

**MINUTES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
APRIL 20, 2004
BALLANTINE HALL 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.**

Summary of Actions Taken:

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes and Summaries

March 23, 2004 (<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/03-23-04.minutes.htm>)

April 6, 2004 (<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/04-06-04.minutes.htm>)

January 20, 2004 (<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/summaries/01-20-04.summary.htm>)

February 3, 2004 (<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/summaries/02-03-04.summary.htm>)

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professor David Daleke)

3. Presiding Officers' Business (10 minutes)

(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)

4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor David Daleke)

5. Educational Policies Committee Resolutions on Admissions, Retention, and Graduation (15 minutes)

(Professor William Wheeler, Chair, BFC Educational Policies Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B43-2004.htm>

6. Foundation Relations Committee Annual Report and Update on Capital Campaign (15 minutes)

(Curt Simic, Director, IU Foundation, Professors Sarita Soni and Rex Stockton, co-chairs, BFC Foundation Relations Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B46-2004.htm>

7. Annual Report: Faculty Board of Review (10 minutes)

(Bonnie Brownlee, Chair, Faculty Board of Review)

8. Annual Report: Faculty Mediation Committee (10 minutes)

(Carol Polsgrove, Chair, Faculty Mediation Committee)

9. AI Language and Proficiency Preparation Status Report (20 minutes)

(Catherine Larson, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, College of Arts & Sciences and David Nordloh, Associate Dean, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

10. Annual Report: Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee (20 minutes)

(Kathy Gilbert, Chair, BFC Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee and Julie Knost, Director, Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~affirm/pdf/2004%20BFC%20Affirmative%20Action%20Report.pdf>

11. New Business (10 minutes)

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Moya Andrews, Ken Gros Louis, John Slattery, Neil Theobald, Bonnie Brownlee, David Daleke, Luis Davila, Patricia Foster, Ann Gellis, Kathleen Gilbert, Laura Ginger, Michael Hamburger, Margaret Intons-Peterson, Elizabeth Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Deidre Lynch, Joss Marsh, Theodore Miller, Richard Nash, Harold Ogren, James H. Patterson, Eric Rasmusen, Amy Reynolds, Elyce Rotella, Barry Rubin, Dennis Senchuk, James Sherman, Sarita Soni, Holly Stocking, Herb Terry, Larry Thibos, Thomas Walsh, Mary Wennerstrom, William Wheeler, Celestina Wroth, William DeKemper, JoEllen Baldwin, Jesse Nelson, Carla Thoele, Grant McFann

Members Absent with Alternates: Don Lichtenberg for Bennet Brabson; Diane Dallis for Mary Popp

Members Absent: Jeff Alberts, Joyce Alexander, Simon Brassell, Ann Bristow, Malcolm Brown, Erik Bucy, Kevin Hunt, Elin Jacob, Murray McGibbon, Kelly Mix, Rex Sprouse, Andrzej Ziemiński, Kimberly James, Jen Crompton, Casey Cox

Visitors: Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Steve Hinnefeld (Hoosier-Times), Barbara Coffman (IU Foundation), Rex Stockton (Co-chair Foundation Relations Committee), Claude Clegg, Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Program Development

AGENDA ITEM #1: Approval of Minutes and Summaries

GROS LOUIS: Our first order of business is the approval of minutes and summaries that I think all of you saw the email earlier today, got an email from Bill Wheeler, asking that we approve the minutes of March 23 and April 6 and then also approve the summaries of February 3 and January 20th. Right Bill?

WHEELER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Any corrections? Anything you'd like to alter in those minutes or the summaries? As Bill indicated in the email to you, you will be getting the full minutes to expand on the summaries. If not I'll take it that they are approved as they have been distributed on email.

AGENDA ITEM #2: Agenda Committee Business

GROS LOUIS: I'll turn then to David and the Agenda Committee business.

DALEKE: And before I start I want to congratulate everyone for making it through yet another year of BFC business. In honor of that, in celebration, you'll find that one of your first items, yellow pages under the agenda is a Summary of Actions Taken. And that of course does not include anything that we do today. As you look through that you can see that we have dealt with a number of substantive issues, primarily in the vein of revising policies, such as the Conflict of Commitment and the Family Leave Policy, Conflict of Interest Policies. We've also issued a number of statements that assert the position of the BFC on a variety of different issues. We finally passed our Campus Mission Statement, which was a carry over from last year, as well as a statement on Diversity and also recommendations from the EPC about the anti-plagiarism software. So we will have other things to add to this list and this will be posted on the BFC website. Other things to be added from today's meeting. I encourage you to take a look at this. We're going to try to keep a running total of the things that we do over the, we do, keep a running total of the things that we do over the year, and it's important to look back not only for historical reasons but also to give you some sense of accomplishment. So congratulations on doing that.

The elections as you know are progressing. The Nominations Committee has come up with a ballot for the new Nominations Committee and that will go out to the new BFC members. I want to take this time to thank everybody that served on the BFC this year. You've done a tremendous amount of work as you can tell by the summary that we just talked about. And there are other things that will continue on to next year. And these will fall into the hands of the new BFC—things such as revisions to the Student Code that we talked about and also discussing undergraduate curricula and the topic of a general education curriculum. And these will carry on to next year. So for those of you who are leaving us this year, thank you very much for doing a fine job and ending your term or terms; I hope we'll see you back at some point. We will hound you for committee service of course; we hope that doesn't bother you too much. And for those of you who are continuing, we are looking forward to joining the new members and continuing on through next year. I will keep you posted on the progress of those elections as they come about.

IUSA has also turned over just recently. In fact, Grant McFann is here, I believe you are already done.

MCFANN: We're done.

DALEKE: I asked Grant and Casey to come, but Casey again has a class that conflicts with this time, mostly so that we can thank them for the work that they've done and I was hoping that some of the new IUSA members could be here today so that we could introduce them to you. I don't see any of them here. Tyson Chastain, Jesse Laffin, Scott Norman, and Gwen Hobley. But Grant, just wanted to give again a note of thanks to you for the work you've done on a number of things—from the Athletics fee that we recently discussed, to transportation issues, parking, the book drop at the library, access to newspapers which we think is a very good program—and congratulate you on all the work you've done this year. And please pass this on to Casey and the rest of your IUSA officers. Thank you. [Applause.]

MCFANN: Thank you.

DALEKE: I have a couple of issues to report on that were left over from our last meeting. First of all we passed a resolution on the access to the Biological, Research and Teaching Preserve. We passed that along to President Herbert and also I made contact with Vice President Clapacs to come to some resolution on this issue. We are in the process of bringing together those people that are most influenced by access to the Preserve so that they can come to some agreement about how and where that access will be. President Herbert has also asked Vice Presidents Clapacs and Gros Louis to participate in this process as well. So we're making progress and I'll keep reporting back as I guess from now on by email, as things move along.

Also we talked about PeopleSoft naming issues and I contacted Don Hossler and Becky Porter, neither of whom could be here at today's meeting about this. The APC met just recently, I believe it was Friday, and discussed this issue. And they are aware of the naming issue as a problem and mostly in the same context that our previous discussion illustrated. I asked them for a list of priorities for fixes to the PeopleSoft program, but that hasn't been sent out yet. I think they're in the process of also revising that list. It was in the context of that list that I was hoping we could have a discussion today, at least a brief one, as to where we would put this naming issue. I just think it's important for us to see the bigger picture of where, of the problems with PeopleSoft. Unfortunately we don't have that today so again this is something that we'll have to pass on by email. I know that both Herb and Ann have put together a resolution regarding this issue; we have a new business section at the end of the meeting and if you wish at that time to bring it up we can continue it then. And I'll let you have some time to think about it.

TERRY: Do you have a copy of our resolution?

DALEKE: Yes, we do.

TERRY: OK.

DALEKE: We also passed the Family Leave Policy with a recommendation that it be reviewed over the course of this year but that it be renewed for the next three years. It was brought up by the Agenda Committee that there may be problems with the wording and we're also going to bring that up under New Business. Some minor changes that just have to do with asking the Trustees to charge us to do something, when actually we can just charge ourselves to do that. So I'll bring that up and it will involve maybe a change of about 3 or 4 words to the resolution that we passed last time. But in the meantime we'll also have copies of that distributed to you at the meeting today.

You have today's meeting agenda before you. I'm not going to go through much of the detail of this because, in the interest of time, but I just want to point out that the last report by Kathy Gilbert from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee and Julie Knost who is from the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity. We may not get to that report even though we have a very nice bound version of it sitting in front of Julie. We discussed this as the Agenda Committee and had decided that if it got to the point where we didn't have enough time to adequately review this document that we would take it up at the first meeting of next year. And in fact, we've discussed this with Julie and with Kathy too so it's ok with both of them. But we'll see how things go today so we might actually get to it.

That's all I had for Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM #3: Presiding Officer's Business

GROS LOUIS: I just wanted to indicate that, as all of you know, the Journalism search is continuing and I spoke with David earlier but let me ask now the Nominations Committee, which I gather will be the new Nominations Committee, to submit names of faculty both from Journalism and outside of Journalism for the reassembled search committee. And I think last time, if I understand correctly, the Nominations Committee went to the faculty in Journalism, and the faculty voted on the proposed membership. I've also asked the new IUSA officers for two student names and the Professional Staff Council and CWA for a staff name from each. In the case of Journalism the faculty in Journalism and the outgoing chair of the committee, search committee, have requested that the same people who served this past year from the professional staff and clerical, serve next year. And I've asked the two individuals who oversee those appointments if that's ok with them.

In addition, as you know, at the last meeting of the BFC each year I'm supposed to indicate the administrators to be reviewed in the coming year and also ask the Nominations Committee for names of faculty to serve on those review committee. Much to my dismay there are five people to be reviewed next year. Dick McKaig is up for review and obviously the faculty, he does have a faculty advisory committee, but given his responsibilities the faculty should come from a broad array of campus schools from the Nominations Committee.

The second administrator is Suzanne Thorin of the University Libraries. And again, the majority should come from the Libraries but because of her duties there should be a substantial number of faculty from other entities on the campus as well.

The third person to be reviewed is Dean Swamy in the College of Arts and Sciences and again the majority of the committee as called for in BFC procedures should come from the College, but there should be some faculty from outside the College as well, recommended by the Nominations Committee. Typically by the way in these reviews, the chair of the review committee does not come from the school or entity where the person is reviewed. So for example at least in past years, unless you recommend otherwise, the chair of the review committee for Swamy would come from outside the College, and similarly for Suzanne would come from outside the Libraries, etc.

