak in terms of the participation rates, it was determined that a task force would be appointed to take a look at the program and how we could finance it. Not to make changes in the program but find a way to finance it.

We recognized that this program had the possibility and we looked at the numbers a very real possibility of serious encroachment of meeting the other academic priority needs of the institution. It was high time that we found a way to address it. A plan was developed. It was brought forth to this body, to many bodies across the university on all of the campuses. It was discussed. We had very good participation, very good representation on the task force and it came forward with four elements in the financing plan. We started with a premise, as charged by then President Myles Brand, do not take away the program, do not put the program in jeopardy but find out a way to smooth out the funding.

The first step in this was to reduce our contribution to TIAA-CREF to 10 percent. That was not done lightly in the sense of it wasn't an easy step to take, at that point we had a 12 percent contribution but also had a sidebar of IU supplemental retirement of about 2.4 percent. We really were dropping if you will the benefit package to new employees. There was no effect on employees currently working for Indiana University. It was agreed and recommended that there would not be a supplemental retirement program that would be in place any longer so the contribution to TIAA-CREF was it.

There was a provision and it recognized the differences amongst our campus in terms of the numbers of individuals eligible by various departments and units. It also recognized differences on campuses, on the larger campuses, but it called for a 20 percent departmental reallocation which meant that if you had a faculty member or eligible staff member that opted for 18-20, that 20 percent of that interim benefit would be contributed by the department. The rationale for that was because the position would be vacant, and you can debate whether this was the next step in that rationale was reasonable or not, but that in all probability this was a longer serving employee and with certain exceptions in high market demand disciplines it was anticipated that in all probability that the starting could be lower. Now that's not always the case, there are lots of instances where that is not the case, but we did include the recommendation of the 20 percent departmental reallocation.

The other recommendation that was brought forward was the concept of a retention plan. Perhaps out of all the recommendations this has been the one that people have had the most questions about in terms of whether or not it was successful. What this plan was designed to do was to provide an opportunity for a school or a dean to make a decision if they wanted to offer a retention incentive to folks to trade-off if you will a year of additional work with that retention

incentive for a year of 18 funding eligibility. Dan will report to you in just a few minutes about what has transpired as a result of that retention.

The plan has been reviewed on at least two occasions. We monitor it annually to make sure that we are not seeing any significant changes in the plan. We are heading into our highest period of the utilization of the plan. Dan is going to show you some actual numbers with regards to employees. I've asked Steve Keucher to provide you some information about how we are funding the 18-20 plan. These were steps all designed to if you will garner resources in a variety of forms. Steve will explain exactly how we funded the plan and some thresholds that we have met. One that I would ask you to keep in mind is when we, and some of you have seen this graph many times, it really shows that we have a compressed period of about 6-8 years where we were facing rapid growth in the dollars required. Remember it was funding on an as needed basis. So we put in place a mechanism to try to smooth out that funding. One of the real concerns that we heard from all the campuses was that it was very difficult in budgets, and we new this too, when you get hit with a big bill year after year after year as your building up to this is very disruptive to your budgeting and priority funding. It would be far better to find a way to smooth that out by capturing some dollars in the years when there was going to be less demand, put those away, solve them away if you will so that they can begin to flow out to fund the cost to maintain a more reasonable growth rate or stable growth rate in those high utilizations years. For those of you, I look around the room and see if I am any judge at all that several of you will have an opportunity to experience the time when you will be on the other side of the hill and that's going to be a very good news period for the University but I hope—because it means that more of those resources will be freed up to go elsewhere in your budgets. I believe that we have some very good news to report to you today about where we are in terms of funding of the plan right now as we head into these peak demand years. With that I would like to ask Dan Rives to share some of those with you and he will be followed by Steve Keucher. Thank you.

