

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 7, 2006
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

Members Present: LTC Lori Bass, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliot, Emily Fairchild, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Susan Jones, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, Gerald Marker, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Jeanne Sept, Alex Shortle, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams

Members Absent: Katy Borner, Romualdo De Souza, William Leckey, David MacKay, Dale McFadden, Alyce Miller, Richard Rubinger, Jodi Shepherd, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman,

Visitors Present: Edwardo Rhodes (Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Support & Diversity) Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Bradley Wheeler (Research & Information Technology), Maynard Thompson (Senior Counselor to President), John Graves (Faculty Council), Adam Herbert (President)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

January 24, 2006

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/01.24.06.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions

Professor Emeritus Donald F. Carmony

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B27-2006.htm>

Professor John D. Long

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B28-2006.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business

(Professor Theodore Miller)

4. Question / Comment Period*

(President Adam W. Herbert and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. Indiana University Bloomington Policy on Undergraduate Admissions (FIRST READING)
(Professors John Carini and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs, Educational Policies Committee)
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B13-2006.htm>

6. Intellectual Property Policy (FIRST READING)
(Professors Randy Arnold and Robert Ivie, Co-Chairs, Research Affairs Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B29-2006.doc>

7. Bloomington Capital Priorities Committee Report (DISCUSSION)
(Vice Chancellor Neil Theobald)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B30-2006.xls>
(Please note that there are 2 tabs in this file—New Construction and R&R)

8. BFC Presiding Officer (DISCUSSION)
(Professor Theodore Miller)

9. Standing Committee Reports
10. Old Business
11. New Business

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/ COMMENT PERIOD

T. MILLER: Ladies and gentlemen, we are graced with the presence of our president today.

HERBERT: Graced?

T. MILLER: Yes, graced [laughter]. So we are going to reorganize the agenda a little bit. Adam can stay with us only until four o'clock and so we want to focus first on the question and comment period and then we're going to start into the admissions discussion. The president has a statement that he would like to make about that as we get into it and then Bill will begin to present the proposal that we're going to discuss. So we will begin today with the question and comment period if there are questions. I did not receive any questions in advance. You may have noticed that Michael McRobbie is not with us today. He is traveling; he'll be with us I believe at the next meeting. So, I'm going to preside—I'm the presiding officer for today. So, is it time?

KISH: Yes.

T. MILLER: Sorry about that. I hope you can hear me. Questions and comments please.

HERBERT: Could I make a comment now?

T. MILLER: You could make a comment, yes.

HERBERT: May be I could just make a couple of observations to start our conversation. First let me tell you that Michael and I are actively engaged in a process of examining all aspects of campus operations, looking at structural issues. Those of you that have sent comments to us, observations in the context of organization charts, all of those have been very helpful. Essentially the way we are dealing with all this is Michael in particular is focusing attention on the academic side. What I'm looking at is the broader campus operations, budget issues, the relationship between the university administration units that are providing support to the campus and how we deal with some of those going forward as well as some of the offices that have historically reported to the chancellor. We're trying to decide which of those should report to the president versus the provost. My assumption is that we will be in a position to deal with most of these issues by the end of April if not before.

My intention, as is Michael's, is to meet with the Agenda Committee of the campus of your organization to assure that we have an opportunity to discuss some of these matters. As we move toward board presentations I will anticipate that we will make some presentations to the board or a presentation to the board with some elements of this at the March meeting. But again, I think it will take us a couple more because there are some issues that we simply must focus greater attention on. Just to give you an example, as we have dealt with the manner in which we're going to handle the research function that currently is in the Office of a Vice President, it appears that we will probably eliminate that office but there are several components of it. Some of those will go into the provost's office. One area that we're trying to deal with is what happens with compliance. This is a major issue not only in the context of research but more broadly. This is an issue that is of great concern to the members of the Board of Trustees. We had a lengthy discussion of that in Indianapolis at a previous Board meeting and so I have asked Dottie Frapwell to bring in some outside consultants to take a look at exactly what we're doing, how effective are we in this area, are we covering adequately all of the aspects of compliance that we should and how should ultimately, that be structured and where is the optimal place to have that unit focus.

So I just give you that as an example of some of the types of issues that we're trying to grapple with. What I can tell you is we're strongly committed to the basic proposition that we're going to elevate further the academic reputation and the quality of the Bloomington campus. We're going to operate in a fashion in which all of the aspects of the campus from a budgetary perspective are occurring under a consolidated leadership structure so that—previously the chancellor had to negotiate with the vice presidents that were providing services for the first time in several decades, all of those decisions will now ultimately come to the president so that we can get things resolved.

So, I think the process is going well as we're going through these analytical processes and again I want to thank those of you who have forwarded some suggestions to us and ideas for us to play through and work through as we come up with the final feedback that we will be giving to the board. Let me just stop there and again, I look forward to responding to any questions that you might have.

T. MILLER: John?

CARINI: So there was a long list of questions that—documents that we've been looking at, at the last meeting, I guess some others at the UFC meeting last week. You were going to supply the answers?

HERBERT: Yes, what we agreed on at the UFC meeting is that the two co-chairs would take all of those questions, there were some that were redundant and so as soon as I get those we'll begin to prepare responses to all of them and we'll get those out very quickly.

THOMPSON: I talked with Bart Ng this morning and he hopes to have those questions to us in two or three days.

HERBERT: Ok. So within a couple of days we'll get those back out, we'll do that very quickly.

KRAVCHUK: Thank you for being here Mr. President, I appreciate that very much. You and I talked about this before but not before this body, it has to do with the realignment of some of the campus reporting relationships here, in particular the School of Optometry. From a budget stand point, I understand the program in place is to extrude the budget somehow from the Bloomington campus and have the budget come under the purview of the Indianapolis chancellor. Anything short of a physical movement of the entire facility to Indianapolis however means that we're still going to have some assessments, some overhead process that will be associated with providing for that school, that facility here: police, fire protection, heat, hot water, among other things, use of the library. I have a concern that the school be rendered harmless from a budgetary stand point due to the change in reporting relationship. I have a particular fear that the school will end up being tripled assessed. Once from the university administration, once from the Bloomington campus and I have to believe that Charles Bantz is going to want a piece of things too. The danger is that the school could end up with fewer resources than it currently has only because its reporting line has been changed.

HERBERT: The easiest answer to that question is that it will not happen.

KRAVCHUK: Thank you.

HERBERT: These are some of the things that we have to address and the intent is not in any way to harm any unit as we go through this process.

KRAVCHUK: I understand.

HERBERT: So, for those from the School of Optometry, don't worry about that. And also I might add that one of the things that I think that—and it's a principle, is that wherever faculty are housed, that is where they should go through tenure and promotion processes, so that from a governance perspective, the faculty in the School of Optometry should be part of this campus. Right now the reporting relationship is in Indianapolis. So what we've done is just linked the reporting relationship to or the budget to where that reporting relationship is but again, as a matter of principle, I believe that where a faculty member resides, is where, in terms of units, that's where they ought to deal with governance and promotion and tenure and those kinds of matters.

T. MILLER: If I could just say with regard to that point, the faculty councils of Indiana University have worked, I believe, now for about 35 years since the reorganization took place in 1970s, has worked very very hard to implement a principle like that one but we haven't been able to do it. The system that is working now does not quite work that way in all cases. I mean, there are some sort of outlying pockets of people that are not being treated in that way. It's my hope that we'll be able to kind of settle on a policy that would say essentially what you have articulated here.

HERBERT: I feel very strongly about that so let's do it. I don't know what we need to do to accomplish but I feel very strongly about that personally so I'm glad to hear that...

T. MILLER: Well, I mean, one of the issues, one of the reasons that the Optometry situation is a concern to me is that there are important administrators in this university who feel that once the budget line is established, that the personnel action lines should follow the budget line. We have some cases like that and this is an issue that I think has to be resolved and we have to be clear as we go forward with whatever budget restructuring we're going to be doing. We have to be clear about this issue, it's very important.

HERBERT: I definitely agree and if we're all in accord, my view is that there are some new sheriffs in town and let's go ahead and get these things done.

T. MILLER: The Bloomington faculty have supported this idea without reservation, our problems have been elsewhere.

HERBERT: Well the good news about this structure is that the decisions about this campus are going to be made through a process of shared governance and the president and the provost and no other vice presidents ultimately are going to be able to impact—I mean, they can provide input but again, it's a new way of doing business. I think it's an appropriate way for the flagship campus of Indiana University.

W. WHEELER: May I please move the agenda. The president has only a few minutes and I think he has some things that he wants us to hear about admissions and there are things about admissions that we want him to have the opportunity to hear from us for the Trustees.

T. MILLER: Very good. We will go on to the admissions item and...

DAVILA: This is related to that if I may ask a question? Along the lines of this new sheriff in town that will safe guard some very vital interests of any university and that is a question of diversity. Given the unease that's permeated our academic atmosphere from the part of the minority perspective, what is being done to safe guard what some of the trustees, at least one, is concerned about not having pipe dreams of making our admissions standards the same as Stanford's or Ivy League schools and in essence having the danger of factoring out people, be it SAT scores and other norms that don't ultimately favor Latinos or certainly African Americans and others. What sort of negotiation is going on with the trustees and through your presidency? I'm glad that there's a new sheriff in town.

W. WHEELER: Mr. President, I think this question is better addressed in the context of relations to the policy because I think part of the answer to Luis' question is to be found in the policy that we will have before us and the explication on it and so I think that his question comes before the context of our discussion.

DAVILA: But I'd just like to...

HERBERT: There's a philosophical issue and may be I'll just talk about that in the context of the board without getting into...