The fourth person to be reviewed is Gerardo Gonzalez in the School of Education and again the majority of faculty, as called for my BFC procedures, should come from that school, but there should be faculty from other schools and in the case of Education, there should also be faculty from IUPUI. And I don't know how the Nominations Committee, if you simply ask the Nominations Committee there for some suggestions, which seems the most reasonable thing to do, or if you want me to do that, if so I will do that as well. In Gerardo's case, unlike Swamy and Suzanne, and Dick, he is also responsible for the Education program at IUPUI.

And the fifth person to be reviewed is Astrid Merget in SPEA. And because that school technically reports to Indianapolis the review procedures will be those of the IUPUI Faculty Council, which are very similar to ours. Probably the major difference is that the chair of their review committees is always some other dean, of a school other than SPEA obviously. That too is a school that functions on five campuses so the Nominations Committee should identify faculty from Bloomington, but also either identify through the Nominations Committee at IUPUI and the other three campuses where SPEA functions, or ask me to do that. I'd be happy to do that, either way. So it's up to the Nominations Committee in the case both Gerardo and Astrid who will have faculty, Gerardo from Indianapolis, and Astrid from four other campuses besides Bloomington. And as with the others I'll be asking IUSA for student names and the Professional Staff Council and CWA for staff names.

What I'd like to do is get these committees at least organized before the end of the May. But if anyone asks none of the committees will meet until late in August or early September. So if anyone says do we have to be here this summer the answer is no, it's simply good to have the committees in place and even the dates set for the first meeting, even if that date is the end of August or early September. So the committee has time. And I believe there will also be a survey next year of Gwyn Richards in the School of Music. It's his third year. Is that right Mary?

ANDREWS: Fourth year. It should have been this year but it wasn't done.

GROS LOUIS: Ok, so we'll have a survey next year.

WENNERSTROM: I was going to ask you are these people you just mentioned in their fifth year?

GROS LOUIS: Yes, yes McKaig is actually in his sixth year, but the other five, well Suzanne it's her fourth year after her first review, so as you know it's in the fifth year and every four years

thereafter. Swamy, Astrid, and Gonzalez they're going into their fifth year. So it's their first review.

ANDREWS: I'm not sure Astrid came the same time as Gerardo.

GROS LOUIS: She did.

ANDREWS: She came the same as Gerardo.

GROS LOUIS: She told me she did. She may be trying to trick us into something. I don't know. I think the difference may be that she didn't start until October.

KNOT: I think she was hired in July and started later.

ANDREWS: That's right.

GROS LOUIS: But she's the one that brought it to my attention when I announced these at the last meeting.

ANDREWS: She must know.

GROS LOUIS: Well either that or she's trying to pull a fast one. Who knows?

WENNERSTROM: Gwyn will be in his fourth year next year. So.

GROS LOUIS: OK. So we really should have done the survey this year rather than the survey next year. So those are the people to be reviewed. As I said get the names to me sometime in the next few weeks, four weeks so I can get the committees formed before the end of May.

I want to remind you that you are all invited to my home for a reception after this meeting, we'll begin at 6, but if you get there earlier that's fine. If you, many of you have been at my house before, but if you can't find it the phone number is xxx-xxxx and we'll tell you; tell us where you are and we'll tell you how to get there. If you know where you are. And we'll tell you how to get there from there. When you get to be my age you hear a lot of stories about elderly people and one I heard recently that I pass on sometimes. There's two women or two men, it could be easily two men, they've been playing cards together for 55 years. And they are playing cards one night and one man says to the other you know this is very embarrassing but I don't remember your name, could you please tell me. And the other man thought for a few minutes and said how soon do you need to know? [Laughter.]

In any case, the next item on the agenda...

AGENDA ITEM #4: Question/Comment Period

GROS LOUIS: Any questions or comments, Don?

LICHTENBERG: I have here before me something I didn't expect to have but it says that for total voluntary support IU is 15th in the nation. It also says that among the public...

GROS LOUIS: You're going to hear more about this later during the Foundation report you know.

LICHTENBERG: Among public universities in the Big 10 Indiana has the most, number one, in endowed positions.

GROS LOUIS: Right.

LICHTENBERG: In view of all this support in endowed positions why are we still next to last in the Big 10 in faculty salaries?

GROS LOUIS: Good question. And when the Foundation report gets up Curt, I'm sure, will ask me to answer that question.

Alright. Any other questions or comments?

THIBOS: Did that answer your question?

GROS LOUIS: We'll get back to that Don when we hear the report. Ted?

MILLER: Could you review for us the situation regarding the Athletics Fee, Ken?

GROS LOUIS: Yes, the committee had its first meeting last Friday. Kurt Zorn is chairing the committee. I asked the Agenda Committee for names of people and the following three faculty, in addition to Kurt, Dan Maki, as co-chair of the Athletics Committee, Bob Kravchuk, as co-chair of Budgetary Affairs, and Carolyn Walters, who is on the Student Fee Commission, the faculty representative to that. Paul Sullivan who is from Athletics, actually works with Terry Clapacs, but Terry has had him working in Athletics; the ingoing and outgoing IUSA Presidents, and the outgoing Graduate Student Organization President, Jesse, who's on the Council. And I think that's it, right Jesse? Membership.

NELSON: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: So what we came up with last week after trying a variety of approaches is a we think a proposal that achieves the 1.1 million that the \$30 fee was supposed to raise. And if its approved, and there have been several modifications since then, then there should not need to be a fee, a \$30 fee. Much of it depends on the student response and the, I had to leave before the end of the meeting, but at the end of the meeting it was agreed that Casey and Tyson and Jesse would go back to their student constituents and see what they thought of some of the ideas that we came up with. Since then Athletics has proposed an optional, a couple of optional plans, but that plan also achieves the 1.1 million—which is, by the way, what our charge was, not to come up with the full 2 million dollar deficit, but to come up with what the \$30 fee would have raised had the fee been approved. It's still possible of course that the fee will be it. Part of our challenge as I

said, and the committee completely understands, is that we have to have the money in hand so that some of the proposals you may have read about in the IDS, such as having students buy more football tickets to raise the revenue, we can't count on that and certainly the Trustees at the meeting in the first week of May need something in hand. So we have to come up with proposals where actually the money is on the table or at least is potentially on the table.

Another option we thought was advertising. Unfortunately, not unfortunately, but it's a fact that the Athletics Department has 2 years to go with its contract with the current advertising agency it works with and can't make pre-negotiations at this time. So that's not an option.

So the options are doing something with the student tickets and/or with all ticket prices and then perhaps secure the try to increase the number of football tickets that are purchased by students; by that I mean, if the students in one option were to give up some of their basketball seats to be sold to the general public, they would get them back in proportion to the number of football tickets sold beyond 5,000—which is the number of student football tickets sold last year.

We also know that next year is unusually difficult year, compared to the year after next, because there are only 5 home football games and usually there's another, 6 sometimes 7. There are still not the full complement of 18 home basketball games; there will be two more than this year, there were 14 this year and next year there will be 16 I believe or something like that. But every home basketball game is \$280,000 so if you don't have 18, the year that we have 14 and that more than a million dollars really was lost. So both because there will be more games, more football games, and I'm not sure about Kentucky but Ohio State and Purdue will be back here; that's the other problem next year, not only are there only 5 games but Ohio State, Kentucky, and Purdue will not be here, and they tend to bring, as you know, sizable numbers of fans.

MILLER: You were quoted Ken in the paper saying that the idea of cutting athletic department programs was not something that was going to be considered. Whose, where does that come from?

GROS LOUIS: It was a comment that President Herbert has made to me on several occasions; it's also something that I believe strongly in that we should not look to solve the problem by reducing men's sports. And I can, anyway, it's something the President has indicated, it's something that I feel strongly about. If the committee feels otherwise obviously it can do what it wishes, but I think it's a very unfortunate option.

MILLER: Well I think many of us sitting around the table have confronted very unfortunate options in our units that resulted in program cuts of some substance. You know and it's kind of an odd idea that we're going to exempt that unit from any talk about cutting.

GROS LOUIS: Well it's something, as I say, if members of the Council feel strongly, by all means, let me know or Kurt Zorn know that this is something that you don't think should be off the table. I just feel the morale of the department is such, even morale as it is, that the opportunity to have the sports that we have is such that it would be a shame, the only sport that's going to make...another point Ted is that even if you were to cut a sport now your savings, as it

would with an academic department, aren't going to be realized in time to do much with this deficit. And the only sport of sizable numbers is baseball.

Yes, Luis?

DAVILA: Ken, there are two items I'd actually like to bring up here at our closing session for the year. First, an item that's been lying dormant since we first, barely, discussed it at the beginning of our academic year, and that is what we might be able to do if anything about bringing the Faculty Handbook a bit more in line with the Student Code of Ethics that's just been subscribed to once more. I'm not sure that we can do much. As I learn more about how faculty are employees as supposed to how we deal with students and the labor laws that are involved as well as the question of academic freedom and the First Amendment as it might apply to faculty, but I do think that it's very mortifying to know that the least of our brethren sometimes—that is the gay, lesbian students that I know only through cyberspace, I don't know them—have at least inquired if anything at all will be done. And I think it's incumbent on us for next year to at least deal with this in some way or another—administratively, possibly sometimes that's the best way to go—if we can't temper much with the Faculty Handbook. But it is something that still bothers some young people, and maybe older people too that belong to this minority. And we temporized a bit and we laid it dormant for a while but it's something that needs to be confronted. So I just say this at this point so that hopefully we might at least broach this, be it in Faculty Affairs or whatever other avenue might be germane.

Secondly, a very mundane, if you like, inquiry again; I feel that we still have the eye soar of that link fence to the north of the Auditorium that seems to be just a big vacant wasteland. And it's actually dangerous at parts as many of us walk to and from the Library. And we soon will be receiving parents once more during the summer with hopes for their young children to start at IU, and I forget who it was that you told me I should inquire of, there was someone on the faculty. But I think at least we ought to find out how soon we can, if you like, redress this beautiful campus of ours. And I think that sore thumb hurts us all landscape wise. And even linking the first item I mentioned, the very gyroscopic soul that we wish to embrace as a faculty is in part touched by how we, if you like, leave our campus at times go on for wilds upon end. So I know that we can't have a gyroscopic, moral panacea but I think we do need to remember the diversity that we so much proclaim and practice. Sorry I made this a little longer than I wanted to.