RIVES: Give me a sign if you can't hear me very well. What Vice President Palmer has been describing here is how we are accumulating the resources to pay the benefit. My office has responsibility for making sure the benefits are actually paid. Again to reinforce something that has already been said nothing that is going on is jeopardizing this plan in fact everything that we do ensures the plan will survive completely. I already got one question about this since your agenda came out. We talk about the early retirement plan but there is actually quite a bit of confusion across the university. Some of you are not covered by the 18-20. Many of the new faculty are not covered by 18-20 so there are actually three early retirement plans in the university. We can talk a lot about the 18-20 plan. The 18-20 benefit actually applies to faculty hired prior to July 15, 1988 category. Then we created a supplemental plan or replacement plan for a cohort group, the class of new faculty for the fall 1988 which is pretty much a replication of the 18-20 benefit but under a different statute of codes and so forth. We will show you 18-20 in a second. There are 110 individuals that are potential recipients of that benefit.

We then created a replacement of 18-20 for a couple years that is called IUSERP, the IU Supplemental Early Retirement Plan. There are 1450 individuals receiving that benefit today. There are approximately, I'll show you the 18-20 numbers in just a second, there are approximately 1500 faculty which are not covered by any of these plans. The new faculty hired since July 1999.

So 18-20 real quickly, we have today 1360 faculty and some administrators who are potential recipients. I always say potential and I think Vice President Palmer mentioned it that there are some vesting requirements: 18 years in the IU retirement plan, the base plan, 20 years of full-time service and age 64. It could have been named 18-20-64. Some of you and you look around at your peers and wonder why they are not taking the 18-20 well they may not be covered by the plan at all, they may not have completed 20 years of service and they may not be age 64. So there are several reasons why you look around and some of your peers are not taking the plan.

When I took at the end of each calendar year as a snapshot in time December 31, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 and looked at the number of recipients; by the way on the prior slide, it said 394 individuals receiving benefits today well that's the end of March, that's April. This is 2005. This would be December 31, 2005 and so here we have the number of recipients, those individuals who are terminated, retired from the University and qualified for 18-20 benefits. Every month some individuals are leaving the plan and many months individuals are joining the plan. We have two large classes. One will be in May and the other will be December.

These are the dollars of just the 18-20 plan. Regardless of the funding, my office pays the benefits every month for the recipients of 18-20 both what we call the interim benefit and the contributions to the base plan. These are the total dollars for that respective calendar year that will be paid out and you can see the increase. If you were to look at the budget, look at the numbers we show for early retirement plans they are larger than this number. We spend another 2.4 million on IUSERP, and almost another 2 million on contributions into a trust for the replacement plan. There's another nearly 4.5 million dollars pay off every year for the other two early retirement plans.

Prior to this meeting I asked Bart and Ted what they liked to hear. One thing I heard was what has been happening over the last five years for the plan. By the way to sort of look forward, when I think about projecting the cost to the next year, I try to look at the number of individuals joining in the plan and the average salary of those coming on board. So both the number of individuals will go up over the next five years continuously and the average salary of those individuals [End Tape 2, Side A, some conversation lost].

[Tape 2, Side B did not record. The remainder of this transcript contains notes recreated after the meeting.

[Professor Spechler asked Dan Rives about the effectiveness of the retention program and the overall percentage of eligible faculty taking the 18-20 plan compared to the retention plan. There was also discussion about the role of the deans in offering the retention plan. Steve Keucher reported on the budget for the programs and indicated that some time around 2014 or 2015 the number of eligible faculty would start to decline again which would show some savings back to the contributing units. President Herbert announced that some additional savings have been identified that will result in an immediate savings to the academic units for next year.]

AGENDA ITEM #10: FACULTY COMPOSITION REPORT

[Professor Ted Miller introduced the 2005-2006 Faculty Composition Report prepared by the offices of the deans of faculties. These reports are annual and represent a numeric picture of the composition of the faculty on each campus. It was recommended that in future years we continue to include an IU total composition page.]

AGENDA ITEM #13: NEW BUSINESS

[President Herbert and Professor Miller recognized the outstanding leadership and service of outgoing senior co-secretary Professor Bart Ng of Indianapolis. Bart will be returning to the junior co-secretary role next year as a result of his re-election to the IFC presidency. He was presented with a gift from the UFC Agenda Committee.]

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.