DAVILA: I think it's important to hear beyond the process that you are undergoing, which is a bit more bureaucratic...

HERBERT: I think that if you listen very carefully to the board, several things are being articulated. On the one hand there is a very strong belief that particularly with regard to Bloomington, they want to see us raise the quality of the student body and ultimately that does translate, in part, into the admission standards. It also speaks to how we recruit, it speaks to the amount of money that we have for scholarships, it speaks to the kind of reputation that we have. So I think that we understand what the variables are in terms of what we have to do to recruit, overall, the kind of student body that all of us want to see in the institution.

The second issue is one of diversity and in that regard I think it's important to note that the board on the 14th of January, in the document that it released, was very clear about the commitment to diversity and the expectation that we're going to do an increasingly better job in recruiting minority students, faculty, staff and administrators. And there was a specific charge in that document and it was to both the faculty and the administration. Now what I have done in response immediately is to create a unit that reports to the president that will also provide information on an ongoing basis to the trustees, that focuses on diversity that will help us from a monitoring perspective with reports. This will cover not only those areas but also what we're doing with regard to minority vendors and in an overarching sense demonstrate that we truly value diversity as a core value of the campus. And what I will have to do is to report to the board on how we're progressing. I can tell you that that is going to be a very high priority for me and I think the fact that the board has articulated that, it will be for all the senior officers of the university. I can tell you that at that level, I focus on what they're doing in terms of diversity in my annual evaluations for all vice presidents and I think we just have to make that part of the culture. But it must be carried out not only at the administrative level but faculty have got to embrace that as well. One person can't address these issues alone.

We are going to be looking at what we need to do from a scholarship perspective. I think clearly what we do in the context of whether or not we have a holistic approach to admissions will make a difference. Again, the key point is that the board is talking about both of those issues simultaneously. May be the last observation is that I don't think, as I've heard members of the board, there is a range of views about how selective or elitist we should become and my view at least as I've talked with them, it is that if we can be somewhere close to the mean of the Big Ten, that that's not bad. I don't think that we realistically, given a whole host of variables, are going

to be able to approach Michigan over the course of the next decade and I'm not sure we ought to try. But the commitment to raising the quality of the student body from my vantage point, there's no question about that. I think everyone in this room would share that feeling. That's what you should expect of a Big Ten institution and my belief also is that the board is saying that they do not want us to remain dead last in the Big Ten with regard to the profile of our students, that that's not acceptable for Indiana University and I would imagine that most of us would probably agree with that. So what we're going to do is to raise the quality of the student body or the profile of the student body as we simultaneously continue to demonstrate that diversity is something that we deeply value. And I can tell you that we're strongly committed to doing all we can to provide the infrastructure to make that happen in the recruiting office and also in terms of the dollars available from the scholarship perspective.

T. MILLER: If I could just add something to that, I had quite a long talk with Trustee Breckenridge after the trustee meeting last week and my sense coming out of that conversation was that she—and I think it's an understandable conclusion to draw because there's been a lot of talk about SAT scores and some people feel, and this is what Bill was referring to earlier, some people feel that our new admissions policy is going to be just about SAT scores which of course is not the case as we will see as we get into this discussion. One of the reasons that the talk about SAT scores, I think at least has been important up to this point, is really to counterbalance what seems to be very clear in our current admissions practices. We are under emphasizing SAT scores. We've seen many statements from the office of admissions about the relative importance of SAT scores and what they do and my interpretation of what has been said uniformly is that they're just not important. They're kind of last in the list of things to be considered and I think that talking about the SAT scores has been a good thing; it's served its purpose and I'm hoping that as we go forward as our new admissions policy demonstrates, that we're going to be taking that aspect of it more seriously than we do now.

MELAMED: I wonder if I might ask a question about a phrase that the president used a couple of minutes ago that I don't think I've actually heard here in my six or seven years, and that was flagship campus. I got the impression that that term has been studiously avoided in favor of other metaphors; multiple front doors and so on, is there a change in thinking?

HERBERT: Not only has there been—first let me just tell you this that I took a lot of heat on that [laughter]...

MELAMED: Yes, sir.

HERBERT: And that was a recommendation that came from the faculty on this campus. My decision was that I would not alter in any way the language that ultimately came through the governance processes and so that was given to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees did approve it and so now the official designation for the Bloomington campus is that it is the flagship campus of Indiana University and so I'm very proud to be the CEO of the flagship campus of Indiana University [laughter].

MELAMED: Congratulations.

HERBERT: Thank you

OGREN: One thing that has not been discussed much in this reorganization plan is the university library system. Do you know if the administration will be changing for that and whether or not the separation of Bloomington from the IUPUI library, whether that will follow also in the scheme?

HERBERT: That will be something that Michael will articulate. I would be very surprised to see any change in that but that's something that's on the list of all the issues. I can tell you that with regard to the reorganization plan as we gave it to the board for consideration, we did not talk about breaking that up or changing the reporting relationship on this campus. That same thing is true by the way for the graduate school; that will continue to report—continue, it will report to the provost on this campus.

AGENDA ITEM #5: INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

T. MILLER: Bill would you like to start?

W. WHEELER: Because the President has only a few minutes, I'll give a very short introduction that we need to mention in his presence. As one thinks about admissions: policies, goals, strategies, those are the three components to approach with admissions. We have before us today, a policy document. I also asked Kelly to distribute to you a copy of Chancellor Emeritus Gros Louis' presentation to the Trustees last Friday about admissions. And if you look on page 8, you will then see a statement, in the following two pages goals and then there's the issue of strategies and Trustee Shoulders at the meeting last Friday said, well we've heard about goals, but we haven't heard anything about strategies. So policies, goals, strategies; those are the three things, the three components. Policies are supposed to give the foundation and the framework for admissions. It's the framework within one can set goals and then develop strategies. And so the foundation, the frame work, the policies, are the most fundamental thing and that is the thing that only the faculty can do. But the one thing that I want to make certain that President Herbert hears today is that this policy also includes the strategy that can achieve the goals articulated by the enrollment plan, by Chancellor Gros Louis and addresses also the issues of diversity and class rank and SAT scores in an entirely satisfactory way. The place there is to look in the section on Academic Preparation.

Last Friday Trustee Reilly said “what is the profile of the student body at a Top 30 research institution”. And the answer is, this is it in Academic Preparation and I hope that Steve Hinnefeld in his headline tomorrow can say the faculty are presenting a strategy for dealing with admissions. We are raising the number of college prep courses that we require from 28 to 33 and the profile will provide the profile of a top 30 institution and that will, from the College Board, indicates that students who satisfies his profile do indeed have better SAT scores. If we had these requirements this year, our 25th percentile SAT score would be at least 50 points higher.

What is the academic preparation that we are putting forth for the fall of 2011? As I said, a policy, a framework, should be more constant. In fact one needs to give the students in the state of Indiana at least a four year lead time on any changes that are expected in academic preparation. These are things that only the faculty can do. It hasn't been discussed in the discussions by the administration and the Trustees because the administration and the Trustees cannot specify the courses. This is the unique contribution for us as faculty to put forward to deal with the issues we have before us. The preparation that we're proposing is 8 credits of English; this is the same as it has been, to increase the credits in mathematics, from 6 credits to 7 credits. According to the SAT data, this in and of itself will increase our 25th percentile score by 50 points; SAT score. To increase the amount of social science required from 4 credits to 6 credits, to increase the amount of laboratory science required from 2 credits to 4 credits, to require 4 credits of world languages. At this point in time we only recommend four credits, we do not require any credits, but we do recommend it. And then to require 4 more credits of additional college prep courses, trigonometry, additional science and math credits for students intending to pursue a science degree, additional world and language credits recommended for all students. This is a very strong program. We have been unable—a history of this, the modern history of admission standards for IU begins in the early 1960s when the Council adopted the policy in anticipation of the baby boomers that called for 26 college prep credits. In the 1990s, the 26 was increased to 28 and here we're proposing to increase it from 28 to 33. The place that we have fallen behind other top research universities is in not requiring adequate preparation of our students. We've been unable to do so because of the one university with 8 front doors. Some of our other campuses are expecting to decrease the number of college prep requirements, the courses they require from the 28 back to the 26 which is what CORE 40 requires; CORE 40 requires only 26.

And so this is a very strong strategy for achieving our goals with regards to the quality of our incoming class. It is the profile of a top 30 research institution. The only difference might be that if we were talking about MIT or Cal Tech or perhaps even Purdue, that we would see 8 credits of mathematics because engineers require that much. But we are a liberal arts institution and 7 seven credits we think is the appropriate number for us. So I'm hoping that in the first weekend in March that President Herbert and Provost McRobbie and our BFC President Ted Miller would turn to the trustees and say, Trustee Reilly here is the profile of a top 30 research institution and Trustee Reilly, here's our strategy for achieving all those goals. If we put this into place, the data from the College Board indicates that we will be having higher SATs, we will have higher class ranks. Further more, this is an issue that deals with diversity and access issues. Taking the courses, what the message we'll be sending to the students of Indiana would be; if you want to come to Bloomington, you need to take the college prep courses. You need to study and you need to make Bs and if you do that you will be sufficiently high on your SAT scores, you will be sufficiently high on our class rank to give us, our student body, a good profile.

All the public schools in the state provide this curriculum. It's not necessary to take special SAT prep courses to do this. This is not, you know, regardless of one's possible diversity status, minority group, ethnic status, religion or anything of that nature, regardless of one's socio-economic class, by going to the public high schools of this state, taking the college prep courses, studying hard and earning good grades, you will meet this profile and we will find our student body improving.