GROS LOUIS: Those are very good points, thank you. I think we've reached the end of our time for questions and comments, I'm sorry. If there are other things by all means email them to me or to David.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: Educational Policies Committee Resolutions on Admissions,
Retention, and Graduation
(Professor William H. Wheeler, Chair, Educational Policies Committee)**

GROS LOUIS: Item five is a recommendation from the Educational Policies Committee and I will turn it over to Bill Wheeler.

WHEELER: Thank you. You have before you the resolution that's proposed by the Educational Policies Committee. The Educational Policies Committee this year has spent a lot of time discussing both general education requirements and also admissions policies—we've examined some data on those things. And in the course of our discussions we've become, well we've learned a lot and we've also felt that the Council should hear many of these things. We will be reporting on these things in our annual report that will be submitted over the summer, but looking ahead we thought it would be good to have the appropriate administrative offices present annual reports to the Council so that the Council could on a regular basis discuss these issues which are of great interest and concern to all of us: admissions standards, retention patterns, graduation patterns, and things of that nature.

So we present to you today this fairly brief resolution that calls for the appropriate officers of the campus to present report to us in October or November in each year. The resolution provides that the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services, who is Don Hossler, and the Director of Admissions, Mary Ellen Anderson, should present a report on undergraduate admissions to the Council each year in October or early November.

Secondly, the chairperson of the Campus Retention Committee, Ray Smith currently, the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services, again Don Hossler, and the Registrar, Roland Cote currently, should present a report on retention of undergraduates, again each year in October or early November.

Third the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services and the Registrar should present a report on graduation patterns of undergraduates each year in October or early November. And those individuals have agreed that they thought this was a good idea and that the timing in October or early November was a reasonable time for them. And fourth is that these reports should be prepared in consultation with the Council's Educational Policies Committee so that we can help shape those reports to respond to our and your concerns.

GROS LOUIS: This comes to you from the EPC and therefore it is moved and seconded, the resolution. So the floor is open for questions or comments on the resolution. Yes, Don and then Peggy?

LICHTENBERG: Yes, is this supposed to lead to actions on the part of the Faculty Council or just for information?

WHEELER: Well the Educational Policies Committee has been discussing both a general education requirement and also a model admissions policy for the campus and we would hope to bring that to the, we'll be reporting on that in our annual report, and bringing that to the Council for its consideration next year.

GROS LOUIS: Peggy?

INTONS-PETERSON: It seems to me that this is an excellent resolution and something that the Council should welcome.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

RASMUSEN: It probably shouldn't be in the resolution but it would be good to provide guidance as to what should be in the report very specifically so maybe the EPC should prepare some guidelines for exact figures as to what admissions statistics is like.

WHEELER: That's the purpose of item four.

GROS LOUIS: There are each year, there is a very detailed retention report and a very detailed graduation report that I guess the EPC has seen. There are different versions of the admissions report but the EPC I'm sure could ask to see each and then decide which is the most complete to bring to the Council. Yeah?

NASH: I'm interested Bill if there's any reason why these reports are restricted only to undergraduate patterns? Would it not make sense to have similar reports about graduate admission, retention, etc.?

WHEELER: We could. The Committee has primarily been concerned with undergraduate programs because the graduate programs are usually handled by the individual departments whereas undergraduate admissions are handled by a campus-wide unit and there's a sense that individual departments and individual schools pay great attention to their graduate programs. But it's this Council that has responsibility for paying attention to the undergraduate population as a whole.

GROS LOUIS: John?

SLATTERY: I think the faculty might actually be surprised by some of the numbers you'd see on retention, attrition, and time-to-degree, in graduate programs.

WHEELER: We can certainly include that.

SLATTERY: And it's a key issue nationally in recruitment of graduate students and there's kind of more and more talk about actually putting that sort of information up on web pages so that students will see those programs where they have the highest probability of success and success in a reasonable time.

WHEELER: Well might I ask rather than trying to frame a friendly amendment at this point that we refer that to Educational Policies Committee to frame it because it would have to be a separate office and the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services is not involved in graduate admissions and, nor is that an appropriate office to give a report on graduation patterns for graduate students. So we would need to frame a similar clause involving the Dean for Graduate Studies and Deans of the individual schools for that purpose. So if it meets with your approval if we can just refer that to Educational Policies Committee and we'll come forward with something next year.

NASH: That's fine.

SONI: Bill are the dates, are the dates realistic? Will the campus have data before October so it can be shared with the Educational Policies Committee by then?

WHEELER: Yes. Yes. The only one where the data was a near call is concerning graduation because the data, although there is a graduation in August, the corrected grades for the summer semesters are not due until the middle, or the end of the September. And so the final data on August graduation is not available until toward the end of September. An earlier version of this had called for these reports to be submitted in early October; Roland Cote, the Registrar said that that was not really practical. And so, he said, you know, that later in October would probably be feasible for him. And so we've said October or early November. The early November date appears to be feasible for all of these things.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Ted.

MILLER: Well I think John Slattery has a nice idea here. And rather than wait until next year to do this let me just try a friendly amendment to this. It could read as simply as that "The Dean for Graduate Studies should present a report on graduate admissions, retention, and time to degree, to the Bloomington Faculty Council each year in, I don't know is October or November, is that a reasonable time frame?

SLATTERY: Yeah, that would be fine.

MILLER: So it could fit this pattern very nicely I think.

GROS LOUIS: I assume this would exclude the MBA or the Law students, etc.

MILLER: Yeah, the degrees that the Graduate School is responsible for.

GROS LOUIS: Can you repeat that? Ted why don't you repeat that so that we have the exact wording or something similar?

MILLER: Well I believe John's title is Dean for Graduate Studies.

SLATTERY: Yes, this week. [Laughter.]

MILLER: We'll have to have, we may need some alternate language to substitute. The Dean for Graduate Studies should present a report on graduate admissions, retention, and time-to-degree, to the Bloomington Faculty Council each year in October or early November.

GROS LOUIS: Bill do you want to take that as a friendly amendment?

WHEELER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Is there a second?

TERRY: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Unless there's no objection Bill has agreed that the EPC, on behalf of the EPC, to take it as a friendly amendment.

DALEKE: And I take it that that is inserted as item number four and item number four now becomes item number five.

WHEELER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Any further questions or comments on this resolution now amended? Herb?

TERRY: I just have one comment on the amendment. This list, items one through three, emerged out of the work of the Educational Policies Committee this year. We learned through our work that it would be useful to ask for information and what it would be useful to ask about. I hope in adopting Ted's proposal we're not limited to that. If the Educational Policies Committee would like additional data, if John wants to offer additional data, I hope the reports could be a little freer than just those three topics. If that's really what would inform the committee and if that's what the Educational Policies Committee deems would be useful.

GROS LOUIS: Let the record show that. Any further questions or comments? If not, all those in favor of the resolution indicate by saying Aye [Aye], Opposed [none], Abstentions [none]. It carries. Thank you, Bill.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: Foundation Relations Committee Annual Report and Update on
Capital Campaign (15 minutes)**

**(Curt Simic, Director, IU Foundation, Professors Sarita Soni and Rex Stockton, co-chairs,
BFC Foundation Relations Committee)**

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B46-2004.htm>

GROS LOUIS: The next item on the agenda is the Foundation Relations Committee annual report and an update on the Capital Campaign. Sarita are you going to start?

SONI: This was my first year on this particular committee, as co-chair, and my co-chair Rex Stockton certainly taught me a lot of things on this committee, as did Curt Simic and Barbara Coffman. So I want to thank them for helping me through this year. The committee has met twice already this year, and is going to be meeting again next week. We're going to end up having three meetings. And the committee also went to the very first meeting of the IU Foundation Board of Directors meeting in October, most of the committee went to the different committee sessions at that time. But the second meeting was away from Bloomington and Rex and I represented the Foundation Relations Committee at that particular meeting.

It's really very interesting to attend some of those IU Board of Directors meetings. And it's wonderful to see how seriously the Board of Directors take their task of raising funds for IU and also investing these funds. Curt has been a wonderful person, as far as this particular committee is concerned. He has welcomed us with all the questions that the committee had and I take a great deal of pleasure in introducing Curt, the President of the IU Foundation today to you to discuss the campaign for the Bloomington campus. Curt?

SIMIC: Thank you, Sarita. Thank you very much. I appreciate being invited each year to talk with you a little bit about what we're trying to do. I know the time is tight so I'll try to be pretty close in what I do. Just to reiterate some things that you probably read in the newspaper and they were referred to just a moment ago, we were 15th in the nation. This is the 12th year in the last 14 that we've been in the top 20 in the nation; we were 7th among public universities. We usually range between 7th and 12th. And we were 2nd among the Big 10 institutions; we usually range between 6th and 2nd. We were, well once we were first when we got a major grant in another place. It really comes down to good work by the faculty, whether it's relating directly to individual donors or its seeking support that's directly focused on your particular work. But last year was a record number of donors at nearly 106,000 donors; individuals, corporations, and foundations. They were world-wide in terms of their distribution and they were world-wide I think in terms of where they gave across the landscape of the institution.

Ten years ago we received about 49 million dollars in gift funds annually; this last five years its averaged about 140 million dollars. So progress has been pretty steady and it continues to move on. This past year that I'm referring to gift funds were 164 million and non-governmental research was about 85.5 million dollars. So those two together comprise total private support as defined by the national agency that does the surveying on this. There were about 100, not about 100, about 1,000 universities that participated in the survey so it's not a small thing at all to be there. So things are good.

You may have heard the President say in his Inaugural Address that he expected us to increase giving at 10 percent per year over the next period of years and when you do that and compound it out it doesn't take very long for that to get to be 100 percent. So it will be a busy next few years. In our own strategic plan we had 12 percent as our goal because we felt that on a normal year we're someplace around seven percent and we should try to stretch ourselves. The issue will really be will we put the resources into fundraising that we need to get that done. One of the things that's happened over the last decade or so is we have seen an increase of investment in fundraising by the deans in the various schools and the colleges and that's really been very, very important. We have not particularly grown very much in proportion as far as our budget is concerned for fundraising but because of that increased investment, which means more people out asking for money in a more defined and focused kind of way with its own constituency, then we've had a very good response across the institution.