HERBERT: I just I wanted to first compliment you; I think that it is particularly appropriate that using the word again, that the flagship campus of the university, take advantage of the concept of mission differentiation and increase the academic preparation. So I strongly applaud everything that you have in here. I have one question under point 2, and that is whether or not all the public schools or all of the schools of the state offer 1 credit of pre-calculus, that's just a question. The second thing is, actually I have three questions, the second is this that I noted under section 3 in the third paragraph, and it says that we would give priority to non-residents who are in the top 40% of their graduating class. And I was under the impression that it was somewhere around 30-33% right now and I was just wondering as we're dealing with increasing standards, why we would lower the admissions expectation for the priority for out-of-state students, and we're doing just the opposite for in-state students? And then the final point under first time undergraduate students, the very last sentence says the campus may at its discretion admit a student on a probationary basis and/or through faculty sponsorship. My question there is, is conditional admission the same as probationary admission? I ask that because we have Hoosier Link that we made and if we want to admit some students conditional upon their fulfilling certain requirements and that may be different from probationary. With the exception of those questions, I think you've done an excellent job and I compliment you.

W. WHEELER: Thank you. Let me give a quick response please to those three questions. On your first question referring to pre-calculus and let me check with Neil on this. I believe it is the case that every high school offers pre-calculus. Most of them actually offer calculus. Pardon?

THEOBALD: I don't know.

W. WHEELER: We will check on that.

HERBERT: I just wanted to make the point because especially some of the inner city schools because then we can have just the opposite effect of delimiting opportunities for access.

W. WHEELER: No there is an issue as to whether all the schools, the inner city schools and rural schools can offer enough labs. So if you compare this to the CORE 40, we're requiring 4 credits of laboratory science and then suggesting to more. CORE 40 requires 6 semesters but it isn't clear if all the schools will be able to offer enough physics labs. But as far as mathematics I believe it is the case that we'll find that every school does. In fact most of them offer not only pre-calculus but also trigonometry and also calculus. So I believe that one will turn out to be readily satisfied.

HERBERT: Thank you by the way for including 4 credits of world languages.

W. WHEELER: Thank you. On your second question, that's addressing footnote number 5 that is added to today's thing. Footnote number 5 appearing on the last page, notes that the policy that has been in effect since the 1960s does specify that Indiana residents should be in the top half of their graduating class and non-residents should be in the upper third of their graduating class and that was part of our access mission in the 1960s. This was proposed—this was passed just before the baby boom came in, in the fall of 1964 and so during that time, the access mission had

priority over other missions for the campus. But today we try to balance our quality and access missions and we actively recruit students from top non-Indiana high schools. And as it has been observed that's a more recent development, we didn't begin doing that in the 1960s, we've been doing that in the 1990s, to very actively recruit from some of the outstanding high schools across the state and then when you go into those top ones then you'll have students who are very good but because of the competition they weren't actually in the top third. If you look at what's currently happening, we certainly are accepting a number of out-of-state students currently who rank below, even lower than the top 40%. So this is recognizing the situation as it exists. It's a bit of realism, that is to say the top one third seems to be realistic when we changed our state recruiting standards in the 90s.

The third point had to do with...

HERBERT: Under four.

T. MILLER: Conditional.

W. WHEELER: Conditional is a type of probation. So we intend probation be a more inclusive thing and conditional being one variety of a probationary basis. So the answer is it's our intention that that is subsumed under that.

HERBERT: Thank you, other wise it's a good job.

T. MILLER: Are you going to leave us?

HERBERT: I'm sorry I have to leave but I wanted to be able to come here so I had to push something back to get here but I just want all of you to know that both Michael and I are looking forward to working with you and we'll be working very closely with the Agenda Committee to assure that as we sort through some of these issues that we continue to get faculty input. Thanks, thank you very much.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much Adam.

W. WHEELER: I would like to say one more remark before I turn things over to John for his comments on this. I'd like to say that this document is before you today as a discussion document, not yet a motion from the Educational Policies Committee. And in an effort to be nimble, we were asked by the Chief of Staff of the Faculty Council to merge the proposal passed by the UFC last Tuesday, with the document that we brought to you last November the 7th I think it was, in order to have a kind of fresh current up to date copy for you to discuss today. We have done that by email and by Oncourse to come up with this draft with the comments and implicit approval of the Educational Policies Committee. The Educational Policies Committee will be taking this up and taking a vote on it at its meeting next Tuesday. So this will come back to you two weeks from now we trust for final reading and at that time it will be eligible for amendments; for motions and amendments. But as a draft for discussion, this is before you for your comments and suggestions, not for motions today. So, we hope that whatever comments and suggestions you have you will give to us either today in the discussion, after the meeting or

by email so that we can take account of that in preparing a draft for you to vote on hopefully at the next meeting. John?

CARINI: So I'm glad Bill emphasized section 2 in the proposal because I always view that as being the heart of our proposal; trying to make sure that our students are well prepared coming in. I would view this as our attempt to come up with a minimum description of what students need to be well prepared and so I would hope that this applies to all students. Some of the points in section 3 where it talks about achievements and abilities, you might notice that those are often qualified by saying preference will be given to certain classes of students with a particular score in the SAT or having a certain grade point average. But what we really want students to have completed the courses in section 2 and I don't think we're asking too much. If you think about it, 32 credits means 4 academic courses every semester and when they come here we expect them to do 4 or 5 in order to graduate within 4 or 5 years. So I think it's very reasonable which draws that most of our students are now coming in with this level of preparation or above, you know, having achieved an Academic Honors Diploma which requires 34 credits of academic courses and looked at what the average number of academic courses SAT takers, college bound SAT takers in the state take, that's also about 34 academic courses. So I don't think we're asking too much. Now, why didn't we ask for more, it's because have many different programs on campus; obviously the College of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, many other areas. We don't think that we should ask too much to have a single very high standard that should apply to everybody because not everybody is going to be majoring in math or physics or other areas that might require a little bit more academic preparation. Craig?

BRADLEY: Turning to Section Six under Inter-Campus Transfer Students, given that we're trying to differentiate ourselves from the other campuses this looks like a kind of back door way for students to go to one of the regional campuses, get in with lesser credentials and then come in the back door of Bloomington with only a 2.3 average at those other schools. It seems to me that we should have a higher requirement than 2.3.

W. WHEELER: Let me put that, and thanks for asking that because this has been one of our concerns. Let me put that in context. Currently it's a 2.0 and to clearly 2.3 is to actually raise the standard and the other campuses are protesting about this. Every other campus that we went, members of the UFC-EPC as each one of them realizes the implications of allowing is to put up a standard that's higher than the traditional standard for intercampus transfer, they protest that this is going against one university. In fact IUPUI raised this objection at the UFC meeting last week.

The data that has been provided to us by University Division indicates that if you look at students who have a 2.0 and transfer in, that the success rate there is only about 50% and is much lower than the success rate of our first-time undergraduates, that is, our entering undergraduates. By the time you say 2.3, they should be getting close that is that intercampus transfers that have a 2.3 have a somewhat comparable success rate as our first-time undergraduates to begin with. So that is why we came with a 2.3 as opposed to a 2.0. But the most crucial thing is the requirement that they must satisfy the Academic Preparation. You know that is actually what has heretofore been the wide open back door as students who didn't have foreign language could go to another campus, go there for one semester, choose a 2.0 and come down without a foreign language or they could do without the sciences. And so what this is saying, the important thing here, more

important than the 2.3 is the provision that says before they can come to our campus they must have satisfied, either in high school or by taking courses at the other campuses, the course preparation required in item 2 Academic Preparation. So, we can always look at the issue of should we put it higher than 2.3 but we have looked at the data. The 2.3 is a significant increase over what it's been heretofore. It has led to protests from other campuses and at the very least it is a step in the right direction. I think the Academic Preparation is even more important.

T. MILLER: If I could just say, one of the actions that was taken at the University Faculty Council last week, as a number of you know, was that the Council approved a policy that authorized each campus to develop its own admission policies. So, whether the other campuses protest or not, it really isn't—I mean, this is something that is under our jurisdiction now and it's really a question of what the trustees will approve. And I'm, well, I'm not sure what that is but whether the other campuses like it or don't like it is clearly less of an issue at this point.

THIBOS: Bill on a note of diversity and on a global scale, I don't see anything mentioned in here specifically about foreign students. I don't know if the omission there was not intentional but I would recommend that there at least be some mention of requirements for foreign students and how a potential foreign student might be able to deal with some of the requirements that have been set up that are appropriate for American student, domestic students, but might not be appropriate for a foreign student and the rationale being that we don't want to put up a false barrier that by omission tell students that they needn't bother to inquire about Indiana because we haven't even thought about international students and we don't even mention them. It seems to me that we should make some kind overture, a logical path to avoid, if part of the requirement of languages for example is an obvious example.

W. WHEELER: I appreciate that. In some areas that is the reason for the phrase “or equivalent” in various places because we recognize that students in other countries are probably not going to be taking U.S. history, so it's certainly the case there. We can certainly undertake to include such a section. Let me mention though that this is not, this document is not being prepared for public consumption. It's the expectation that the Vice Provost for Enrollment Services and the Office for Admissions will take this and they concert it into all of the many pamphlets and letters and flyers and website. So this is a public but still internal document for the university. It's a policy document, it's not the things that we will actually send out and so we could undertake perhaps to include specifically a touch on the issue of international students. But the primary responsibility for customizing this in the materials that we send to international students or in such things on website, the primary responsibility for that customization will lie with the Office of Admissions. So please bear that in mind that this in headlines, it might be nice. So those of you who are readers of the Indianapolis Star to see headlines that say Bloomington is raising the number of college prep courses from 28 to 33 to deal with issues of quality, that would be very nice. But in terms of what action we send out to the high schools, to the high schools counselors—in fact if you look at this you'll find out to my astonishment, Chancellor Emeritus Gros Louis said that we currently send 40 different items out to our prospects. It's really astonishing. I just assumed, you know, maybe 10 or 15 or less you know. So the recruiting process is really quite intensive and that's where most of the students are going to learn about these things. This is where we set our policies and then give guidelines for the administration and that's why line number 8 is very important because it says that the Bloomington provost shall be responsible [Tape 1 Side A

Ends, some comments lost] ... achieving satisfactory levels of student academic quality and success. There's this policy and then the administration has responsibility to implement it. Kevin?

HUNT: Bill do you know what proportion of the students on the other campuses satisfy these new Academic Preparation requirements?

W. WHEELER: No, I don't have data—well, there is some relevant data in some of the university reports and we can undertake to get what we can for you on that; I don't have it on my finger tips.

CARINI: Yeah, you can look at the fraction of honors diploma recipients who were going there for instance, that will be a good start.

HUNT: Ok. Thanks.

W. WHEELER: So currently about 60 percent of the entering class, for Indiana residents, have Academic Honors Degrees and that percentage is much much lower on the other campuses. So we can look up that data and bring it back to you for your information.

IVIE: This is probably just a matter of clarification. I'm not sure I know how to read item 6 under Academic Preparation where it says 4 or more credits of additional college-preparatory courses. Shouldn't that be a colon, everything that follows that is really exemplary?

W. WHEELER: Perhaps it should be a colon and not a semi-colon, yes.

T. MILLER: I think that's the intent of it, Bob. Could I ask a general question Bill? Again using item 6 as an example, in that first paragraph in item 6 you use the word "must" with reference to the cumulative grade point average.

W. WHEELER: What section?

T. MILLER: This is section 6, I'm sorry, section 6; in the first paragraph, that "transfer students must have a grade point average"...and then you say that they "should have satisfied the course requirements" in section 2. In many places in this document, the word "should" is used and I think one of the things that I would like to ask the committee to do is to think about the use of that word and where—in some places I think maybe that would be the appropriate word. It's not clear to me in some of these other areas if that's the appropriate word.

CARINI: That it's not strong enough?

T. MILLER: Yeah, I think it may not be strong enough because this actually doesn't say that inter-campus transfer students have to satisfy these course requirements. I mean, we're encouraging them to but it doesn't say that they must.

W. WHEELER: Yes, we certainly will change that. Thank you, other questions? Yes?

TERRY: Well I had the same observation because when you spoke you said must and then it's should. One point, I would kind of like to respond to the president's concern about class ranking. I serve on the committee that produced the Chancellor's Enrollment Report and on the search committee for the vice chancellor, or I'll use the word vice provost, for enrollment services. I think we're learning that class rank is becoming an increasingly meaningless admissions criterion. Very good high schools no longer report it because if you're in the bottom 40% of the very good high school you may still be good but you don't appear to be good because you're turning up there. Many schools did not, in fact there's a table in the chancellor's presentation on the decreasing number of institutions that report it. By 2011, my prediction given the trend line is that it will be a completely meaningless concept and I wouldn't mind seeing it disappear from this document. At least I wish you would think about it some more. We've had candidates in to talk about the enrollment services job and they are surprised that we are still talking about class rank. For example, folks that come from institutions where that's dropped out of their admissions criterion. So I just wish you would consider whether looking forward toward 2011 we want to throw that in at all because there may so meaningless by then.

W. WHEELER: Well if I could refer you to page 5 of Chancellor Emeritus Gros Louis' presentation, you'll see an interesting graph up there because it presents first what percent of the incoming freshmen class is in the top 25% of their high school graduating class and the white bars you see the percent reporting a rank. Now as a person who sometimes teaches statistics, although I'm not going to be joining the statistics department, this is one of those graphs that does deceive because it's missing the scale. It's missing the top ten percent and bottom is cut off; the bottom 40% so that the visual thing is not quite as accurate as it should be. As I look at that, I actually see, if I look at the white bars, I see a graph if I joined that that's an exponential decay graph that suggests that in fact it will stabilize at some point in time. So I have to say that looking at the quantitative data I'm not persuaded that class rank will—that that graph is going to have to change for class rank to disappear by 2011. However because it is the case that as you can see that 35% of the schools no longer report class rank, an increase of 20% in the past five years, that the committee did go ahead and include these alternatives to class rank which have not heretofore been in it, because that was where we said that in class rank, that preference be given to Indiana residents who are in the top 45%. That's an increase heretofore it's been in 50th percentile to non-residents who are in the top 40% of their graduating class. Now, that's coming down from the current standard as written, but not the current practice, it actually would raise the current practice. To applicants who have a grade point average of B or better, greater than a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale in their college prep courses, we actually came up with that by looking at data from the College Board that gives correlations between SAT scores and GPAs in classes as reported by students and in terms of the SAT profile that we want to aim for that seemed to correspond to a strong B I believe. John and I looked at it, that the desired SAT profile corresponds to students having the grade point average of a strong B or better on their college prep courses.

To applicants who's exam scores on standardized subject exams demonstrate proficiency in their subjects and that latter part is clarified in footnote number 6, the footnote there should be a 5, 6 but the software I have doesn't provide for putting commas so it looks like footnote 56, that's really footnote 5 and footnote 6. If you look then to over to footnote number 6, it says examples

of standardized subject exams would be the CORE 40 subject exams that the state intends to implement and of course the College Board subject achievement exams and the ACT subject exams. We do not currently require any of these subject exams. Personally I have pushed for it thinking that this wouldn't be the proper response to the issue of class rank. That we need something—we do need a measure of achievement and it would be good to have a measure which did not depend on the particular school but at the same time there has been pushed back because that's for fear that we might discourage people from applying because they would have to take not only the SAT but they will have afternoon exams and there's a cost there.

The CORE 40 exams, at least for Indiana students, all Indiana students are going to have to take the CORE 40 subject exams. So by that point in time, we will be able to rely more on those exams. So, recognizing the limitations on class rank, it was the committee's hope that by combining all these different measures of achievement; class rank, GPA and grades in courses and scores on achievement exams, subject exams, that we would be able to have a good measure of student's academic quality.

T. MILLER: We have about 5 minutes to spend on this topic, any final questions please.

HARBISON: I have two small points; one is in relation to the grade point average. I think it would strengthen what you say since there's that issue of weighted versus un-weighted class rank if you said B or better (greater than a 3.0 on an un-weighted 4.0 scale) might be a little clearer. I'm not sure but it seems at least you should consider that issue. The other thing is that in category number 3 where it says that Indiana residents should complete a CORE 40 curriculum or equivalent, etc.. The word equivalent there is that a corollary to the last sentence in that section where it says some of IUB's schools and academic programs may require additional or equivalent high school course work. In other words, will the CORE 40 curriculum be mandated and then the variations in course work is where the schools have their parameters and flexibility or is the actual CORE 40 something where a school could determine an equivalent.

W. WHEELER: The language there is taken directly from state law and if you look at footnote number 2 which appears at the end of that sentence and also in footnote number 3, if you look at this online, if you go to the BFC website and look at it online you will find that there's an active link to the appropriate part of the state law where it says that four-year state institutions must require as a condition for regular admission, that Indiana residents complete the CORE 40 or equivalent. So the reason for that paragraph is to meet the requirement of the state law.

HARBISON: Ok.

W. WHEELER: And the word equivalent of course is very vague and it's vague in the state law and so we intend to import whatever vagueness there is in the state law which is quite great at this point. It is my understanding that IU lobbied for the word equivalent in the state law, that we are partly responsible for that and according to J. T. Forbes' annual report on his lobbying activities, he indicated that we had lobbied for this and part of the reason was for the School of Music. That when you look at some of our schools, particularly the School of Music, that you can have a lot of emphasis, you need to have music theory courses; you need to have music performance courses and so it may be that when you looked at direct admission to a particular

school that the CORE 40 provisions are not entirely the best preparation for that particular school. This is especially true for schools of fine arts and things like that and that's what provided by the...

DAVILA: Ted, could I have a minute, just have a second may be. Regarding the proposition that we disregard class rank ultimately, I myself respectfully disagree with that philosophically. In terms of the rural school or the ghetto school, that's the best of all possible worlds for certain students. The politics of the better schools saying well our bottom students lose out in this politics of class ranking, it works against, ultimately, those that are disadvantaged. So we need to be careful about that just, as if you like, Ivy League schools, for a group long now been proposing that we forget about SAT scores. Well, we're not forgetting about it and they have the luxury to disregard them, or work out their formula otherwise we need to take care about, if you like, politics that deal out those schools that are considered not as good as those well off ones. Thank you Ted.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much, Bill. This item will be back on our agenda in two weeks time, I believe anyways. If you have comments that you would like to send to the committee, please send them to Bill or John. I think we're anticipating that the trustees will be discussing the admissions policies for Bloomington, for IUPUI at the March meeting. So it would be good if we could actually act on this in two weeks. If you have amendments you want to propose as we go into that next meeting, please prepare them and bring them along with you.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

T. MILLER: Alright, we're going to then go back to the top of our agenda. Item number 1 approval of minutes for January 24th. Any corrections to be noted on those minutes please? No, hearing none, we'll take that as an approved item.

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

T. MILLER: Item 2, memorial resolutions, Dean Sept.

SEPT: Thank you, Ted. I'm pleased to present some excerpts from memorial resolutions.