One of the things that is going on that drives these numbers right now is the IUPUI campaign. I looked at the numbers today and the last report is 937 million. So we really have a chance before the end of that campaign to hit a billion dollars. We've avoided very carefully, avoided using the b-word in fundraising these last fifteen years. We didn't alienate the legislature. We felt that using that might be a problem. The usual cycle of a campaign, by the way, is about 7 years, 2

years or 3 years in quiet phase, and then 4 years public. And over the last several seven-year cycles, again they overlap, we've been raising about 1.5 billion, 1.4 or 1.5 billion, so there's been good giving. And I love to chide my friends at Purdue who say they are doing the first billion dollar campaign and I say, been there, done that. And we have, we've had good support from across the institutional family.

You do have some material on endowed chairs and professorships; I just thought you'd find that interesting. It compares all the institutions in the Big 10, there's a chart, kind of a matrix-looking chart, and on the back side it defines what that is and we last did that survey I think just a, well in the last year to see where we stood against what happened. It was the Bloomington academic endowment campaign that moved us from the bottom of the Big 10 to the top of the Big 10. It was really quite successful. It's not all chairs and professorships, it's all endowed faculty positions and that can include some library positions or some curatorships and a variety of things across the spectrum of the institution. I just simply thought that you'd find that interesting as well as the ranking material that you have.

The other piece that you have is this little booklet and this is the booklet that describes the matching program for endowed graduate fellowships. And this sort of segways into the Campaign. One of the reasons, I am convinced, that we succeeded in the endowed chairs and professorships campaign is because we had an income match. That is, matching the 5 percent that the million dollars, or the half million dollars would yield. And so when we've been in conversation really over the last three or four years when George Walker was the champion for graduate fellowships, and always was a champion for it, we started looking for a way to do some income matching and the institution came up with that. And that I think will help us a lot.

Our constituency understands scholarships and they're forthcoming with undergraduate scholarships; John and I talked about this on his first visit to the campus. It is not as tied in to graduate fellowships. It doesn't understand, I don't think, the immediacy of the need for graduate fellowships so creating this inducement which is the income match, we think will help us as we make the case for graduate fellowships. That is the top of the list of things that we would like to achieve; and again, when I say we it's what the institution wants us to do so we just become the collective wheel on that. The institution decides what it would like to raise funds for and we try to do some testing to find out what will sell in the marketplace of gift giving and then we build a campaign around that. So the graduate fellowships is the number one. And income match, as I understand it, Neil or Ken can correct me, is a part of the special fee, the fee for excellence that's been allocated on that basis.

That's also true for the second priority of the campaign which will be undergraduate scholarships, also endowed as well. We deliberately did not roll out the undergraduate scholarships at the same time we started talking about graduate fellowships because we were concerned that the donor public would gravitate to the undergraduate scholarships. So our thought was let's get the graduate fellowships out there first, that is the first priority. Let's work with that for a year or two and then we'll roll out the undergraduate scholarship piece of the thing and pick it up from there.

There are a variety of categories under the undergraduate scholarships—four to be exact. One is

to focus on recruitment of first generation students. That has some implications for diversity as you'd expect and so that was a focal point. There is a desire to expand the Wells' scholars program; that certainly has been a very successful program for the institution and to expand the support that's available in the Honors program, the Honors College as well as we go forward with that one. So it's high-achieving students, undergraduates, with those three or four little categories.

The only construction piece so far that is in the campaign is the Multi-Disciplinary Science Building and that's the first building, the phase 1 building. The need from the private gifting side is about 25 or 26 million dollars. In two gifts, one from Lilly as a part of the INGEN grant 10 million and then the one from the Simon family is another 9 million so, and there are another couple million already committed so that one's beginning to look like it's pretty well in place for the time being. The Simon gift will not be cash, it will be over time, so there's an issue of financing the construction of the building as we go forward but [end of tape 1 side A, some words lost]. It's very good, it's long term, and their devotion to IU is very much appreciated and has potential to grow at least I have to think out a little bit too, what the next campaign is going to look like. But it really does, it's a great family, and we're dealing with not only the first generation, the Mel and Bren part of the generation, we're dealing with the children too and they're all participating financially in this as well. The children are not participating with deferred or state gifts, they are doing cash and the seniors are partially cash and partially estate-kinds of gifts.

There are some learning experience initiatives, that's what they're called. One is to see if we can develop further support for the international experience which has really, the central part of that has been Ed Hutton's 9 million dollar commitment to endow opportunities for students to go abroad sometime during their four years. It's in the Honors College as far as administration but it's broader. So there is other opportunity for other students to be participants in that. Mr. Hutton chaired, if you recall, some of us who were around years ago when we had the Foundation Relations Committee, Mary and me and Rex we asked Ed Hutton to chair the Wells Scholars campaign which he did and now he's come back to take the lead in this program. A graduate of Kelley School and just extremely supportive and got his international view of the world from Dr. Wells as you'd expect, not a surprise there. So that's 9 million endowment; our goal is to go to 18 million endowment in that. My hope is that we'll look at that in the context of an undergraduate scholarship that could perhaps be a matching part of it too, it will be up to the campus to decide whether that's what it wants to do with the match. There is some desire to find some undergraduate research funding as well as some service learning resources to make it go. That is pretty much what I had in the way of prepared. Ann?

GELLIS: I guess I'm a little bit surprised that there are not more funds going to be devoted to help what is a very severe problem on the campus and that is our capital improvement and infrastructure.

SIMIC: Well that will be up to the campus. I think one of the things that's happened, oh excuse me.

GELLIS: Let me just say that I think that people ought to think very strongly about advising and using the funds in this way. As a member of the Capital Priorities Committee this year the a 10-year capital improvement plan was put forth and I think it's already gone to the Board of Trustees. It calls for 2 new buildings, an enclosure of a courtyard, renovation of 8 existing structures, and upgrade in infrastructure for a total of 12 projects and an estimated cost of approximately 200 million dollars. The top priority would be for the Humanities Building, a new classroom building which would be the first general purpose academic building on the Bloomington campus built since Ballantine 45 years ago.

The group that was put together by the Vice President for Research to look at research space needs on the Bloomington campus estimates that Bloomington is in an urgent present need of 921,276 square feet with another 200,00 square feet needed within 10 years. So we, and the infrastructure needs I deal with everyday. We have, and part of it is obviously you know the cut in the R&R budget, but it's more substantial than that and it's much deeper than that. It seems to me how are we going to fund that 200 million dollars? If we wait for the state legislature to fund one building every four or six years we'll probably all be dead. We could probably debt finance some of it but I've looked at some of the numbers and there is I think in 2011 there will be a retirement of a great deal of amount of debt, but it looks like the university is already projected some uses. Now we know that the power plant has to be, a new power plant is needed for I think is it 150 or 170 million dollars. My guess is that most of our bonding authority will be taken up with that construction of the power plant. So that leaves us either no construction, no new space, or the Capital Campaign. And I would like to see that the, in terms of determination of priorities, that the needs of this campus both the teaching, office, and research, and for infrastructure, whether it's cooling plants or what have you, is undeniable and there is no other source of funds. I feel strongly about this.

SIMIC: I could tell. Ann used to be on our committee too, I understand. It really is up to the institution to guide us.

GELLIS: Well I hope the institution is listening.

SIMIC: Well I heard you. The President of course is weighing in, I'm sorry I'll finish this, the President is weighing in as far as his own view of what could happen and he has said to Ken and me too on occasion we have to do something in the humanities in the liberal arts. What form that will take, I don't know. But that has been spoken too. He's also been chided for not mentioning the sciences and whatever it was in one document somewhere along the line. But he is committed to that as well. But it is an institutional decision. What we can do once we have all these ideas and what needs to be done is we can at least test it in the marketplace and find out if it's possible. Now if it's something like renovation of buildings that went by the board when R&R went by the building, the truth of the matter is that's a hard sell.

GELLIS: Let me just quote from the web page of Purdue University for their 1.3 billion capital campaign...

SIMIC: We're past them.

GELLIS: ...which will fund more than 50 new buildings and renovation projects effecting almost every campus, school, and program in the university system. They are putting their money into build new buildings and renovations across the board. So if they, I assume they believe that they can collect the money for buildings. I always thought building in fact, and I realize renovations may not be as catchy as new buildings, but it seemed to me people like to see their names on the front of buildings or wings or annexes or bathrooms or whatever rather than some of these other things. I shouldn't think that it would be that hard a sell.

SIMIC: Well it isn't until you get out there selling it, then you have to find out. And I'm not speaking against it Ann, you know that.

LICHTENBERG: Yes I just had a question about this total voluntary support.

SIMIC: Oh, yes.

LICHTENBERG: When you look at Number 12 it says University of Wisconsin at Madison. And number 16 University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. But Number 15 IU Foundation it doesn't tell whether it's all 8 campuses.

SIMIC: It's across the board.

LICHTENBERG: So it's all 8 campuses being compared to one campus at a number of other places?

SIMIC: Seven campuses, we don't count what Fort Wayne raises because they are under the aegis of the Purdue; but yes, it is system-wide. There are really two campuses that raise significant money and they are Bloomington and Indianapolis. And the rest is important but in relative numbers it's not a big number.

LICHTENBERG: Why do you compare single campuses for other institutions in the Big 10 but for IU it's all 7 campuses?

SIMIC: I don't. I just send it in to the national organization and they do the tabulation. They know that this is the IU system.

SENUK: Very remarkable figures here and it looks like the gross national product of small countries. You had mentioned your hope that enough money would be put into fundraising to kind of get the kind of money you wish to get in the future. I was wondering how our fundraising costs compare with what we're bringing in?

SIMIC: We look every year at that and the return on investment in fundraising if you're between 10 and 15 cents on the dollar you've done well. We've been running around 12 cents. Now to tell you that that is a completely clear accurate, totally accurate figure, I can't tell you that because one of the things that's not into it is any portion of the Chancellor's time or any portion of the President's time, or any portion of the Dean's time. And if you put that number in there it would inflate it substantially. Our sister institutions across the Big 10 in particular have the same

problem. And when you try to get your hands around it what you can do is you can take the direct cost of fundraising and then you can do some divisor or divider on it and come up with a number. That's what we come up with. We're very similar to what the other Big 10 schools are and very similar in terms of comparators in contrast to the one, the point you just made.

SENCHUK: Just a follow up I just wondered where that money specifically is drawn from?