Donald F. Carmony, Professor of History, died February 14, 2005, at the age of 95. Don Carmony was born in Shelby County, Indiana, the son of Bert and Golda Carmony. He attended one-room schools and after graduating in a class of nineteen from Manilla High School in 1925 went off to Indiana Central College (now the University of Indianapolis), where he graduated in 1929, not yet twenty years old. He soon began teaching at Indiana Central, where he met and in 1934 married Edith Hagelskamp.

While teaching at Indiana Central, Don began graduate study at Indiana University, completing his PhD in history in 1940. The next two decades he taught and administered in the university's extension division, first at Fort Wayne and then in 1944 as director of the South Bend-

Mishawaka Center. In 1950 he moved to Bloomington to become associate dean of the university extension division. He joined the Bloomington history faculty in 1955, the same year he became editor of the Indiana Magazine of History.

Don's early academic interests were in mathematics, but he gradually drifted toward history, particularly the history of the pioneers of his native state. He studied with two IU historians who created the first enduring academic scholarship in Indiana history, Logan Esarey and R. C. Buley. Don often spoke of his gratitude to these academic pioneers, telling stories of their wit, eccentricities, and brilliance. Don developed his deep knowledge of the state's pioneer origins through hard research that included thousands of hours reading newspapers, government reports, letters, and other primary sources. His understanding came, too, from his own life. As a boy, he lived for a time in a log cabin (a painting of which later hung in his living room). In an interview published in 1995 Don noted that "The farming that my father did was entirely the old-fashioned horse-drawn variety. There was no tractor, no electricity. In some respects, it was like the early history of Indiana."

Don's published scholarship included numerous articles and essays but centered on a two-volume history of the state co-authored with John Barnhart, Indiana: From Frontier to Industrial Commonwealth (1954), and Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era (1998). The latter volume was the culmination of a half century of scholarship and will remain the standard reference for the period. A significant part of Don's scholarship endures in the pages of the Indiana Magazine of History, which he edited over a twenty year period, much of it with the assistance of Lorna Lutes Sylvester. Under his direction the *IMH* became one of the leading state history journals in the nation. A prominent feature of his work was a dogged commitment to accuracy. On one occasion, when a would-be contributor to the *IMH* quoted from a tombstone in Valparaiso, Don stopped by the cemetery to check the wording.

Don's teaching focused on his Indiana history class, which enabled thousands of students to continue their lives and careers with a deeper understanding of the importance of place. Don taught and mentored graduate students on dissertation committees and especially as potential authors of articles in the *IMH*. Much of his teaching extended off campus in the hundreds of lectures he gave to service clubs, teacher workshops, and community groups. Through Continuing Studies he and Edith organized trips to historical places in Indiana, during which Don lectured on the bus.

Service was an extension of Don's teaching and research. He became a "public historian" long before the label was created by playing key roles in celebrations of the bicentennial of the American Revolution, of Indiana's sesquicentennial of statehood, of the university's sesquicentennial, and in guiding a history of the General Assembly. In this work he developed early historic preservation guidelines, and organized history teacher programs. A statement he made in a 1998 interview reflects the bedrock of his service: "I think the study of history should make you more tolerant, more understanding, more appreciative of the problems and your obligations to society."

Many awards recognized the quantity and quality of Don's work. They included the University's Distinguished Alumni Service Award in 1994 and a Sagamore of the Wabash

presented by Governor Frank O'Bannon at a special ceremony in the State House in 1998. Especially important was the establishment of a chair in history at Indiana University. The campaign to raise the endowment for the Donald F. Carmony Chair was initiated and led by two of his former students, Stephen Moberly and John Worth. Many others contributed.

Don's commitment to Indiana and its history did not make him a Hoosier provincial. He often spoke of the necessity to teach and learn about other parts of the world. He was a progressive voice on current issues, including support for public education and civil rights. In 1930 he spoke at the Indiana conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the only white speaker on the program at a time when many white Hoosiers were closer to the Ku Klux Klan than the NAACP.

Family was the center of Don's life. He often spoke of the debt he owed his parents. When on one occasion, as a dispirited sophomore, he was thinking of quitting college his mother told him: "I've given up too much. I've sold too many chickens. You're not going to quit school now." He and Edith were parents of two sons, both of whom became academics: Lowell, a mathematics professor, and Duane, a physics professor. Edith died in 1991. Don married Mary Hiatt Crawford in 1993, a friend from his graduating class at Indiana Central. Into the twenty-first century he and Mary exercised regularly at the local YMCA. In one of his last cvs, Don listed his hobbies: "gardening, exercise, travel, genealogy—and Indiana History."

In recognition of Donald Carmony's devotion to the university and to his profession, be it resolved that this resolution be a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council and that copies be sent to his wife, Mary, and to sons Duane Carmony and Lowell Carmony.

John D. Long died in Bloomington on December 14, 2004, ten months after being diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. He was my highly valued colleague for 42 years. A superb teacher and researcher, he was a source of inspiration to fellow faculty members and many students. He was always available as a sounding board of ideas, irrespective of how strange they were, and he never took differences of opinion personally.

John rendered important service to Indiana University. Some of his assignments were thankless and controversial. For example, he chaired a committee that conducted a sensitive presidential review. Also, on two occasions he chaired committees that conducted studies of the financial implications for IU of the early-retirement program for faculty members and senior administrators. He was chosen for such tasks because of his well-deserved reputation for level headedness and integrity.

John's family and church were central in his life. He is survived by his wife, Hazel, three children--Douglas Paul Long, Martha Susan Caughey and Elinor Jane Badanes--and their spouses and seven grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his parents, John Boyd Long and Effie Yates Long and by a half-brother, Rozelle Graham. He was a charter member of the Evangelical Community Church in Bloomington, where he served as an elder and teacher. After his retirement from IU in 1990, he increased his service to his church and wrote four thought-provoking books on aspects of Christianity.

John was born in Earlington, Kentucky, on July 21, 1920. He received a B.S. from the University of Kentucky in 1942, an M.B.A. from Harvard University in 1947, and a D.B.A. from Indiana University in 1954. He also earned Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter and Chartered Life Underwriter designations.

His academic career began as an academic instructor at DePauw University for one semester in 1947, after which he became an instructor in IU's business school. He was promoted to assistant professor of insurance in 1954, associate professor in 1956 and professor in 1959. He chaired the school's insurance department for many years. He served for a short time as editor of *Business Horizons*, the school's professional journal. In 1983-84, he served for about six months as the school's acting dean. In 1985, in recognition of his professional stature and his service to IU, he was named as the first Arthur M. Weimer Professor of Business Administration.

John was recognized internationally for his academic achievements in his chosen field of insurance. He was the author of *Ethics, Morality and Insurance: A Long-Range Outlook*, a book for which he received the 1975 Elizur Wright Award in recognition of "outstanding original contribution to the literature of insurance." He also received two awards for outstanding articles in *The Journal of Risk and Insurance*, the leading academic journal in the field. He was the editor of two editions of the two-volume *Issues in Insurance* used in the study program leading to the Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter designation. He was the senior editor of the *Property and Liability Insurance Handbook*, a widely used textbook in the 1960s and 1970s. He was the author of about 75 articles published as monographs or in journals.

Because of his professional reputation, John was in great demand by insurance-related entities. He was the 1966-67 president of the American Risk and Insurance Association, an organization of insurance professors and others interested in insurance education. He served for ten years on the board of trustees of the American Institute for Chartered Property Casualty Underwriters and chaired the institute's ethics policy committee for several years. He serves on the board of directors of the American Finance Association, and on the administrative board of the S. S. Huebner Foundation for Insurance Education at the University of Pennsylvania. He served for about 15 years on the board of directors of the Meridian Insurance Companies, where he chaired the investment committee and several ad hoc committees, and was on the executive and audit committees. He prepared major studies for State Farm Insurance and for the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. He was engaged on about 50 occasions as an adviser or expert witness to offer his views on the meaning of disputed insurance policy provisions.

During World War II he served in the U. S. Army in the U. S., New Guinea, Australia and the Philippines. He advanced through the ranks from private to captain and received a Bronze Star for meritorious service. His academic interest in insurance began when he read an insurance textbook while stationed in New Guinea in 1944. He was recalled during the Korean War and served as a Strategic intelligence officer at the Pentagon and elsewhere. During that tour of duty, he met and married Hazel Elinor Schnyder in 1952 in Washington, DC.

John had a wry sense of humor that made it fun to be with him. His wit is illustrated by the following three-way exchange--one of his personal favorites--that occurred in 1986 during his

expert testimony at a trial in San Francisco (Mr. Ready was the attorney conducting the cross-examination):

Ready: Now, professor, do you think that the Hartford, the Travelers, AIG Group and the Home know something about the construction of the CGL policy in asbestos-related bodily injury cases that you don't know?

Long: Well, I'm sure that each one knows--well, I guess I don't know how to answer that. I don't know if you know something I don't know, because if I knew you knew it, then I would know it.

Ready: Right.

Judge: Mr. Ready, I want to caution you, you want to be careful of a question you ask a Hoosier.

Ready: Yes sir. I recognize the problem.

Judge: Although I'm not one.

John was a gentleman, scholar and friend, in the finest sense of those words. His many admirers will treasure his memory.

This memorial resolution will become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Copies will be sent to Hazel, Douglas, Martha and Elinor.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much Jeanne. I'd like to ask the council members to stand for a moment of silence. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

T. MILLER: The next item is the report of the Agenda Committee. I just have a few items, some of which I've already mentioned I believe. The UFC took action on the university-level admission policy last week, setting the stage for us to do what we are doing with our Bloomington campus admission policy.

The trustee meeting was an interesting meeting. We've heard a bit of discussion about the enrollment plan. There was quite a session on that topic and I came away from that discussion and the president emphasized it today that there is a very high level of interest in the trustees in doing something to raise the student profile of the Bloomington campus and frankly I don't think there's any question that this is now going to happen. It's really a question of time, I would say. As you all know this is something that I've been interested in for some time and I'm very pleased about it.

There was also a discussion of the Search and Screen Procedures. The trustees as you know have some interest in this. I should say that at the UFC level, where there is a search and screen there is a university level Search and Screen policy, the UFC Agenda Committee has appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to take the ideas that the trustees have distributed regarding their views of search and screen. We're going to try to think about our existing policy, university policy and try to put something together that makes sense to us. We of course on the Bloomington campus have a search and screen policy as well and this is something that we will be doing here. The Agenda Committee will talk at its next meeting about how we're going to try to address that on the Bloomington campus.

There are a couple of things in the president's report, a section of the trustees meeting that I want to report to you. One was a pledge to consult with the faculty over these reorganization issues. He indicated that he was going to be consulting with the BFC Agenda Committee. You'll recall we had a resolution here at our meeting last time indicating that the BFC Agenda Committee would be an appropriate group for this consultation. He pledged that he would be consulting with the BFC Agenda Committee, also with the UFC Agenda Committee on university-level issues. And I was pleased to hear him say that. My expectation really—he said if you'll recall that he thought by the end of April a good bit of this will be kind of decided and frankly it wouldn't surprise me if we start hearing about it at the March meeting of the trustees. So I'm expecting that during this month there will be some discussions with the agenda committees over some of these matters.

The other thing that happened at the trustees I think that's noteworthy is that one of our colleagues Brad Wheeler is sitting in the back, he's been a faithful attendee of our BFC meetings this year. I appreciate very much Brad. Brad was appointed the Acting Chief Information Officer of Indiana University and I wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate you Brad and wish you well. Brad's previous position—some of you, many of us I think don't understand that there has been in Indiana University on the Bloomington campus for a number of years, a position called Dean of Academic Computing. Brad has been the Dean of Academic Computing on the campus for several years now and this is one of the reasons why he's paying attention to us. I hope Brad that in your new position you will be able to find some time for us as well.

B. WHEELER: Indeed, I'll be here every time I can.

T. MILLER: Okay, and congratulations to you. The final item is regarding the election for the BFC next year. The election materials have been sent out. The ballots of course will be returned to Dan Seldin who is our faithful counter of ballots and the committee preference forms should be, which are included in the material, should be returned to the BFC office. I would encourage you in your units to encourage your colleagues to participate in the election and also to take the BFC, the committee preference forms under advisement and to get involved in the Bloomington Faculty Council. There are lots of important things happening here that we can have an influence on. Alright, thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #6: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

T. MILLER: We then turn to item number 6 of our agenda which is the first reading of the Intellectual Property Policy. This is a revision of the current Intellectual Property Policy. This is a first reading. I'm not sure exactly what the future plan is for this document, whether we'll be coming back to it in two weeks or not, I'm not quite sure yet. But this is clearly a fairly important fundamental policy in the lives of the faculty and I think this is something that we should give close attention to. Randy Arnold is here with us. He is the co-chair of the Research Affairs Committee, BFC Research Affairs Committee and he is going to be giving us a presentation regarding this policy, thank you Randy.

ARNOLD: Thank you. This policy implements the Indiana University statement of principles on intellectual property. Like the statement, it is an expression of faculty led efforts to shape the interface between academic and the world of commerce and industry according to the ideals of the university. The policy attempts to address complex questions concerning patents, copyright and other forms of intellectual property created at Indiana University in a way that furthers the research, teaching and public service missions of the university and that preserves academic freedom and the open exchange of ideas. I won't read the rest of the policy to you but I did want to make that presentation.

The document being presented to you today consists of two parts. The first part, about a page and a half long is a brief introduction that provides explanation of a number of the key elements of the policy but this introduction of itself is not the policy, the second part and the longer part is the policy itself. I want to provide a brief history of the development of this policy into the document which is presented to you today. In April of 2004 the university Intellectual Property Policy or IP Policy Review Committee was established with the charge from Vice President McRobbie, and I quote, "review the appropriateness and effectiveness of IP Policy" and further on, "how effectively it can has been implemented and stipulated revenue distributions". After addressing that charge in April of 2005, this committee produced a draft document titled Indiana University Policy on Intellectual Property which was then passed along to the Research Affairs Committee as well as the Faculty Affairs Committee in the fall of 2005.

In deliberations of the Research Affairs Committee, we found the document to be both thorough and well written. However, it was determined that in the format provided to us by the review committee, the document did not have the proper format to serve as a policy. Specifically, the prose of the document included many examples and explanation of policy which did not have an appropriate place in the policy itself. Thankfully one of the Research Affairs Committee members, a professor in the school of law undertook the arduous task of converting the document from a pros format to the policy format you see before you today. The new version was approved by the Research Affairs Committee in November of 2005. In addition the Research Affairs Committee found it appropriate to retain some of the explanatory prose in the text and incorporate that into the introduction to the Indiana University Policy on Intellectual Properties. That's sort of how that introduction came to be. Our committee feels that the introduction should be juxtaposed to the policy, so that it can provide useful explanation without being confounded with the policy per say.

A brief amendment was proposed by the Indianapolis faculty council's Research Affairs Committee after our committee approved the version of the policy that you have. A slightly

modified version of that amendment was approved by our Research Affairs Committee and this amendment addresses the responsibilities of the Intellectual Property Policy Council and just briefly, on page 16 of the text that you have, the amended text would be inserted into section 7 after 7.b.i part (b) as a new subsection C. And so this is one of the responsibilities of the Intellectual Property Policy Council which would be to periodically review the effectiveness of the IURTC in utilizing the revenue that it receives under this policy to serve the interests of the university. In addition the text of section 7.b.v on page 17 will also add some text so that it will read “the Intellectual Property Council shall submit a written summary of its activities annually to the University Faculty Council” that part remains unchanged and then the added text “and shall specifically address in this report the effectiveness of the IURTC in utilizing the revenues that it receives under this policy to serve the interests of the university.” So, just some specific tasks there for the Council. This amendment does not appear on your version, your current version, but should be included in the text for the second reading, assuming there will be one.

I do want to point out a few highlights in the policy, some of this is text that you’ll find either in the introduction of the policy, some of it is just what I’ve written for you as explanation for today. There are two major types of protection afforded to intellectual property, patents and copyrights. In general patents may be sought to protect discoveries and inventions. That is, useful applications of novel ideas resulting from studying an experiment that have been reduced to practice. Copyright protects original works of authorship that are fixed in a tangible medium of expression. Works subject to copyright protection includes books, articles, artwork, music, soft, traditional or electronic correspondence and materials placed or found on the internet. So this policy, for example, would follow under copyright protection.

Copyright protection rests automatically upon creation of work and it’s fixation in a tangible medium from which it may have been perceived. Placing a copyright notice on the work and registering it with the U.S. Copyright Office offers are optional. With regards to software, under the law, software which is initiated as authored computer code, is treated in the first instance as a copyrightable authored product. However, because software shares certain features with inventions, it may also be patentable and in such case subject to the provisions of the Bayh-Dole Act where federal funding is involved. In this policy, software is generally treated in the manner of patentable intellectual property rather than copyrightable. And furthermore in the policy it’s stated that software is executable computer applications which courseware may include. But for further clarification, the term software means computer source code or executable code. Other digital media that we may sometimes think of software in fact in many cases are not. If I post lecture notes on the web, this is not software. If I produce some really cool graphics to include in my course notes and make this available on the web, it is also still not software. If I post a website that allows a user to enter two numbers and the website returns for them the sum of those two numbers, this may be software, but only if I wrote the code that computes the sum. If I’m simply invoking a program that already exists somewhere on my computer, it’s probably not software that I have actually created.

In order for work to be considered software, it must in some way manipulate or transform information into a new form and then in those cases it would be considered software. Software is covered in much more detail in this policy than in previous versions of IU’s IP Policy. But in the opinion of our committee, the way that software is treated in the policy has not substantively

changed. For example in many cases it is the creator's intention or possibly the requirement of the funding source for that research that software be released as open source code. Such release of software is consistent with this new policy.

One important aspect of the policy that has changed is the manner in which revenues are distributed from the licensing of intellectual property. Under the old policy, the percentages of revenues distributed to the creator and to the university varied depending on the amount of the revenue with the creator receiving a larger percentage initially and the university receiving a smaller percentage initially which then increased as the revenues increased. Under the new policy these percentages are held constant with the creator receiving 35% plus 15% for the creator's lab, the campus receiving 20%, the university receiving 5% and the office of Technology Transfer or IURTC receiving 25% and those numbers you can find on page 14.

In addition the PI Policy continues and protects faculty control over traditional scholarship, consistent with the current policy the university owns a copyright to works in traditional scholarship but allows a creator broad access to these materials for the purposes of instruction.

And that is my introduction and I'm happy to take any questions and try to address them.