SIMIC: Oh, ok.

SENCHUK: And also as a side issue what the heck's going on at the University of Arkansas—Fayetteville?

SIMIC: 300 million gift from Sam Walton. That's easy. The year we were first among publics we had 105 million dollar gift from the Lilly Endowment. Where the money comes from, I'll speak to our budget, in addition to what the deans put in in their own development operations with development officers who report there, we pay partial salaries for about 30 development officers across the landscape of the institution. Right now in that program we're putting more into Indianapolis then we are Bloomington simply because that program when we started their Campaign was not as far evolved as this program was. We did the same thing in the academic endowment campaign when we built the program for the Bloomington campus what 10 years ago or so, whenever we started that. The money is coming from a variety of places. When we're in campaign mode we have drawn money from the campus—there's a commitment from the campus in the campaign mode. There's been a commitment in the last 2 campaigns, Indianapolis and Bloomington, 1 million dollars from the President's Office. I don't know that that's available anymore.

But the two major places where we get the funding for what we do are these: one we have a fee for service contract with the institution. It's about 4 million dollars, 4.2 million dollars. When it was put in place in 1989 it was supposed to cover the cost of fundraising. The cost of fundraising in terms of what we're putting into it now and that's all the support, research on prospects, all the things that go into creating brochures, etc. is more like 9.5 million dollars. So where we're getting that money is there's a charge against the ongoing Endowment that funds the fundraising to that degree. So the fundraising budget that we have is around 9-10 million dollars and it comes from those two places, a charge on the Endowment and this fee-for-service contract from the institution. Now going forward with the campaign the campus will put some incremental money into it. And the money we're talking about going into this next campaign will be in the neighborhood of 3 percent. Well you can't raise money for 3 percent, but you add 3 percent increment on top of what we've already got in place and you can move forward and raise money for 10 or 12 cents on the dollar and that's where we're heading. But the campus is putting in some money. I don't expect the President to put in any money. I don't think this President has much to work with. We were in a little better shape because of the market and a variety of other things in the past so I think those will be the two spots that we get it. That's why it's so important the investment that the deans are making. One of the things that you've seen happen in the College of Arts & Sciences is Swamy has put resources and there is a commensurate return on investment. That's moving along very, very nicely with what's going there. The Kelley School has put major resources in fundraising and that has shown in a variety of ways. The other unit in

the university is the Medical School and the Medical School has put a lot of money into fundraising and that's great because it shows in the numbers. And when I said the number about the IUPUI campaign about 35 or 40 percent of that is Medical School; it's a big number. But there are resources going into it. It's just one of those things that for me I have to have people out on the street talking to people because it's a one-to-one thing. We had to change the culture of this campus 10-12 years ago from what was a culture of stuffing envelopes and licking stamps into people going out to see people on a face-to-face basis. One of the things that if I say this word you will recoil, but our telefund produced almost 60,000 of those 106,000 donors last year. New gifts and renewals of gifts, and it works, it works very well. Our students, we pay students, get about a 29 percent return; now any other telefund doesn't get that and direct mail might get 1.5 percent so it's an effective approach. We're trying things across the board. Yes, sir?

OGREN: I'd like to return to Ann's topic just for a minute. That is there's two very important research buildings that have been approved by the state, MSBI and MSBII. And it's my understanding that the start of construction is being held up at the moment because of trying to align up funding for these. Do you know when they might be able to start?

SIMIC: I don't know the answer to that. You have the state...

GROS LOUIS: The groundbreaking for MSBI is early in June, I don't know the exact date.

SIMIC: June 3rd.

GROS LOUIS: June 3rd?

SIMIC: And the second one has also a gifting component that we haven't started on yet. I think it's about a 30-20, 30 million and 20 million in gifts as well so that's yet to be done.

GROS LOUIS: Eric?

RASMUSEN: I just don't want you to be left with the impression that we all like buildings. I think it's actually wonderful that you're going with graduate fellowships because I think that's the cheapest way to get leverage for improving any university and it's going to improve both teaching and scholarship, relatively cheaply, since graduate students do come a lot cheaper than faculty of the same talent. So I just want to commend you on that.

GROS LOUIS: John?

SLATTERY: If I could just expand on that a little bit Curt, kind of looking at the brochure here it really doesn't explain the impact of outstanding graduate students on a university at all. And actually the most effective way from the fellowship recipients standpoint in combining money is to combine some fellowship support with AI support and even RA support. And when you do that you're bringing the best teachers in that are going to be there in some of the undergraduate help sessions and that sort of thing and independent classes. And I think that, and the role that was just suggested here in terms of recruitment and retention of faculty, could actually be fleshed out much better. What you're contributing to in a very substantial way is the intellectual ecology

of the university and they have an extremely important part of kind of being the glue in these different pieces and they work shoulder to shoulder and so my approach kind of to selling it would actually be much more the impact on the quality of undergraduate education than it would be on trying to do a favor for a graduate student who in all probability doesn't come from the state of Indiana.

SIMIC: This one really needs, this particular document needs a lot of supplementation. The primary purpose of this document is just to explain the match, but it needs exactly what you're talking about. As we move forward you and I talked some time ago, we need your take on that to guide us.

SLATTERY: I'd be happy to work more closely with you.

SIMIC: Thank you.

SLATTERY: I guess one other thing that really does effect us but David we talked a little bit yesterday about the indirect cost issue and there is another source of money for building and that sort of thing and it might be interesting to get a subcommittee together at some time that would actually think about that issue on a national scale. I had appointments at both private and public institutions before coming here and it was amazing, neither one of them with much of an endowment, to look at the difference in quality. And I guess this institution that I came from went from calling themselves state-supported to what I actually wrote it down here, state-supported to state-assisted, and as the fraction of the state budget dropped to 16 percent they began calling themselves state-harassed. [Laughter].

SIMIC: My colleague who some of you will remember was on our staff is the Vice President at Penn State now for Development, and they have set aside a portion of the increase in indirect costs for buildings. But it's something that the university has to look at that. you have so many countervailing pressures.

SLATTERY: Yes, I understand.

GROS LOUIS: Laura?

GINGER: Curt, do you anticipate working with Tom Healy and that new Government Relations operation or him helping you?

SIMIC: Well I anticipate working with him, I'm not exactly sure how we'll fit together and what we'll do in that regard. But I think one of the sources for matching funds has to be the federal agencies. We did get some, and when I say we it wasn't us, the federal relations office did get some matching funds that were earmarked for emerging technology center and a variety of other things. So there's a way that we, there are many ways that we can work together. And what we're trying to do of course is leverage success in one place to beget success in another, whether it's on an interest matching basis or a facility matching basis, as we are with MS, Multidisciplinary Science Building, etc. So I anticipate doing that. In specific terms, we haven't even met.

GINGER: Thanks.

GROS LOUIS: Richard?

NASH: It's clear that when you come to meet with us that there's no shortage of good advice about how you can spend all this money that you are raising for us. I'm thinking of the question that we had earlier about whether or not there would be a need for an Athletics Fee given some of the problems with the Athletics budget. And I'm looking at the listing of voluntary support and it made me wonder can you give us an idea first of all what percent of those dollars are designated to the support of Athletics? And I'd like just your considered judgment about whether you think our current situation is likely to help in any way our attracting more money or perhaps convincing some people that voluntary support might be better spent in the College of Arts & Sciences?

SIMIC: Actually the fraction of money, of this number that goes to Athletics is very low. It's about 6 to 7 million dollars a year. What's interesting to me is we track a lot of things and one of the things that we track is what do members of the Hoosier Hundred, which is \$3,000 a year for athletes, do otherwise. The Hoosier Hundred membership gives more than twice that amount to the academic enterprise. In the total of what we're talking about anywhere from 98 to 99 percent, maybe 97 percent, in a year is designated by the donors across the board. So in the expenditure of all this money we're raising we go out and ask for designated money and that's what we get. Where there is undesignated money we have an obligation to return some to the President so that there is money for representation in the legislature and some other things that the President cannot use state funds for and so that's the primary direction that the rather small amount of unrestricted money goes. So that's why it's important for the institution to decide what it wants to raise funds for because everything we're going to talk about is what you say, not to raise unrestricted money and then portion it out in some way. We find that the donors, especially large potential donors, want to know exactly what it's going for and participate in a specific way. The Simon's got excited because they think that the basic science as it relates to continuing on into the applied science of medicine is really very exciting to them. They're making a difference, is the way they see that—as they were when they made the gifts to Music and to Hillel for that matter.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: I want to follow up on this before I forget. One of the first things that occurred to me to address the Athletics Department shortfall...

SIMIC: Oh, I didn't answer that question.

TERRY: ...was the question of whether there was someplace they could borrow the money from. That would create an incentive to the Athletics Department to find the money later and dig itself out of this hole. And if it is indeed partly a function of just not having in one year the proper number or mix of games or something, an odd year, that would seem to me better than tinkering with ticket prices or other things that might not produce the money right away or might

not produce money. Do you function in that way? Could the Athletics Department take a loan from you?

SIMIC: Well we have made loans but we have to look at the collateral. We've provided a bridge loan for the Kelley School when those pledges were being made. We could make a three-year commitment on the bridge loan. We provided the bridge loan for the emerging technology building. The thing that we mostly put money into is the acquisition of property across the spectrum of the state. Each of the campuses has its master plan and rather than say we're going to expand in the property north of the river in South Bend and watch all the prices go up, what we simply do, the university does, is it waits for something to come on the market, comes to us to buy it, and what we do is put together a series of leasebacks that ends up paying the money back. The reason for that is none of the money belongs to us. All of the money belongs to somebody else so we can't just even without interest loan it away; we have to load it with interest because somebody's depending on that interest to support itself.

TERRY: But if it hasn't been on the table though, I hope that a bridge loan is another thing that the committee will consider.

GROS LOUIS: It's out. Off the table.

SIMIC: I would really have to look at the collateral.

GROS LOUIS: Our difficulty is that Athletics has already borrowed.

GELLIS: Get the first draft choice.

SIMIC: One of the things that is always asked of me by the Foundation Relations Committee and by the way, it's a pleasure to work with the committees of this, the subcommittee of this organization, is how they can help. Rarely do people say I remember who was in this administrative position or that administrative position when we talk to them—they remember faculty members. They remember who they were with in the classroom. They remember who seemed to care about them as individuals when they talk about making major kinds of gifts. And it's just universal. So what the faculty can do to make it possible for us to be successful in fundraising is just what you do. Do it well, do it in the classroom, do it with attention, do it with your research fellows, and that makes it a lot more, makes us a lot more effective.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you very much.

LICHTENBERG: Excuse me. I didn't hear the answer to my question about faculty salaries.

GROS LOUIS: I'll try to answer it quickly. The paradox Don is for IU salaries to be 4th in the Big 10 we'd have to be 1st. Ward Scott has proven that over the years as his successors have. The problem is our peculiar mix of programs. So I don't think that the figures that you saw in the paper Sunday accurately reflect what the Trustees agreed to some years ago; which is to take out of the other institutions average salaries their engineering salaries. Because we're the only institution that does not have engineering. And engineering tends to be a highly paid field.

Therefore, the AAUP figures will look much different if you took out engineering from all those other schools that have it. Now you get into questions about taking out other programs, etc. but that's too complicated. It's our peculiar mix of programs. Thus the better information is the American Association for Universities Data Exchange which gives salaries by school and by department in arts and sciences. In those figures some of our schools are among the top three in the Big 10. Some of our departments in the College are first in the Big 10. Some are not, some are 8th and 9th and 10th as well. But you see a greater variety if you look at the campus salaries school by school vis-à-vis other schools in the Big 10 and department by department vis-à-vis other departments in the Big 10. So it's a lot more complicated.

NASH: Could we get that information linked to the BFC web page?

GROS LOUIS: I don't know when the AAU data comes out. Neil do you know? I talked with Judy Palmer about it and I know that she intends to make use of the AAUDE as we have in the past. The AAUP is just better known because many of us get Academe. But it's apples to apples is really what the AAU Data Exchange does. And it's much more revealing and much more helpful. Jim?

SHERMAN: I don't remember the answer to this. I assume that the salary reported in the HT was for IU Bloomington only.

GROS LOUIS: Yes.

SHERMAN: Does that mean in addition to not including engineering because we don't have any it doesn't include the Medical School?

GROS LOUIS: Right.

SHERMAN: Which would also be a higher paying department. So everyone but Purdue has a Medical School on their campus.

GROS LOUIS: Except I don't think, Jim, I don't think Medical School salaries are included in the AAUP figures.

SHERMAN: Ok.

GROS LOUIS: Anyway.

SHERMAN: But in the newspapers figures?

GROS LOUIS: No but I mean when schools submit their salaries to AAUP they're told to exclude administrative salaries and medical school salaries. I'm almost certain that's correct. Eric?

RASMUSEN: I actually have my wireless here and that Data Exchange does have a website but it's under construction so there's no reports now.

GROS LOUIS: Well I've seen it on paper. In the old days...

AGENDA ITEM #7 Annual Report: Faculty Board of Review (10 minutes)
(Bonnie Brownlee, Chair, Faculty Board of Review)

GROS LOUIS: The next item on the agenda is the annual report of the Faculty Board of Review. And I'll call on Bonnie.

BROWNLEE: As many, perhaps, most of you probably know, the Faculty Board of Review is one of the two campus faculty run committees charged with dealing with faculty grievances. I'm going first today but in reality on the Board of Review we think of ourselves as the second of the two committees. That is, the last place for appeal for faculty who have grievances. The Board's role is to hear and to make recommendations regarding complaints about a range of issues. Those include dismissal, reappointment or non-reappointment, tenure, promotion, conditions of work, salary, academic freedom. The Board makes its recommendation, generally its to the Chancellor, oh the Chancellors gone, generally to the Chancellor, who has the option of either accepting the recommendation or rejecting it, or doing something in between.

The system is set up in two stages and its set up that way to allow for resolving conflicts amicably at the first level, which is the Mediation Committee. Typically a faculty member will take his/her grievance to that committee first seeking a less confrontational resolution than what the Board likely promises. Once a faculty member gets to the Board often he/she will come with an attorney or some other representation or representative and the administrative people against whom the faculty member has brought a case may well have some representation as well.

Grievants however may first come to the Board. That is, they may bypass the Mediation Committee and come directly to the Board. Or, sometimes the Mediation Committee may hear a case very briefly and decide that it's not going to pursue that case and rather encourages the grievant to come directly to the Board of Review. I mention this only because such was the case with the one case that the Board of Review this year heard. There are some other issues that the committee dealt with but we heard one case. And I want to mention this case just briefly; I'm not going to give you the details of the case I don't think that that's appropriate or even necessary.

But I wanted to mention this one case because the substance of it is a reminder to all of us, to all of the units, of a need to develop, if we don't have them, and to follow, if we do have them, policies regarding non-tenure track academic appointees—this handbook that all the units have and probably most of us haven't paid much attention to. The policies actually that we need to follow with non-academic, non-tenure track academic appointees are really very much the same as those with regular faculty members. So this case we had dealt with the non-reappointment of a person who holds the Lecturer position; that's one of the new defined positions. And this case revolved around the circumstances of the review and of the manner of non-reappointment. The concern of the Board was with the manner that the review was done of this individual and the manner of notification which was a bit confused. The lesson of the case, and this was actually a

lesson I felt very personally coming from my unit which I think has generally good policies but it made me step back a bit and think about the importance once again of writing and following policies regarding the non-tenure track folks. It's especially important I think to mention this and to reiterate it—Moya mentioned this and reiterated it yesterday at the AAUP meeting—because of the increasing number of non-tenure track appointees that we have on this campus. And they need to be treated like regular faculty members because that's the role that they're playing.

In addition to this one case that we heard the Board was approached early in the year with two cases that dealt with academic freedom and conditions of work. Those two individuals disappeared so we never pursued that case because they disappeared. And then just recently at the end of the year of course is the time when tenure and promotion notifications are given and we've just been approached by two people who have been denied tenure this year. Whether they will ask for hearings we don't yet know. So that's my very brief report about the Board of Review. I would like to thank my compatriots on the Board of Review—this is really difficult work. It's hard to work one's way through the issues that we had to deal with. So I'd like to thank Jack Bielasiak, Malcolm Brown who is from the Council but I don't think is here today, Joe Miller, Dick Rubin, and Dennis, who kindly stepped in at the last moment with the case that we did have to hear because of a potential conflict of interest of one of our members. Thank you.

DALEKE: Thank you, Bonnie. Does anyone have any questions?

WENNERSTROM: I was just wondering if you could say anything more about the notification problems that you ran into with the non-tenure track. I mean isn't it, I mean we're supposed to return it to the Dean of Faculties office right when they're not.

BROWNLEE: This was complicated in a way that I don't think any other unit would complicate it. I mean we complicate it in our own special way I guess. This had to do with timing, the language of the letter, and then the language of a subsequent letter, and...

WENNERSTROM: I mean it seems...

BROWNLEE: If you follow the rules you're ok.

WENNERSTROM: ...I mean the way it's set up. I mean you write back to the Dean of Faculties office with a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment I think. And then you let the person know one way or the other. I mean is that, you're not suggesting the basic procedures are?

BROWNLEE: No, no. The procedures are here, they're clear. It's a matter of following it and I think one of the, it's easy not to follow the rules because I think we sort of thought at least, maybe I'm just speaking for myself here I don't know, but we sort of thought of what we used to call part-time people as kind of a different classification of colleagues. But when we're now talking about lecturers and clinical appointees they really are in the same category except with a different title.

WENNERSTROM: We treat them just like the regular faculty procedures.

BROWNLEE: They need to be reviewed each year. And they need to be reviewed in the same sorts of ways that we review colleagues, regular faculty colleagues.

DALEKE: Michael?

HAMBURGER: Has anybody tracked the results of these reviews over periods of several years? In general, how is the administration responding to the recommendations of the Board of Review?

BROWNLEE: Well I used to chair, for many years I chaired the Mediation, the Grievance and Mediation Committee and we sort of tried to track these as they went along and we always felt, at that time, as if the administration backed the Board of Review. I can say in this case we were backed completely with this particular case. I don't know if that would always be true but it was this time.

DAVILA: I served on the Board of Review some years back and I agree with you that by and large the administration did go with the Board of Review decision.

BROWNLEE: It's obviously, it's nice to know that.

DALEKE: Thank you very much Bonnie.

BROWNLEE: Thanks.

AGENDA ITEM #8: Annual Report: Faculty Mediation Committee (10 minutes)
(Carol Polsgrove, Chair, Faculty Mediation Committee)

DALEKE: We will turn to actually the first step in the process and that is the Faculty Mediation Committee and Carol Polsgrove.

POLSGROVE: We had a very busy year. We had a total of 6 grievances. We mediated 2 of them. We helped prepare one for Bonnie's group. We thought that was better; that that was a case that ought to go directly to the Board of Review. In another case we suggested a different recourse from this process. And then I advised two other, or talked with two other faculty members who did not file grievances. So that's not 6 grievances, it's 6 processes involving 7 people.

And I would echo Bonnie Brownlee's suggestion that we're getting problems with these, really be careful with these non-tenured lines. That's where some of these problems are coming from and it's partly a matter of not following the policies that are easily available on the web. Partly, sometimes promises are made that are then retracted. And that seems, it just shouldn't happen. Administrators should not make commitments and then go back on those commitments. And sometimes they are made in writing and this just creates difficulties. The other thing that I

suppose we would like to know is as a committee is what we do if we negotiate, we mediate, we come to an agreement, and one party reneges on that agreement. And I don't know what the solution to that is, but we are interested in finding that out.

DALEKE: I think that Ken can answer some of that from experience so when he gets back from making his phone calls but, it depends on which party is reneging.

POLSGROVE: An administrator.

BROWNLEE: Is that what happened?

POLSGROVE: It hasn't quite yet, we are waiting for the end of the story.

DALEKE: As you know I think that the recourse would be to go to the Faculty Board of Review with that and the Faculty Board of Review would then take up the case and it would go through the appropriate channels.

POLSGROVE: But of course see the Board of Review does not get our report.

DALEKE: Right.

POLSGROVE: So if we have gone to, spent a number of hours mediating something and we reach an agreement and then those terms aren't kept and it starts over with the Board of Review this person can't take our report and say look I was promised this and it didn't happen.

BROWNLEE: Yes they can.

POLSGROVE: I don't know. Can they do that?

BROWNLEE: The individual can himself.

POLSGROVE: The individual can do it. Then that's fine. You may get another case.

DALEKE: John?

SLATTERY: I know there are some efforts on campus that kind of a new chairs' school and I wonder if a recommendation might be made to include the chairs of these committees and to make sure that the new chairs' school is regularized. What you usually find you know with bringing in a new chair in a department is that you get an outstanding academic with kind of a view to the greater good but they don't necessarily know about these issues. They haven't necessarily ever read the Academic Handbook. They don't necessarily know that it exists. And this kind of new chairs' school is an extremely important thing that can be a forum for presentations and...

POLSGROVE: The deans need a new deans' school too.

GINGER: Or an old deans school.

SLATTERY: I'll volunteer.

DALEKE: That's a very good suggestion John. Any other comments?

POLSGROVE: Thanks to my committee which is large and there are a couple of new members so I'm not going to try to name them all but they work very hard.

DALEKE: We would really like to thank both of these committees for their hard work. This takes some time, an extremely large amount of time and effort, but this is a very important, both of work, the work of both of these committees is very important to us and it really strives to the heart of faculty governance. We set the policies for both of these committees and we have in the past and it seems that they're working fairly well. Thank you very much. Ted?

MILLER: Well I would just second your comments I mean we do owe the people who work on these committees a great deal of thanks. It's a very important role.

BROWNLEE: Thank you, we appreciate that.

**AGENDA ITEM #9: AI Language and Proficiency Preparation Status Report (20 minutes)
(Catherine Larson, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, College of Arts & Sciences and David Nordloh, Associate Dean, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)**

DALEKE: OK next on the agenda is the AI Language and Proficiency Status Report. David Nordloh and I don't know if Catherine Larson could make it.

GINGER: That's not Cathy Larson.

DALEKE: As you might remember those of you who were on this body last year we heard a report of the status of the test for English proficiency for AIs and a particular remediation efforts that came out as a result of that test. We asked them to come back this year to give us an update on how the testing and remediation processes are working. David?

NORDLOH: Thank you, and we're not them. None of the people who are going to be speaking to you today were involved in last year's discussion. Last year's chair of the committee, the committee was chaired by Lynn DiPietro, an Assistant Dean in the Graduate Division of the College of Arts & Sciences. Lynn is somewhere south of several borders right now, although in communication with us. Catherine, I'm David Nordloh, Catherine Larson apologizes for not being able to be here, she had a sudden but not serious medical emergency that took her away from campus a short while ago. In her place, but not quite in her place, is Claude Clegg, who is here as another of the Associate Deans in the College of Arts & Sciences. And Catherine and I had asked Claude to join us in part because in his role in the College office he's also involved in

some elements of foreign AI language training. I want to give first of all just some sense of the significance of this matter. Despite all the implications of September 11 and their effects on foreign students travel to the United States and enrollment in the university last fall saw the highest number of students taking the TEPAIC exam, the general placement exam for AI instructors in the history of this program—some 202 people. In addition the pass rate on that examination is the highest it's ever been—approaching 67 percent for the first time participants in that program.

Now that's not to say that we're talking about any particular success in the revision process of this exam but simply that our recent experiences have significant numbers of students continue to take the exam and significant numbers are sufficiently well prepared to move on to their instructional responsibilities. What I want to try to do much too quickly I'm afraid is to bring those of you who have some past experience with this issue up to date, tell you where we are, and where we are going. Last year at this time Lynn DiPietro brought on behalf of a committee made up of various people from departments from the College from the Graduate School, a report concerning the evaluation of this process. What had happened before this last fall and I apologize if this gets a little bit cumbersome with acronyms and details is that foreign students who proposed to undertake instructional responsibilities as part of AI appointments first had to pass the Indiana English Proficiency Exam—the IEPE—a test which is required for all entering foreign students. They have to pass that first. If they didn't pass it they had to go through a remediation process associated with courses offered by the Center for English Language Training and the Department of Linguistics. Then retake the test until they passed it. Certainly that's outside our purview, that test stands there though I will return to it in a while.

Next if those students had also entered with TOEFL scores—Test of English as a Foreign Language scores—of 550 or above, they could take our own self-prepared test, the Test of English Language Proficiency for Associate Instructor Candidates, generally called TEPAIC. That exam consisted of a 15 minute oral interview and a 45 minute composition exercise. Based on the results of their performance on those tests students would be certified in a variety of specific ways—fully certified to teach, certified to teach in limited circumstances, not certified to teach but certified to undertake other instructional responsibilities like monitoring laboratories, doing grading, and so on, depending on the appropriateness of their preparation for the discipline. If they were not successful, and this is under the old test, they would undertake remediation and that's a crucial part of this process. Until this last fall that sort of remediation process was either departmentally centered, departmental responsibility, involved private tutors, or in the one institutional resource available, Speech and Hearing Accent Modification Training—the sort of institutional program. And then they could retake the test until they either passed it or became discouraged and got their degrees.

In the meantime many of them, as you know, from your departmental experience were under the terms of AI contracts, they were being paid as employees of the university and were in some cases underemployed because of the lack of appropriate language skills. Now what the committee proposed was a gradual transition in this process involving a change in program for this year and a further change for next year. This year there is still the underlying IEPE requirement, you have to pass that first, a general test for foreign students first. Next, beginning this fall for new students the TEPAIC examination, the locally prepared examination specifically

for AIs, was focused entirely on the oral portion—there is no composition test associated with this, with this particular internal test any longer for a variety of reasons. The writing is tested by IEPE, the writing is tested by TOEFL, writing is also evaluated in part by the graduate students' own applications to programs. Next there were significant enhancements to the remediation processes. Besides pronunciation training there was a pilot test, there was a continuation of a pilot tested Conversation Partners program which continues. There was the significant introduction of a graduate level course—G530 Teaching in the US Classroom—designed by Lynn DiPietro and conducted last semester by Lynn with the assistance of Elizabeth Merceron, and this semester taught by Elizabeth Merceron on her own. There will be more about this in a few moments because it's a crucial addition to the process.

And finally there are, with the help of Instructional Support Services, ongoing developments of campus-wide workshops as well as department-specific workshops. And finally there was this year the introduction of a new examination called the Appeal Exam [end of Tape 1, Side 2, some conversation lost]...oral process exam which involved an interview, mock teaching, and mock office hours. The student passed that examination, the student could be certified to teach. Now the student could go on and take that Appeals Exam without going through any other sort of remediation first if he/she wished. There was that alternative.

Now, a couple of other additions. What's proposed for 2004-2005, proposed now, and I'll come back to this later, is that the oral TEPAIC examination and the Appeal Exam will be combined. There will be a single examination, 30 minutes long, and not only would the examination be more elaborate but the proposal is that the number of participants in that examination will increase—there will be 2 English as a Second Language specialists, an Instructional Support Services Consultant, and an undergraduate who participates as part of the process of evaluation. All that's proposed for 2004-2005. In addition what the committee did not discuss but what has become increasingly significant with the assistance of the Center for English Language Training is the provision of video conference interviewing of prospective graduate students. That is, the opportunity for the university in some way to evaluate language skills with those students before they are awarded AI contracts, before they travel to the United States, and before we make a commitment to them and they to us. Now that was not part of the specific mandate in this description but it's become an increasingly significant part of the process and a number of departments are using that this year. So that's where we stand.

One significant dimension of all this is the addition of the G530 course which is intended to give students classroom experience. Catherine Larson collected, and she and Claude have had access to information about the reaction on the part of departments of the experience of that kind of remediation process. And Claude would like to take a few minutes to describe that for you.

CLEGG: Good afternoon. The G530 course that was taught by Betsy Merceron has been successful generally. We solicited departments for their input after the AIs who had successfully gone through this course were actually placed into courses of their own, we went back or I went back, and solicited these courses, or these departments for feedback. And on the whole very positive feedback with regard to how helpful the course was for refining the ability of the students to convey ideas that are central to the discipline and the course material to their students during the course of the classes they are teaching this spring. They saw a notable difference in

the command of English that these students revealed once they had their own courses this spring compared to in the fall when the students first got here when it was discovered that they weren't prepared at that particular time to have their own courses. We would like to see this course perhaps make a couple courses of this nature per semester offered in the future because of the payoff that it allows the university. More bang for the buck in regard to having a course in which a number of students are getting this particular training instead of the expense of course having 1 on 1 instruction based on hourly wages to some tutor which would be a much more expensive proposition. In addition to this course we'd also like to see sort of a menu of options available to students who need better refinement and command of the English language before they go into the classroom. This course would be one of the centerpieces of that menu. Also remedial type, or 1 on 1 courses, conversational environments in which students perhaps, in collaboration with other graduate students, native speakers of English, or sort of tutoring them in addition to some exposure to more specialized training that they might get from CELT, or the Center for English Language Training.

So in the end we'd like to see a campus conversation about this across schools, not only in the College although most international AIs are in the College, but I think it's a campus issue in which students from all over the college and all over the university are taking courses that are taught by international AIs. So we're hoping that this is the beginning of a conversation that is campus wide. And also we're hoping that in the future that we're able to put in place not only G530 but a number of other choices for international AIs that would take into consideration that all international AIs, their English skills, are not created equal. So some would do well in a G530 course with a number of other graduate students that were getting prepared to teach their own courses in the following semesters; also others would need more 1 on 1 training, some would do well simply in a conversational environment in which they are exposed to English speakers throughout the day or throughout some protracted period of time outside the classroom setting.

And some other things that we're looking at in addition to a number of ways in which we can evaluate the ways in which we evaluate these students, their preparedness for the classroom, beyond TEPAIC and a number of other measurements that we have. So I guess the big note here is that we're encouraged by G530 as a tool for polishing the command of English for our international AIs who are coming to serve us and to contribute to the educational experience of our undergraduates. But at the same time we would certainly like the campus, and that includes the College, the Graduate School, etc., to continue being a part of the conversation in regard to how we might better serve these students with courses like G530, 1 on 1 tutoring opportunities, exposure to conversationalists, forums for students to enhance their English language skills, and other parts of again, hopefully a menu of options that are available to our international AIs.

NORDLOH: Let me add a couple of other details to this mix. Certainly we hope that the Center for English Language Training and the departments will continue to develop the video conference testing process, evaluation process, which I think is proving successful. Second, we would like to make it clearer than it has been in the original committee's report that successful completion of G530 or an equivalent training course for students be accepted as appropriate certification for student competency to undertake teaching responsibilities. That has not been particularly clear and there's apparently some disagreement involving CELT about the status of that course. That is students complete it, get successful grades and detailed evaluations submitted

to departments, but the question has remained because the original report about whether that satisfies the obligation for preparation for the classroom. We think it ought to.

Next, we are concerned about, we have a suggestion from Susan Greer, the Center for English Language Testing, about the proposed revision of the TEPAIC program for the coming year. The move to the more elaborate examination form is likely to be very expensive, although that's not the only reason for making this proposal. The current testing process costs about \$25 a student; the proposed expanded test with more personnel involved has an estimated cost, which may go up, of \$90 plus. Susan Greer has suggested that for the coming year instead, and this would not be definitive by any means, we continue with the present process, the 15 minute examination involving fewer testers and the longer 30 minute more elaborate test for students who wish to appeal, but with this change: students who appropriately pass the first test with a satisfactory grade can go on to teach. Those who fail it definitively, a grade of 5, have to undertake some sort of remediation process. Those with borderline fail scores, that is a score of 4, could proceed to the Appeal Examination either immediately or after further work. Now the rationale for this proposal is that students who've demonstrated high ability in the shorter test are very likely to do so in the longer one, so for them the process is repetitious. Those who fail it are likely to fail the longer one. But those somewhere in the borderline are the ones who are most likely, if anyone will, are most likely to benefit from the expanded examination. We think that's an appropriate intermediate idea as we continue to explore other options.

Further, and these are particularly important. We, given the resources available now, not simply through CELT, the test and so on, but the array of resources of different kinds available on campus, including English courses for foreign students in the English department, we think it's particularly important that by some process a coordinator of these remediation and training resources be more fully identified. Part of the problem here, and I'll leave it to the Council to deal with, is that it's not quite clear who owns this issue. The Council has at various times passed it's obligations onto various people; it mandated the Center for English Language Testing to test students but it has never quite clearly identified the authority for supervision of this entire process. I don't know why I'm here? My English is bad enough but I found a file in Ted Miller's desk in the Dean of the Faculties office that had something to do with this so I guess that's why I'm selected. But I think there is a question about where this ought to be located. There have been discussions of associating with the graduate programs, with the Graduate School, with the Dean of Graduate Studies. Lynn DiPietro has an appointment with the College of Arts & Sciences, and so on. And finally we want to propose that during the current year, and we certainly would be glad to help with this, that we consider alternatives to the internal testing procedures we are now using including TEPAIC. IU is one of the only institutions that has it's own home grown test for this process, many other institutions use professionally prepared external programs of various kinds including TOEFL. One particularly important development is that in the course of the coming year TOEFL will add an oral language test, both speaking and listening to its test array available for foreign students; that's a testing process that can be taken, that they can take part overseas before students come here. We ought to at least examine that particular exam, that testing process, as an alternative to our own for a variety of reasons, because of the greater convenience it offers, because it codifies the process, because it assures that our students, potential students, are not discouraged by the additional hurdles that we seem to be adding to their entrance into the Indiana University community.

Thanks very much.

GROS LOUIS: I thought and Moya shakes her head no. I thought the Academic Handbook assigned responsibility to AI, foreign AI proficiency to the Dean of the Faculties Office.

ANDREWS: I know we've been involved, but do you remember Ted when I know you were working on it.

MILLER: I was a substitute. But the, one of the Associate Deans in the office, Jeanne Sept, actually was the person who was primarily working on this over several years that I was there. She went on leave and I took her place for a brief period of time but it definitely was associated with the Dean of Faculties office.

ANDREWS: It's always been associated but it hasn't had, but we haven't had complete control, is my impression. A lot of different people are involved.

GROS LOUIS: A lot of people involved, I think the ultimate responsibility though is with the office.

ANDREWS: I don't think we have the authority.

GROS LOUIS: But the authority is given to you I think by this Council.

ANDREWS: Oh, ok.

GROS LOUIS: I say that because several years ago the Trustees had asked about the ways in which we tested for proficiency and Debbie Freund then is the one who organized the response on behalf of the campus.

ANDREWS: Oh, thank you.

GROS LOUIS: There are other offices involved, etc. but and it could be changed.

ANDREWS: No, no it's fine.

GROS LOUIS: Michael?

HAMBURGER: I've heard some specific concerns raised about this plan for accepting completion of this G530 course as verification of students' abilities to teach in the classroom. Have you done any post-testing of the students in that class with the standard TEPAIC exam and you know has it certified their abilities to pass the exam after taking the course?

CLEGG: No there hasn't been any post exam or testing or evaluation after the completion of G530. I think that would be something to look into. There has been solicitation of the departments and people working with these students as AIs so we've gotten sort of subjective,

non clinical response in that way. But there has not been a follow up test to find out where students are in an empirical way.

HAMBURGER: Are there significant numbers of students failing the class? Or not passing?

CLEGG: No, not at all.

HAMBURGER: So does everybody who takes the class pass it?

CLEGG: The vast majority do pass the course.

DALEKE: So how many of the TEPAIC takers go on to take the Appeal Exam and how many go on to take the G530 course?

CLEGG: Let me see if we have a figure for you.

DALEKE: While you are doing that I think that this might be a very good issue for our new AI Affairs Committee and the EPC to take up since we've run out of time this year to address these issues.

NORDLOH: I'm sorry I can't find it but we do have something. I can supply you with the numbers that I should have but one of the outcomes of the G530 course is not simply a grade in the course but a detailed evaluation of student proficiency which is delivered to the department so that it is not simply or a sort of blanket authorization to teach in any context at all, but it sort of guides the department to make the kind of specific placement that was also available in the TEPAIC testing depending on what the students score was.

SLATTERY: It is quite common at other institutions for responsibilities in this area, the AI kind of preparation and support in general, to be assigned to the Graduate School. And if it does fall between the cracks elsewhere it might be worthwhile thinking about it.

LYNCH: I wanted to ask about the costs which you touched on, David. The students themselves pay the fee to take the test, am I right in thinking that, it's not the departments, but the students?

NORDLOH: No, my understanding is that the departments bear those costs.

LYNCH: It is the departments. Ok, Ok. I'm just wondering, because I am wondering about the redundancy. Because they certainly pay to take the TOEFL, right?

NORDLOH: That's right.

LYNCH: And so you know at a time when I know that the cost of being an international student has increased quite a bit because of the new fees being assessed by the, I forget the name of the office, the International Students' Office, they've had to assess new fees because of the costs of covering the unfunded federal mandate called SEVIS. I mean it worries me that the kind of level of redundancy in what you've described is a little worrying I guess. So if we have all this why do

we require them to take the TOEFL? I guess is my question.

NORDLOH: Well in fact just the other day I asked the question that one of the presumptions about the IEPE is that we test, the definition says we test those particular academic language skills required for success. I'm not sure how in the evaluation process that is distinguishable from what TOEFL also says it is doing, provides us evaluation about. I just think this is an appropriate time to evaluate the status of these competing, or at least overlapping, instruments with each other.

And if I may to return to John's comment for a second, one of the reasons for suggesting, my suggesting for the Dean of Faculties office that this question might, this matter of supervision might be moved someplace else is that to a certain extent the AI training and remediation process involves academic programs—not just academic programs, but courses, that is there are graduate courses taught in a variety of places. And at a certain point the Dean of Faculties office, I think, sort of loses authority over these. We can't tell the English department how to coordinate its courses with those of French & Italian or others or those in Linguistics, or those offered in Speech and Hearing Sciences, and so on. And I think in a way it's appropriate to have some kind of connection between this program and graduate instruction, not simply graduate training.

GROS LOUIS: David I think the logic in the past was that the Dean of Faculties were responsible for academic appointees. And that was the link with the AI positions. Ted?

MILLER: Well exactly. I mean, the AIs are, from this point of view, academic appointees, they are not students in that sense. And I think that explains why they are associated with the Dean of Faculties office. You know and I think having an office such as the Dean of Faculties is just kind of a quality control issue as well. I mean having the Dean of Faculties oversee this in some sense. Now there are no doubt problems with what we're doing now that we can improve. But I think there is a rationale for it.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Mary?

WENNERSTROM: I was just asking about fees. I didn't realize that anybody paid fees for this. I mean I know it costs money to do it, I hear \$25 and the \$90 or whatever, but the students pay to take the, I don't think so?

NORDLOH: No, my answer to the question was that students do not pay, student themselves do not pay to take the TEPAIC or the Appeals Exam.

WENNERSTROM: But the departments don't either do they? I mean we don't, I don't think and we had lots of people taking it last summer but I don't know that we paid anything for those. So I mean...

CLEGG: The College has picked up the bill for its departments, so it does get paid and it does get paid on behalf of the departments but it's the College that has been footing the bill, at least for our units.

WENNERSTROM: Unless we're in a sense, somehow, I don't know that, I thought that this was all a self thing?

GROS LOUIS: Dennis?

SENUCHUK: I just want to put in a word for more explicit attention being paid to the English proficiency requirements for qualifications for grading. I notice as you described it you sort of lumped together with things like monitoring. I have a sense that the test results come in and that people who don't do as well are thought to be specifically qualified to grade and I'm not sure that works out. And I do have a sense even from within my own department that it's often thought that well if a student lacked some degree of proficiency it would be appropriate to have them just do grading. And I don't think that makes sense.

NORDLOH: And I think that's important. I think that one of the points that Claude was making is that G530, the course as currently constructed, offers a certain kind of preparation experience for students working face-to-face in a classroom in various sorts of accommodation skills and ways of using blackboards and overheads to accommodate language deficiencies to deal with students questions. But that's all very oral. I have also heard faculty say, anecdotes are very important here, that students may be prepared for oral exchange, but they are not prepared to grade undergraduate essays and quizzes. They may have a great deal of difficulty with the American essay style. And I think one of the things Claude was suggesting is that among the array of resources that we ought to develop further is one that addresses student obligations in areas like those that you are describing.

GROS LOUIS: We have reached the mandatory adjournment time. You have before you the brief change that David alluded to in his Agenda Committee report. And did you pass out the reports, Julie? You have the report, but I assume this will be on the agenda in the fall for any discussion or comments. Thank you very much, a good end of the semester, I hope to see you at my home soon. Oh, David says we have to approve these changes.

RUBIN: So moved.

GROS LOUIS: Discussion? All in favor say AYE [AYE], Opposed [none], Abstentions [none].

Adjournment at 5:35 pm.