MCCORMICK: As co-chair of the Distributed Education Committee we've taken a look at this policy and continue to have some significant concerns with two items; one has to do with dealing with virtually all computer software as patentable. Under patentable ownership, it becomes university owned, it is not the ownership of the initial creator. As you read through this, much of the way that software is treated is as a patentable item. So that raises a lot of concerns for distributed education where small programs may be written by an individual as part of the coursework. Our concern is that it is the format of delivery that is defining who owns this stuff as opposed to the nature of the work. I'll give you one concrete example, as part of an online course I obtained an internal grant to develop interactive cases where students can interact with virtual individuals. Under this policy because I deliver it on-campus, it is not a university work because that's an exclusion under the university works. It then becomes a traditional work of scholarship. If I actually use this online like I intend to use it, it then becomes a university work because the university work excludes anything which university personnel were involved in its development or the individual received release time to develop an online course. Whereas, if I received released development an on-campus course, the university does not own that course whereas if I received release time to develop an online course, it's a university work. The concern is that ownership of this, whether its faculty or the university, is being decided based upon the delivery as opposed to the work itself and that's one of the main concerns we had at Distributed Education.

ARNOLD: That's a valid concern. I believe that your reading of the policy is a correct one but I would have to look at that question a little more in detail and refer back to the policy.

MCCORMICK: Yes, items to compare would be item 1.f and item 3.f.

T. MILLER: Well I think it's very clear that the area of software is one of the really major change areas with regard to Intellectual Property Policy. Our previous policy treated this in a

completely different way altogether. Now, when I got the first copy of this, I sent a note to Dennis Gannon who was a member of the committee that drafted the original version of this policy.

ARNOLD: Right.

T. MILLER: And I asked him to explain why the committee had taken this particular approach to software. He sent me back quite a lengthy response which I think was considered by the committee but basically what he said was really in fact there really is only a certain type of software that the university thinks should be patented or patentable. There are all kinds of illustrations that he had of things that this policy would treat in the patent category that he said really the university has no interest in this kind of stuff at all. So my question is, why are we actually taking the approach to this that we are taking? I mean, if the law says that software is really in the copyright category, why are we saying, okay well, with regard to Indiana University we are going to put into this other category. I mean, what really is the fundamental reason for that? It comes across in this document as a completely arbitrary decision and it just isn't clear. I think it would be nice to have an explanation for why we are doing this and why we are doing the all—everything approach, you know. And I can't really believe that the university wants to get involved in your 2 + 2 software, you know. I really can't believe it. So why are we doing this?

ARNOLD: I don't know if I can speak for the committee that drafted this policy originally but I do want to point out that in our revamping of the policy, we did that with the intention of not changing the intent of anything that was written by the original committee. So this should, even though it looks quite different, should read almost exactly in many cases just word for word with that original version of the policy.

I believe the reason that policy treats software as a patentable is that you can offer certain protections with a patent that copyright protection doesn't provide. Now that doesn't mean of course that everything that could be patented will be patented. Right, only things that are going to be of significant economic value will be something that the university is going to pursue patent protection for. Other things, it's going to be—and if the university decides not to do that, the creator can then take that and on his own seek patent protection for it. But obviously no one is required to and as it also states, software does still have copyright protection. So I think the idea is that by including it as being potentially patentable, then it sort of encourages those cases where software that is of economic value it sort of suggests that the university is going to pursue patent protection for that intellectual property.

MCCORMICK: I think the concern is one of ownership, that the patentable automatically reverts the university ownership. This is one of the concerns that there are these “traditional works of scholarship” that are automatically the ownership of the faculty member creating that. But if it is patentable or if it is online, then it's university owned.

T. MILLER: Ann do you want to say something about this?

GELLIS: Yeah, I think in addition one has to consider that typically the type of software where

even online courses that we're concerned about are the ones where—that unlike the traditional works that we're familiar with before the age of the computer where you wrote it down and you basically use your pen and pencil and a library, that material software, and materials and web-based materials in terms of courseware use—often use, not all the time, extraordinary, what's referred to as Extraordinary University Resources. And that under the old policy where it was not clear whether software was traditional or not traditional and what happened with university works, that the thought was this was a cleaner way, since some software can be patented and it's very hard to distinguish, you know, at an early point whether it is or it isn't, that this was a cleaner way to handle it and for those things that either used Extraordinary Resources, as defined, or were patentable, that this policy would treat it as falling under the Intellectual Property Policy and provide for a revenue distribution that was in the policy and that for software that was not patentable and had no commercial value and had no extraordinary resources and would belong and would be treated basically that the rights would go back to the creator and they would be treated the same as traditional works. So it's really, I believe, an administrative way, easier way, of handling the confusion that necessarily arises with software because it can be one or the other and because even when it's not ... [End of Tape 1, Side B, some comments lost] ... than patentable why don't we treat it all as copyrightable? Well that would be perhaps a good argument if that were the only factor that makes it confusing. It's this second or third element that, with regard to the use, sometimes very substantial use, of other university resources that makes it not as easily put it one or the other.

MCCORMICK: Just as a point of clarification though if I spend three years here and develop an undergraduate course and I go to another university and I take my tests, my syllabus, my notes, my book and provide that class at another university.

GELLIS: Yes.

MCCORMICK: If I develop it online though I don't own that course anymore because as an online course developed with, as you said, significant university services it is a university work it is not mine.

GELLIS: But you have to look at the definition if you...

MCCORMICK: My suggestion is that we are dealing with this based on the format in which it's delivered as opposed to its creation.

GELLIS: No, I don't think that's right because I think it has to do with, I mean, as I read the definition, I looked over this this afternoon again, the definition of extraordinary resources is more than simply using the computer and it's more than...

MCCORMICK: But I can use ISS to develop my on-campus course too as the example I just gave. So I've got...

GELLIS: So now we're talking about something beyond that.

MCCORMICK: Well, on page 11, Item 3F3C1, page 11. Top of Page 11, C, “the following elements constitute exceptional university support: provision of designated technical assistance, such as audio-visual department personnel or qualified graduate assistant.” If I use those in developing my on campus course than no where in this document is that exceptional university support. If I use it in developing my online course it now becomes university work.

GELLIS: Ok, which way would you like us to come out on that?

MCCORMICK: Well my recommendation is that, does the university own all course development by faculty? Or is it just those that appear online?

GELLIS: No it has nothing to do with online. It has to do with...

MCCORMICK: That’s what the heading is “for online instruction”

GELLIS: Well the issue comes up online. The issue is whether there has been, the use of the resources tends to be quantitatively different than tradition.

MCCORMICK: I’m not sure I agree.

GELLIS: Well if you can show that they are the same then I can argue either we make more clear what extraordinary is, and that would be where I would argue we want to go, or we could say well we have to come up with some way of protecting against major uses of resources in all course materials. I think the intent is to capture those situations in which the amount of resources that have gone into the web-based course is substantially different from what is done normally with instructional materials.

MCCORMICK: I would contend differently.

T. MILLER: Well I think we can see there is at least one issue in this policy that will be discussed some more in all likelihood. I’d like to raise a second one, just briefly; this is something that you may recall that we approved last year a policy on Conflicts of Commitment. And one of the ideas in the Conflict of Commitment policy was that the activities that were subject to this policy were activities conducted during the period of the faculty member’s appointment—which is to say that for a 10-month appointee activities undertaken during the summer time are not activities that fall under this Conflict of Commitment policy, they occur outside the period of appointment. This policy on Page 2 has a definition in it, the very first definition of “creator” “anyone who creates intellectual property while employed by Indiana University.” I think one of the questions, it just isn’t clear to me, what we mean by that particular language, whether this is a fairly general reference so that irrespective of month, day, year, whatever it might be, I am an employee of the university. Or, am I employed during the period of my appointment?

ARNOLD: I can take a crack at that, Ann. I’ll try and then I’ll point to you to back me up. The way that our committee read this policy and specifically this definition of creators was that you can, the intellectual property that the university is concerned about is intellectual property and of

course you must be employed here during that time. So if you've ended your appointment and you are no longer associated with the university the university would have no claim to that. But during your appointment, and it doesn't have to be a 10-month or 12-month appointment, let's just say on the weekends you generate some intellectual property but you don't use any university resources to do that—so if I go home and I build the best mouse-trap ever the university doesn't have any claim to that unless I use some of the university's resources to do that. If however I go to the machine shop in the Chemistry department and there I design and I consult with people and I build the best mouse-trap ever and I do it sort of on the university's time then the university would have claim to that. So I think that the definition of creator sort of rests more on how university resources are utilized in the creation than it is on the time period within which it occurs. I could also do that on a Saturday, right, I could come into the Chemistry building and do that on a Saturday using university resources, or I could do it in the two months that my appointment is not, that I'm not assigned to my appointment through the university but I could still use university resources because I still have my key and have access to it. So it wouldn't matter specifically on the time in which I did it but whether or not university resources were involved. And usually this kind of intellectual property would involve not only my time but typically the time of some graduate students or some other resources of the university and that's where certainly then it would be that the university would have claim to it.

T. MILLER: So employed by Indiana University, using university resources, that's a combination of things that defines a creator.

ARNOLD: Yes, and maybe it's not clearly stated that way but we may want to rephrase it.

T. MILLER: Do you agree with that, Ann?

GELLIS: I certainly do.

T. MILLER: I think it would be very good to clarify that.

ARNOLD: Ok.

T. MILLER: I think we've gone as far with this as we can. We have two more items on our agenda. If there are other comments or suggestions for the committee please send them to them. Ann do you have a final comment?

GELLIS: Yes, I just wanted to add to Bryan's point as I'm thinking about web based materials. If you were to leave the university you are free to take it, it's not like you can't use that course material.

MCCORMICK: But it's owned as a university work as defined in this policy. So the university actually...

GELLIS: You have a non-exclusive license, you can take it, use it, and give it to others to use for educational purposes. So it really is only going to hit with respect to commercialization.

T. MILLER: Ok thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #7: BLOOMINGTON CAPITAL PRIORITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

T. MILLER: The next item has to do with the Bloomington Capital Priorities Committee and a report will be given to us by Neil Theobald. This was an issue that again was the subject of Trustees' attention in their past meeting and there are some questions, I think, that this Council might want to give some attention to that kind of come out of this.

THEOBALD: I'm going to refer to this document that's in your handout. The Bloomington Capital Priorities Committee is a 21-member committee. We meet bi-monthly and review all construction projects proposed for the Bloomington campus. The 21 members are made up of four representatives of faculty governance, there are two academic deans, Vice President for Research, the University Architect, Registrar, Dean of Faculties, Dean of Students, heads of IU Real Estate and Physical Plant, two representatives from Vice President Clapacs' office, two representatives from student housing and parking, a representative from IUSA, and a representative from the Bloomington mayor's office. So a very representative wide-based group. I chair the committee and Tom Swofford from my staff assists me.

The purpose of the document that we distributed today, that goes to Vice President Clapacs for two purposes. One is inclusion in the university-level discussions as to what requests we're going to make to the state legislature for the 2007-2009 biennium for state funding. And the second is to signal projects that the campus believes need to appear next in such requests, to give some heads up to them in a way so that we can begin to plan for these projects. This second purpose of identifying future project has always been important—there's timing and staging and more to these things. For example, you can't remodel Ballantine Hall until you build the Humanities/Classroom Building because there's no place for the people in Ballantine Hall to go if you're going to remodel it unless you build this building. So you have to build one first and then the next one. But another important purpose is to identify possible projects for the Capital Campaign, which I'll come back to later.

So let's start with New Construction which it says in bold there in the upper left. You see there are eleven projects that we believe should be started immediately; five of which would require state funding. The number one priority—these are listed in priority order—number one priority identified by the committee is the Computer and Information Building known as the CIB. The current IT building is located in a converted in a K-12 public school that was built in the late-1950s. The committee decided that the risk inherent in having such mission critical part of our university located in that type of facility made our vulnerability just too huge. If we were to lose our ability to use email and do anything technologically it would put us off line for weeks. So that simply, the risk of leaving it where it is was seen as too big so there's going to be the idea of going to the legislature requesting \$20 million and then raising the other \$55 million through private sources.

The number two priority is the Humanities/Classroom Building; that's the first step toward remodeling Ballantine Hall which is a very high priority for the committee. Classroom space on this campus is a huge problem. We teach mostly Monday to Thursday; 90 percent of student credit hours on the campus are taught Monday through Thursday. If you look at the usage it is simply not sustainable to continue to use these buildings at that rate. If you look at our lowest usage, the dip is on Tuesday, the average classroom has 11.2 sections taught in it during the day. Wednesday, which is our peak, is over 12.0 sections per classroom on that day. We simply cannot use these classrooms anymore. We had 240 classrooms in 1985, we have 240 classrooms today and we have 6000 more students. We've got to build classroom space on this campus.

Next year there will be a very minor gain; we have identified three relatively underused student computer areas that we are going to convert to high-tech classrooms which will help a bit, but obviously we need a classroom building something like the Humanities Classroom to be built.

Number three is the Faculty Studio Building for Music; and in many cases that's the classrooms those people teach in so in a way those are classrooms as well. Four is a Lecture Building, you are seeing a theme here—we need classroom space on this campus. And fifth is the new home for the School of Informatics which is currently in Eigenmann and overly in Lindley Hall and it's locations are spread to three widely separate locations. So those are the five projects that we recommend that the university go to the state and seek state funding for.

Then the other six—the first two of those are already funded. We have a gift for the Hutton Honors College which is under planning right now and then we've identified a source to build an office/teaching laboratory over on 3rd street which we're moving forward with as well. The final four on the bottom of that list—the priorities are the top five and then these are in priority order as well but do not require state funding—those will need to find other funding sources. We do not go to the state to get money for dorms and that would be in the next set there.

The medium-term and long-term projects you see are in alphabetical order. It's really not worth the time it would take to differentiate between the 21st and 22nd highest priority on the campus. So we simply say we've got these eleven, here's the priority with these eleven, and then here's a list that we need to be looking at next and then long term to give a heads up, these are the projects we're going to need to be planning in the long term.

On the reverse of that is remodeling projects; these are special remodeling projects, these aren't small. Generally \$1 million dollars is the cut-off although I notice there is one here that's \$900,000. But these are larger remodeling projects many of which will receive state funding. We identified six projects that are in need of immediate funding and asked the university to seek state funding for two. You'll notice there are three here because there was a decision made after our deliberations were done—we finished the first week in January—to seek Lab Renovations from the state at the university-level. So that's actually a \$35 million request to the state. We're turning what is normally a general rehabilitation, less than \$1 million, and saying we just don't have the money to do this, let's go to the state for a special remodeling request. And so I've added that to the list although that does not come from the committee that one comes from the university. But you'll see the highest priority we identified is the Wells Library; the IU library is the 12th ranked library among research universities and in order to maintain this standing we

think it is critical that we seek funding for the first phase of the renovation which is technological infrastructure, bringing the building systems up to date—it's not sprinkled for example. If you had a fire there would be a tremendous problem, and adding an auditorium on the south side.

The second project that the committee identified but it's listed third here, is Infrastructure. That's basically heating and air conditioning. If you are here in the summer you know that we have a serious shortage of cooling and as we build new buildings it is going to become an even greater problem. So that is to add to our heating and cooling infrastructure.

The next building, the Law School renovation, is the first one that we're going to do through the Capital Campaign. The Law School will attempt to raise \$5 million in order to renovate classrooms on the second and third floor of that building. At this point we've identified about \$115 million in projects that we will try to raise funds for through the capital campaign. Kirkwood Hall, we've already received the funds for that or we've identified a source of funding for that. We'll be redoing the roof this summer and doing other things in Kirkwood Hall. The Parking Lot and Bradford Woods we need to identify a funding source for that. And then the others it's the same thing we've said there are these other projects that need to be done and they are simply in alphabetical order.

Are there questions on this? The next step for this, for the ones for state funding, is this goes to Vice President Clapacs, as I mentioned and then this goes in a discussion across campuses of what will be the highest priority of the university, because we want to make one request to the legislature university-wide and then they will come up with a smaller group than what we have here that will be combined with IUPUI and the other campuses.

TERRY: What's a project where neither projected state amounts nor other funding sources are stated here, an NA?

THEOBALD: It's not that far along yet.

TERRY: So we just don't know what we're going to ask for.

THEOBALD: Right, don't know.

TERRY: OK.

T. MILLER: If I could...I'm just going to make a comment, this isn't a question. At the Trustees meeting there was a proposal presented by the University Administration as to what the university's request would be for the next biennium. The Trustees didn't act on it but they will shortly I believe. And just to give you a sense, this is a rather depressing end to Neil's story, there really are just two Bloomington items on the final list—Number one from each side of the page basically that made the university's list. Now at the same time...

THEOBALD: Well can I jump in, actually for the R&R all three of them.

T. MILLER: Well, I didn't take those to be Bloomington projects. But in any event, one of the other things that is possible I guess, JT Forbes talked a little bit about bills that are in the state legislature and some of them bear on the university's bonding ability. And so I suppose it's possible that at the end of the day the university may be in a position to go a little further down these lists if something happens there. However, it does appear to me, given what the Trustees were saying, if we were going to build more than just the first two projects, let's say, it's very clear that the Trustees have been told that our greatest needs are for research space. They seem completely uninterested in classroom space. They have been told that basically the problem in Bloomington with classroom space is that we do not use our space efficiently; if we would just kind of do what we all know needs to be done we wouldn't have a problem. So this I think is an issue that I would like to see over the next couple of week perhaps, I think the campus, and maybe the faculty really has to do this, working with Neil, working with Roland, I think we need to try to put together some kind of a picture of what this classroom issue really is for us because it really does seem as though the Trustees have gotten a picture of this that conforms to the way most of us think about it.

THEOBALD: I would agree with that.

TERRY: On that point, the College of Arts & Sciences did a study of its own classroom utilization and that could be obtained from Cathy Larson; it would be a good idea to start with that. I'd like to suggest that maybe we should pursue a different policy as well as that and I've mentioned this to Provost McRobbie not too long ago with no reaction, but I shouldn't expect one! It seems as if we can get money for research buildings. I'm wondering if we should ever build a building that doesn't include at least some classroom space. I'm surprised, for example, that the Multi-Disciplinary Science Building won't contain any meaningful classroom space and that's true with most of our recent building projects. We may have to adopt a policy where we include instructional space in the buildings that we can get authorized where we link those research needs with the future needs together and I'd like to suggest that we think about pursuing that.

T. MILLER: Other comments please on this issue? Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Well it actually goes beyond this issue but it does have to do with bonding authority and I know that from some of the conversation I've had at least with the newly appointed Trustees that they are well aware of our needs in this regard. But I also think that we have an administration that is extremely conservative with respect to debt and debt policy and being a debt guy I think it's a mixed blessing to know that our bond rating improved from AA to AA+--hallelujah. What it means is that we've got a lot of untapped bonding potential that we could be making much more aggressive use of and I think that's an area that really wants to be examined very vigorously.

T. MILLER: Ann?

GELLIS: I would just add that in addition, in terms of the classroom use, there was a campus task force that Myles Brand put together on the Campus Capacity—I know Neil was on it and it was headed by David Zaret and we have, I mean I'm sure the information could be updated by

Roland but it puts forth how intensive we use our space and how we compare to other universities in classroom space, in size, and seats, and everything else so there's a lot of information that could be used.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much. I really think that we need to make some kind of effort to get some information like this to the Trustees. We have reached our mandatory adjournment time and we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm