

**Minutes of the  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
November 1, 2005  
Ballantine Hall 008  
3:30 – 5:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Craig Bradley, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliott, Emily Fairchild, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Elizabeth Johnson, Susan Jones, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, David MacKay, Joss Marsh, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Murry McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, John Odland, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Lisa Pratt, Amy Reynolds, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Sheperd, Alex Shortle, Sarita Soni, David Waterman, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams, Eric Zeemering

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Major James West for LTC Lori Bass

**Members Absent:** Katy Borner, Jorge Chapa, Sandra Dolby, Kenneth Gros Louis, William Leckey, Gerald Marker, Dale McFadden, Joseph Near, Sara Pryor, Aarti Ramaswami, Jerrold Stern, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, Maxine Watson

**Visitors Present:** Charlie Nelms, Edwardo Rhodes, Steve Watt, Roland Cote, Fred Cate, James Wimbush, David Daleke, Randy Arnold, Steve Hinnefeld, Herb Terry, John Graves

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
October 25, 2005

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/10.18.05.htm>

2. Memorial Resolution  
Professor Emeritus Quentin Manning Hope

<http://www.indiana.edu/~docs/AY06/circulars/B14-2006.htm>

Associate Professor Timothy Wiles

<http://www.indiana.edu/~docs/AY06/circulars/B15-2006.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller)

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)

6. Policy on Access to Laboratories with Hazardous Materials or Laboratory Animals by Visitors

[ACTION ITEM] (20 minutes)

(Professors Robert Ivie and Randy Arnold, co-chairs, Research Affairs Committee, with Professor Ann Gellis, Associate Vice President for Research)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U5-2006.doc>

7. IU Policy on Undergraduate Admissions [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)

<http://www.indnana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U9-2006.htm>

8. IU Bloomington Policy on Undergraduate Admissions [DISCUSSION] (45 minutes)

(Professors William Wheeler and John Carini, co-chairs, Educational Policies Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B13-2006.htm>

9. Standing Committee Reports

10. Old Business

11. New Business

## **AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MILLER:** Welcome to the Bloomington Faculty Council. We have a number of visitors with us today. Welcome. We have decided to alter our agenda to a certain extent here today. President Herbert was invited to come and make a statement about the Chancellor/Vice President Search and he's graciously agreed to do that. He has some comments that he wants to make and then he is willing to respond to questions that people might have. We have some time constraints for this part of the agenda. The President has to be back in Bryan Hall at four o'clock for another event, so we have maybe fifteen, twenty minutes or so to accomplish what we're going to accomplish here. Welcome Mr. President.

**HERBERT:** Thank you very much. I appreciate very much having the opportunity to meet with you. I think it just fortuitous that you happen to have your meeting scheduled today and we made a major announcement yesterday with regard to the Chancellor/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs search. What I'd like to do is just make sure, obviously this is a very important position for all of you, so I want to make sure that you have as clear a sense as possible as to where we are and why we happen to be here.

First let me tell you that I think that the search committee has done an outstanding job. I met with the committee yesterday. The committee did give me three names of folks that they felt we should talk with. We had the opportunity of engaging in extensive conversations with them. Ken Gros Louis and I worked very closely together on this. I think the good news is that between the two of us we've had about fifty-five, sixty years of experience in dealing with selection of officers for university positions and frankly I found his participation particularly helpful because he has such a clear understanding, a much more in depth understanding than I, of the day to day aspects of the position, of both positions and also a good deal of historical perspective I found very helpful as we went through the process.

Let me tell you that we talked with each candidate both individually and collectively for over five hours. There were a number of interviews that were conducted. We were operating under a context in which the search firm told us very clearly that if we wanted to attract the quality of candidate to which we aspired that it was essential that we maintain as confidential a process as possible. As it turned out that was especially important for one of the candidates. In any event we did invite the candidates to campus. One candidate had a slightly different kind of scenario because we had to convince him that this was in fact a great opportunity. He had been a candidate for a presidency of another institution. All of that simply to say that I think the committee did a very good job of putting forward an initial list of professionals that I thought were very able in the context of the job that they had held. It also was my view, as Ken and I went through the process that we did not have within the final group that we were considering a person that met all of the fundamental expectations that we had for this position. You may recall that when I met with you, and the same thing was true with regard Board of Trustees, what I indicated was that we were going to find an extraordinary and outstanding person to fulfill these responsibilities, someone who without question met our highest expectations. That was the charge to the committee. We continue to focus in that regard.

Let me tell you that what we did was to enter into a very extensive due diligence process. Actually that process for me began shortly after I arrived on campus. I had meetings with all of the deans, with all of the chancellors and I asked them questions specifically about the senior officer roles within the university and those conversations gave me a very clear sense of what—I also by the way talked to with the co-chairs of the UFC—about the skill sets that we needed in that position, about the responsibilities associated with it that they regarded as particularly important. Those conversations on the one hand were a backdrop for me going through this process. In addition, Ken and I identified several criteria and I won't go through all these. We talked again yesterday with the search committee about them, but we're interested in leadership experience, understanding of issues and trends of higher education, judgment and decision making, temperament, vision, communication skills, collaborative skills as a team player, problem solving skills, interpersonal skills and also we were focusing on their current situation.

What I can tell you is the decision to go forward to continue the search is not a statement against either of the candidates that we were focusing on in particular but rather this is about goodness of fit. One of the things for all of the positions since I've been here that we have focused on, whether it's been on the academic side, whether it's been athletics or with regard to service areas like government relations or public relations we've always taken a position that we have to pursue the highest standards possible. We must identify up front what the criteria are and then follow through on those to assure that we get the right kind of person to fulfill as many of those expectations as possible. It was my conclusion that we did not arrive at that level, that we had not identified the appropriate leader to fill this important position. Under those circumstances I've asked the committee to continue the search. I remain very optimistic. I talked with the consultant and he shared with me some of the challenges that he had initially with regard to developing the pool. He is confident that we can identify a strong group of additional candidates for the committee to consider. That process of identifying candidates is going to proceed immediately. I can tell you that the chairman of the search committee and I, following the very helpful set of observations by the members are going to be talking with the consultant giving him some additional very clear guidance, articulating additional expectations. I am confident that we'll be

able to fill this position during the spring term. If you haven't seen the press release on the website, I did include a copy of that so everyone could see it. I hope you got the email message yesterday with the URL address on that but the key is this; I've given Ken some very specific challenges that I expect him to focus on during the balance of this semester. We're not going to lose momentum. There are a number of things we've got to do to assure that we continue to achieve all the aspirations that we have for this campus and we're going to make sure that that occurs. Let me stop there and let me respond to any questions that you might have.

**MILLER:** We have one person who asked to come, wanted to ask a question or make a comment, I would like to call on him first, that's Steve Watt who is the Chair of the English Department. Steve?

**WATT:** Thanks, thank you President Herbert. I wrote an email to my colleagues this morning and to Ted which expressed, I think, quite accurately the great sentiment from the colleagues who sent me emails last night and this morning, several dozen of them. I'll just read it, it's very short. It addresses actually to a member of the committee.

"I'm writing to a member of the Chancellor's Search Committee. I would be guilty of falsehood if I didn't express disappointment at President Herbert's decision not to appoint either of the two finalists for Chancellor. More appalling by far, however, is the insensitivity with which this announcement has been made, both as reported in the HT and on the university's website. One might have hoped that Dean Subbaswamy, who's publicly recognized as a finalist for the position, that President might have said a few things about the Dean's substantial merits, even mentioned the fine job he's doing as Dean of the College. Sadly we got nothing of the kind and even worse, we woke up to an egregious headline in the paper, "Good Help is Hard to Find". To be sure President Herbert does not edit the local paper, therefore he cannot be held accountable for the unfortunate headline but he and his office might have thought for a moment before releasing a totally inadequate, in my view offensive report, to the media as posted on the website. Every colleague with whom I have spoken, and this exceeds a few dozen, regards the communication as subjecting a valued administrator to public humiliation. This is an administrator about whom colleague after colleague and department after department speaks with uniform praise and respect. He and all of us deserve better".

**HERBERT:** Let me respond to that by saying this, that when we initiated this search process, one of the things that we committed to, both... and this was true with regard to the members of the search committee as well as all of us who are taking part in it, is that we were not going to speak to or identify candidates for the position and I'm sure that you will agree that all of us have been very faithful with regard to that commitment. We told each of the candidate that we would not say anything publicly about their candidacy for the position that ended up as I indicated earlier being very important in terms of our getting folks to consider the position. So, I have not commented in the press release about any candidate. I have not acknowledged anyone as being a candidate for the position, to do otherwise is inconsistent with the initial ground rules for the search process and I think it is important, in terms of maintaining the integrity of it for us to take that position.

If you're asking me as a separate matter, how do I happen to feel about or how do I regard one of our colleagues, that's a separate matter. But I will not do that in the context of the search because again it's inconsistent with what we agreed on from the very outset. I think that we have to maintain the integrity of that. What I can tell you again is that we conducted a very thorough search. I did share with the committee in more detail yesterday the kinds of comments that we received about each of the candidates. What I can tell you is that it just so happens that there are very few of us who have heard everything, who have engaged in the extensive conversations that we had and we have not made any negative comments about anyone because we haven't announced who they were. Although I did make the point yesterday very clearly in the press release that I thought we had some outstanding professionals who were finalists for the position, that we held them in very high regard, that this was simply an issue of a match between what we feel we must have in the university in this position and the candidates that we had the opportunity to consider.

This was not an easy decision. It was one that I did a lot of soul searching over but in the final analysis, it was my belief then as it is now that I owe it to all of you, I owe it to this campus and the university to make a decision that I am absolutely convinced is in the best interest of Indiana University and I can tell you without hesitation that I am firmly convinced that is exactly what we've done and I do believe that when we make an ultimate decision it is going to be one that all of you will be proud of, it's going to be a colleague that you will enjoy working with. It will be a colleague that you will respect and that will have the experiential base necessary to fulfill the very significant scope of this job. It is more than a provost position and when you look at the multiplicity of assignments associated with it, we cannot afford to make a mistake. We don't have time but I have a list of issues that we focused on, questions that we sought to answer to make sure that there were no mistakes on this and that's why I feel so strongly that we have done the right thing by all of you and by this campus. Again I'm sorry that I can't comment on individual candidates but I can tell you that I have the utmost respect for each of the persons that we considered. The committee was very diligent in terms of bringing forward names of folks that they thought were worthy of consideration. There's never been a question about that, whoever those candidates might have been. I'm not going to violate the commitment that was made to each of them that we would not discuss their names publicly.

**MILLER:** John?

**CARINI:** I guess I don't understand your confidence that we will have someone by next spring if we did just do a thorough search that took all year to reach this point and an additional five or six months doesn't seem to be adequate for polling of new candidates.

**HERBERT:** I don't agree with that John. The bottom line is this, that there are time frames. The time frame in which we were operating originally was a more challenging one because normally folks are in the market during the spring term. Second, the search firm pointed out to us some unique realities that we had to deal with as an institution initially and including some folks that were discouraged from becoming candidates. He believes that we can convince those folks at this point in time to come back into the pool. In addition we're going to be much more aggressive with regard to our outreach efforts and we'll be working very closely with the committee in this regard in terms of assuring that we extend our net more broadly. This is one of

the things we're going to be talking with the search firm about. I have conducted several searches at the presidential and the provost level and what you try to do is to make sure you are extending that net in the appropriate fashion. I am much more confident that at this point in time during the spring term that we're going to be more successful. The comments that we've gotten from the consultant reinforce those feelings and there are some other aspects of the search that have caused him to feel that way. In terms of the confidentiality of it I just can't comment beyond that at least in terms of the observations that he made. Are there other questions or comments?

Well again the bottom line is this, that we have just gone through a due diligence process that has not been followed with regard to some of the previous searches including those of chancellor on this campus. I recall very vividly a number of observations that were made when I first came here about the importance of this position and about the characteristics that we had to have. I listened very carefully to that and again I just want to reiterate that I owe it to you and to this university to assure that we get the very best candidate that we possibly can. I know that is the commitment of the search committee. I know how hard they worked. When I talked with them yesterday the sense I had was that they are as enthusiastic as I am about assuring that we get the right person to fill this important role. I'm not going to back away from the challenge of assuring that we do that. There are a number of easy decisions that you can make in these processes but we have got to make the right decision for the university. This is not about friendships. It's not about prior relationships. It's about an ideal match between our needs and aspirations and the experiences, the qualifications and the track record of the candidate and we're going to keep that in mind. My commitment to you is that you're going to be very proud of the person that we ultimately select for this position. We're going to get it done during the spring term and we're not going to allow this interim period to be one in which we lose momentum. We're going to continue searches. We're going to complete those. My assumption is that as we deal with two or three of the major positions that still remain open, that our new Chancellor/Vice President designate will have an opportunity to weigh in on those conversations. This is I think a very exciting time for the university. It's one in which I'm disappointed because I had hoped to have this behind us and have a new person on board in January. Again, I don't back away from the proposition that we have done the right thing by all of you and I think when everything is said and done you'll all feel very proud of that decision. Any other?

**BOBAY:** I was wondering has any thought been given to the dual role of vice president and chancellor and was that an issue in the previous search.

**HERBERT:** The only issue that arose in that context is the amount of experience that the person needed. The combination of those duties is a chief operating officer for this campus and that position carries with it... the position has added gravitas because of that and so it's even more important for us to have someone that has had experiential base that assures that they're well equipped to deal with those added responsibilities. The interesting thing is, as we visited the campus and we spent a good deal of time talking with current and prior colleagues and employees for the candidates, but we were congratulated in one context because we had combined those two roles. What I am convinced of in that regard is that if we had a vice presidential portfolio only, it is not a full-time job, number 1. Number 2 I think that by creating that what we would do is ultimately have a scenario in which that person then began to attempt

to micromanage what takes place on all the campuses, and I think that would be a serious mistake. So, by having this structured the way we are, we are able to provide overarching academic leadership and support without getting into a situation in which there is a much heavier level of micromanagement than we want to see in a university structure such as ours. Are there others?

**HUNT:** Have conditions changed or will the next aspect of the search be conducted with the same level of confidentiality as before?

**HERBERT:** It will probably be conducted with the same level of confidentiality. The thing we've got to recognize is that the competition for these kinds of positions is such... most universities are doing this and we run the risk, if we open it up in a fashion that puts candidates at greater risk in a context of their campuses, they're going to be much less likely to apply. So, we will utilize the same approach. Unless the consultant tells us that he is able to find candidates that are willing to operate in different contexts. The worst thing for us to do is to delimit our potential for attracting the kind of people that we want to have and this is a very competitive environment. There's no question about it. One of our candidates had already been offered a presidency, and he turned it down, there was another one that was talking to him. So, what we know is –and in his case he would have dropped out immediately if his name had been made public. Some of these folks just have those unique circumstances so we have to deal with if we want to get the kind of senior level leader that we desire. Again, I really appreciate having the opportunity to come and to share these observations with you. And again we're going to make you proud with regard to this selection and I'm sorry I can't comment on individual candidates but, from an integrity perspective, I feel I have an obligation to follow through in the fashion that we articulated. But I can tell you once again that I think that the professionals that we considered were very good at what they do, this was simply a matter of goodness of fit, in the context of the nature of this job. There are several members of the committee here; I just want to thank you once again for your service to the university. I know that has been a sacrifice in terms of time and we're asking you to make additional sacrifices but our university is going to be a stronger one as a result of what you're doing. So, thank you for that very much and thanks again for the opportunity to be here.

**MILLER:** Before you go, I think it's... I probably should say, given what I've seen in my email today and various conversations I've had, I mean, there really is a fairly deep concern in the Bloomington faculty over how this is going and I'm not sure exactly what to do about it at this particular moment but I think it's something that we should work on because I really do think there are some deep concerns over this issue and maybe some related issues.

**HERBERT:** Again, the one thing I hope we can do is avoid getting into a scenario in which we're focusing on one individual. This is about more than one individual, this is about the university. Let me just say, in the final analysis, I can break down in great detail the rationale for why we have not recommended each candidate. But I don't think that's useful even if I could do it. But in some respects I think part of what we're asking you is to trust Ken and me that we are committed to serving the university and that we're not going to make decisions that are haphazard, we're not going to make decisions that are not within our understanding of the best interests of the university. This is about excellence; it's about fulfilling very clear needs. We

want to elevate the quality of this institution. We want to assure that the Bloomington campus is as strong as possible. We want to assure that some of the kinds of things that I've heard about in the past do not occur again. And again, that's an obligation that I believe I have to you and I'm not going to back away from my commitment to assure that we respond to the highest aspirations that you have and to the quality expectations that all of us must insist upon. Again, I really appreciate the opportunity to comment. Again, I wish I could share more but at least I hope that you have a clear sense that this is a decision that's been made based upon conviction and a level of understanding that at this point no one else has. Because we've heard so much and we know so much about candidates and about what the needs of the institution are. So I welcome the opportunity of having those follow up conversations Ted. Again, thank you very much.

**MILLER:** Thank you, Adam. You may have noticed that Chancellor Gros Louis is not with us today. He phoned this morning with a rather hoarse, a hoarseness in his voice, and he appears to be quite under the weather today and so I'm going to try to struggle through this agenda trying to keep various people, mostly Professor Wheeler in order here. [Laughter]

**DAVILA:** He's one of us. [Laughter]

#### **AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MILLER:** All right, so the first item on the agenda is the approval of minutes for the October 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. The minutes have been posted to the website. Is there a motion to approve them please? A motion to approve them from Kevin Hunt moves to approve them, a second?

**DAVILA:** Second.

**MILLER:** Luis, all right. All in favor of approving them say "aye" [aye], opposed? Thank you.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION**

**MILLER:** The second item, we have two memorial resolutions and Dean Jeanne Sept will present that material.

**SEPT:** Thank you Ted. I'll read an extended excerpt from these two resolutions but you can read them in their entirety in. The first one is for Professor Emeritus Quentin Manning Hope. Quentin Hope was born in Connecticut in 1923 and spent several of his formative years in Europe where acquired several of the languages that would become his life-long passion. He acquired his B.A. in 1942 from Harvard and upon graduation joined the American Field Service and was attached to the British Eighth Army in the Middle East. Later he was assigned to the European theater where he drove ambulances in Italy, France and Germany. He often regaled family and friends with stories of those years, and in 1999, during his retirement, Quentin wrote his memoirs of those war years and of his numerous adventures with other AFS volunteers, some of whom became his life-long friends. At the conclusion of the war he returned to Harvard and received his M.A. degree and his first teaching position was at the Elizabeth Irvin School in New York

City. He enrolled in a PhD program at Columbia, lived in Paris several years where he did his dissertation on the writings of Charles de Saint-Evremond.

Following in the footsteps of his older brother Henry Radford Hope, Quentin joined the Indiana University faculty in 1956 as Assistant Professor of French. He became Associate Professor in 1961, was promoted to full professor in 1966 and chaired the department of French and Italian from 1965 to 1977. As chair Quentin Hope worked especially hard to develop the Italian section of the department into its current position as one of the leading Italian literature programs in the United States. He was an excellent teacher in French and always developing new courses above the graduate and undergraduate level and he was devoted to his students. He also offered three different multi edition textbooks for the study of the French language and he served his profession in a variety of capacities throughout his career and his prominence in the field was recognized by the numerous invitations he reserved to serve on departmental review committees for other institutions. However Quentin Hope's life long passion was seventeenth-century French literature. His first monograph was published in 1962 titled *Saint-Evremond: the 'honnête homme' as Critic* (Indiana University Press). He was fascinated by the seventeenth-century *libertins* in France, that group of freethinking authors such as Molière who refused to accept the strictures of royal absolutism and religious dogmatism.

Professor Hope studied in detail the group of friends who surrounded Saint-Evremond and his numerous articles reflect his passion for these original thinkers who also liked good living, good food, good wine and good conversation (all aspects of Quentin Hope himself). After his retirement from IU in 1988, he wrote a new book which was published in Paris in 1999, *Saint-Evremond and His Friends*.

Throughout his career Quentin Hope was personally committed to scholarships, professional excellence and to IU. He cared deeply about his colleagues and his department and like his beloved Saint-Evremond, Quentin Hope was a true *honnête homme*, a wonderful friend and an esteemed and respected scholar.

The second memorial resolution is for Associate Professor Timothy Wiles. Tim Wiles' formative years presaged travel, across the country and, eventually, around the world in various capacities as a teacher-scholar and as an administrator for Indiana University. Born and educated in Maine, Tim received his PhD in English in Stanford in 1975 and he joined the IU faculties of English and Comparative Literature in 1973, and taught courses in these and other departments until his death in the summer of 2003.

Tim's major academic interests were drama and performance studies, and in 1971 he spent a year in Poland researching contemporary Eastern European drama movements and theory, directing several plays at an international student theater festival there. The dissertation that resulted from that study was published as a book with Chicago Press in 1980; *The Theater Event: Modern Theories of Performance*, an important study of three distinct theories of modern drama and theater: and a significant book for all students in modern theatre to read and reread as it charts very different directions the modern drama took for much of the twentieth century. He also

edited a book entitled *Poland Between the Wars* (1989) and published numerous articles on European and American drama.

At IU, Tim offered courses in modern drama, literary interpretation and criticism, theories of performance, and cultural studies, as well as popular freshman lecture courses. He was also the general editor of a series in Drama and Performance Studies published by the Indiana University Press. At the time of his death, he was working on a book-length study of Arthur Miller, Tony Kushner, and the impact of the Cold War on the American theater, and he had presented some of his findings to international audiences at scholarly meetings in America and Russia.

As important as Tim's teaching and scholarship were, his international administrative service was just as valuable. In 1975 for example, he was sent by IU to aid in the establishment of the American Studies Center at Warsaw University, a center which continues to provide a forum for international academic exchange. In 1981, he returned to Warsaw as a Senior Fulbright Lecturer with his wife and while there, the two of them coordinated IU exchanges with Warsaw University and witnessed the imposition of martial law during the last days of the Solidarity movement. Upon his return to Bloomington, Tim directed the Polish Studies Center on campus from 1983-1986 and again from 1991-1999. Because of his long career promoting academic exchanges with Poland, he was awarded the Distinguished Medal of Service from Warsaw University and the Amicus Poloniae award from the Polish ambassador for outstanding achievement in promoting Polish culture.

Later in his career, Tim turned his attention to Africa, serving as a visiting scholar at the University of Ghana and working with the School of Performing Arts and the National Dance Troupe of Ghana.

But, throughout all of these travels, Tim never forgot the Bloomington arts community and especially the needs of its youngest members. He was one of the earliest members of the Bloomington Playwrights Project and served on its Board of Directors for many years and he generously volunteered to give pre-performance talks for of the IU department of Theatre and Drama and curtain talks both for the Phoenix Theater in Indianapolis and the Waldron Arts Center in Bloomington.

Tim Wiles was a gentle man, soft spoken, brilliant, and caring—a valued colleague to his many friends in the English department and elsewhere on campus, noted for his generosity and compassion.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much Jeanne. To honor the memory of Professor Hope and Professor Wiles would you please stand for a moment of silence? Thank you very much.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**MILLER:** I have just one item that I'd like to say something about today regarding Agenda Committee Business. Many of you know this, I imagine, but shortly after our meeting here last time, one of our members, Joe Near, had a stroke and was taken to the Bloomington Hospital and I believe he remains in the Bloomington Hospital. I'm not really sure of the details; I think

there's some surgery being planned but there are some complications so the surgery hasn't happened yet I don't believe. Ann do you...

**GELLIS:** Yeah, he developed some infection. He's on antibiotics so they're now talking about some surgery probably not for about another week or two.

**MILLER:** So I think his condition would probably be viewed as serious and for those of you that know Joe, you might wish to drop him a line or something like that.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**MILLER:** There is none today since our presiding officer is not with us.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/ COMMENT PERIOD**

**MILLER:** So we have a question and comment period. There are no questions in advance. There are no questions in advance so if people have comments to questions they would like to ask, our expert question answerer isn't here but we will do the best we can I guess.

**DAVILA:** I would like to thank Professor Steve Watt and you for at least airing this matter a bit more as to the sentiments that I'm sure prevail amongst many of us on campus given a situation of executive privilege which is always a bit of a quandary for those of us in academia as well as the executive privilege or search committee privilege that binds us all. But I myself thank you for at least approaching the subject and reporting it to the Council in general.

**MILLER:** Thanks Luis.

**KRAVCHUK:** May I comment as a member of the search committee and for the benefit of colleagues on the Council. We know that when you get down to a small number of candidates in this kind of a search that anything can happen and it did. And I think that the fact that the President was unwilling to make an appointment that he would not feel comfortable with should be respected and that this goes across the board for all the candidates who were advanced. And I think that after having a chance to listen to him and to speak with him and ask him questions which he answered, I feel that the process as it continues is the right one and that ultimately will be for the benefit of the campus and so as he said, its difficult to say anything more than that because we are bound by the norms of confidentiality. But I wanted the Council to know that as a member of the committee, just speaking for myself, I'm reasonable comfortable with the spot we are in and I do believe that we will recruit the right person for the position, ultimately.

**MILLER:** The President met with the search committee on Friday, is that correct?

**KRAVCHUK:** Monday.

**MILLER:** I'm sorry on Monday, yesterday, for a couple of hours. That's what you're talking about in terms of the questions being answered and so forth and so on?

**KRAVCHUK:** Yes.

**MILLER:** Other comments, yes?

**PRATT:** Ted I just feel like I have to add one additional comment as a member of the committee. I am deeply concerned that Indiana University seems unable to mentor or raise up administrators from within its own ranks and I sincerely hope that in the future we find a way to bring forward candidates who know who we are, who share our understanding of what is different about this campus from other campuses because I am quite concerned that we will find ourselves searching for a new College dean at the same time we're searching for chancellor. I'm deeply, deeply concerned that Swamy will look elsewhere at this point.

**JONES:** I'd like to say I'm very naïve and unconnected in these matters but in listening to this there seems to be two issues that are separable. One is whether the president and committee have every right to make the decision that they made and the other is the impression that's been left that the candidates that were considered were more inadequate than perhaps they were. And from what the President said today, he may not have meant to give that impression and I wonder if something can't be done or requested to make it clear that the candidates have excellence all over the place but emphasizing their sought of specific fit issue or something because that seems to be the most dwelling thing about this whole matter.

**HAWKINS:** As a member of the committee, another one, I think that the President took a lot of time yesterday and tried again today to explain that this is a difficult fit job because it's a two portfolio job. And I think it's been a terrific learning experience for all of us in the committee. When we started we weren't sure we'd have somebody this soon in the beginning. I think there is a fit issue and he's trying to say that all of the people who advanced were highly qualified professionals. It's not that they weren't qualified, it's a fit issue and it's a complex portfolio of two portfolios.

**JONES:** And it just seems as though that message didn't get across especially with the way for example the HT handled the matter and that perhaps another statement could be made.

**HAWKINS:** We've been thinking mostly about Bloomington. We have to remember that this is a senior vice president for academic affairs for the whole university and that there are chancellors on other campuses and people on other campuses who had a stake in this process too; which makes it very difficult for the committee to do its work.

**JONES:** But again, that's the issue of making the choice, which is the committee's purview as opposed to the impression that's been left in the community, which is a little different.

**MILLER:** Well, I think the point you're making is a very good point. I mean, it seems very clear to me from what I've heard today coming out of this meeting that a good bit of upset is over the unintended consequences of the announcement; the way the announcement was made. You know, the President's idea that nobody knew who the candidates were... the fact is that there was knowledge, there wasn't an official statement that person X was a candidate but it was generally known and so there is kind of an issue of this sort of consequence. I think it would be

reasonable for us as a Council and I can do that in your stead just to suggest to the President that may be some sought of verbiage be created that would may be set aside this particular concern. And personally it's a very good point.

Other comments please. Okay, thank you very much.

## **AGENDA ITEM #6: POLICY ON ACCESS TO LABORATORIES WITH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS OR LABORATORY ANIMALS BY VISITORS**

**MILLER:** Our next item is a Policy on Access—I remember the first time we considered this policy, I thought may be the title would change between then and now but it is still as awkward as it always was—Policy on Access to Laboratories with Hazardous Materials or Laboratory Animals by Visitors.

**ARNOLD:** Now it's the Interim Policy, so...

**MILLER:** This presentation is going to be made by Randy Arnold who is co-chair of the BFC Research Affairs Committee.

**ARNOLD:** Thank you, Ted. So each of you have this document. This document contains actually three separate items. The first item is the interim policy which is pages 1 and 2. The next three pages are our model procedures which is labeled Appendix A. So model procedures for access to laboratories, etc., etc. And on the back of page 6, the last page is the form of declaration of compliance, Appendix I. So there are three separate things here. I just want to point that out.

So there are a few point of interest. First is that the policy applies to visitors in labs with hazardous material or laboratory animals. Visitors in this policy are considered as non-permanent members of labs who are carrying out laboratory research. In the policy in Section 3, which is on page 2, it explicitly defined what is meant by visitors in this policy, which is not the standard definition of what you think of in terms of visitors. So for example, guests to a lab who do not conduct research are not considered visitors by this policy. So if somebody comes into a laboratory and takes a tour for 30 minutes or an hour or two hours through the laboratory, they're not covered by this policy. This is not a policy to [Tape 1, Side A ends, some comments lost] ...and learning a new technique are considered visitors under this policy. So somebody who is less than a full time employee of the university or may not be an employee of the university but is in a lab of a temporary basis, is someone who's considered a visitor under this policy. And that's all explained in the Section 3 of the policy.

The compliance form, Appendix I on the back page, declares in point two that said person has successfully completed the necessary chemical, biosafety or radiation safety training. What does that mean and who determines what that means? Let me give you an example. I'm in the Chemistry Department. This is the Laboratory Chemical Safety Plan. This is distributed to all the labs in the Chemistry Department. I'm not going to read it to you. It's about 200 pages. A hundred of those pages approximately are Material Safety Data Sheets which are there for

reference but are not intended to be read. The rest of it is basically the safety plan. That plan applies to laboratories that use chemicals at Indiana University. So every lab at the university that has chemicals has this safety plan. It's required by OSHA. It's the lab standard, is the term that's used for the OSHA policy that was published in January of 1990. So everybody that falls under OSHA guidelines has this same plan. It defines responsibilities as this thing defines responsibilities for the university Office of Environmental Health and Safety, for academic departments, so it defines responsibilities for chairs and for departmental laboratory chemical safety officers. It defines responsibilities for faculty members and then it defines responsibilities for people who work in the labs. That's what this thing does. All of the things that regular laboratory employees are governed by are basically in this plan. So compliance with this plan involves participation and required training, use of safety equipment, personal protection devices and apparel, observing standard operating procedures and informing supervisors of accidents or unsafe conditions. All that stuff is covered in the safety plan. So what you probably all want to know will how much of this is or should a visitor be responsible for. Certainly the information that pertains to the visitors research and their surroundings in the lab but full training, in other words, complete knowledge of this as would be required for permanent employee is usually not necessary nor is it really feasible. You're not going to spend a week training somebody with this safety plan in order for them to do the second week of actually doing research in the laboratory.

So, generally visitors will be familiar with general laboratory safety rules from their permanent place of employment, so they don't come to Indiana University completely uneducated about safety. Details of specific rules to Indiana University and to newer unfamiliar areas of safety training is what needs to be provided by the host lab at Indiana University. It's this policy that's before you today that governs that part. That part of their safety training knowledge that they may not have from their previous institution that they're coming from.

So a brief history of this policy. The policy on April 4<sup>th</sup> back in the spring was presented to the BFC by Rick Viken who was then the co-chair of the Research Affairs Committee. On that date no action was taken by the BFC. At the subsequent meeting on April 19<sup>th</sup> the policy was presented a second time, again by Richard and Cecile Jagodzinski, co-chairs of the Research Affairs Committee. A thorough discussion ensued in which a number of concerns were raised, most specifically the nature of the training described. Which hopefully I've explained a little bit about what that training is and should be as well as the issue of background checks which came up. So today we're considering it again. It's my understanding that the issue regarding the nature of what is meant by training is adequately addressed in this policy. Not in the sense that it provides extensive detail as to what is required of each lab, but rather that it is general enough to apply to all the labs in the university. I gave you the example of chemical safety but there's also high voltage safety and electrical safety, there's laboratory animal safety, etcetera, so there are other issues as well. The implicit understanding is that the faculty member knows best which safety rules need to be emphasized in their specific situation and will provide that adequate training to the visitors in their labs.

Then the second issue with regard to background checks is I believe addressed adequately in the form of declaration of compliance which is the last page, page 6 by including the phrase "for visitors who are also employees". The issue before was, are visitors outside the university subject to background checks? In fact, it's only those that would be employees of Indiana University

who are now going to a lab where they may need to have a background check before they perform research in that laboratory.

It's my understanding that upon approval by this body the proposed policy, then obviously since its blue in color, we move to the UFC where it will be approved there before becoming official university policy. Then that policy part which is the first two pages is university policy. The rest of it is separate and can be considered by individual campuses. I'll now invite Ann Gellis and Bob Ivie and anybody else who wants to add to what I just gave as an introduction to provide that.

**GELLIS:** The, I guess there are two things I would just emphasize. One is that, in the area of chemical safety, bio safety, radiation safety and animal safety we have safety officers who provide training to persons in labs with those elements. These training sessions are a couple of hours long at the most. Some of them are done with CDs, CD-ROMs and so on so that in some ways the training can be done by the safety officers as they do with everybody else who goes into a lab initially. I just want to make sure that everyone understands that OSHA in particular, some requirements for inoculations and those have to be verified by the safety officers so that for example that with biological agents, a bio-safety officer has to know that the person in the lab has gotten requisite inoculations and keep a register of it. The same would be true for animals. I just don't want people to have the wrong idea that there will not be safety officers...

**ARNOLD:** Or that this is the only thing that holds faculty members accountable.

**GELLIS:** Right. The other thing is that, just to get us in the interest of being up front, the model procedures that are attached have to be...what we're saying is that they will be...you can add to them but they have to at least contain the provisions that are in the model. That's all I have add.

**MILLER:** So the sequence of events that we're talking about here is that these first two pages, which is meant to be a university policy, will be forwarded to the UFC. It will be acted upon hopefully shortly. Once that is done then are these procedures then going to...is your idea that these will then come back to the Council to approve the procedures at each campus level.

**GELLIS:** I think so because they may be specific...

**MILLER:** Some additional things you want to put in.

**GELLIS:** For example I well imagine that Indianapolis with the medical labs may have other things that they might want in the procedures than what we would need in our labs here.

**MILLER:** But in the case of Bloomington this may suffice for...

**GELLIS:** This may...yes, yes. You can pas them now.

**MILLER:** Well I think it would be reasonable to approve the policy first.

**GELLIS:** Oh I don't know. [Laughter]

**MILLER:** So this comes to us, approved by the Research Affairs Committee. So, it's been moved, it's been seconded. Discussion? John?

**CARINI:** Some of the links should probably be fixed up before we actually pass the policy. Second, are hazardous chemicals and chemicals basically the same thing for all practical purposes?

**ARNOLD:** Um...

**CARINI:** I'm not talking about a jar of salt.

**ARNOLD:** Sure, sure, well but that is a chemical, so water is a chemical right? Hazardous chemicals would be those that are on a specific list of hazardous chemicals. So I could probably find it in this document. But there are at least 200 that are listed here, I think, as specific chemicals.

**CARINI:** So if we go through the list and sure enough...bottles and chemicals in my lab...

**ARNOLD:** Right. If you have water and sucrose, you're probably okay. [Laughter] I'm not trying to be facetious; I'm just trying just trying to find the exact example here.

**CARINI:** And then to what extent are these required by the Homeland Security clause? For example about the visa regulations and things like that.

**GELLIS:** The visa regulations are really required by the immigration laws, by the export control laws. The Homeland Security aspects of it relate to the select agents. That is those biological agents and toxins that are on this special list for which in order to have access to you need to be cleared from the FBI.

**CARINI:** But the general, the hazardous parts...

**GELLIS:** The hazardous has to do with OSHA basically.

**CARINI:** So would the visa requirements, visa check be required in those cases as well?

**GELLIS:** Well it might be for immigration. I mean, one of the, essentially what this policy says is, we want to make sure if you're here that your visa allows you to be...that one, you have the correct immigration status to be here which presumably you do anyway at this point. Two, if you are not a U.S. Citizen or legal resident then we need to know that because then you cannot have access to export control technology. Even if you are a United States citizen and you want to work with select agents, which we don't have at the present time on the campus, you would need to be cleared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Does that answer?

**CARINI:** Right, but I'm thinking of specifically if the situation, say at the Cyclotron...

**GELLIS:** Right.

**CARINI:** ...user facility to use neutrons instead of...

**GELLIS:** Right.

**CARINI:** ...structures that we expect to have people coming in from over eas...

**GELLIS:** Yes.

**CARINI:** From, fairly regularly.

**GELLIS:** And that's going to be...

**CARINI:** And in every case we need to...

**GELLIS:** Yes. The Cyclotron is an area in which we expect to have the most business. Particularly when the export control regulations, if they are amended as we think they will be by the Department of Commerce. At that point we have to make sure that any lab that has something that might involve the use of export technology, which means in essence, anything that is not publicly known to proprietary information and that is related to a controlled technology which includes everything from cameras to autoclaves. If the proposed regulations become law, then those people who are not U.S. Citizens or not legal residents will have to either have a license to have access or they can't be allowed in.

**OGREN:** But does that only apply to the visitor term, that's sort of not clear, if they are not a visitor if the visit is less than 5 hours?

**GELLIS:** Right.

**OGREN:** So someone could visit the Cyclotron or an area where it has export controls or radioactive sources for less than 5 hours and be exempt from this.

**GELLIS:** Right now this speaks as of what the law is today. In theory, if the Department of Commerce were to change the regulations that they've proposed then you could not have a foreign visitor have the access to use export technology, whether they were here for one minute or five hours or two years.

**OGREN:** Would that count a graduate with a foreign passport.

**GELLIS:** Yes it would. You can see that we don't...

**OGREN:** It's a disaster.

**GELLIS:** That's disaster and we have written comments to the Department of Commerce and various other, you know, groups, the Physics Association and the COGAR and the Association

of American Universities. So, we've all registered tremendous concern about this but we don't know what they're going to do.

**IVIE:** I might add that the documents constrained by other legal context as well so it says in Section 4 on minors that none of the provisions can supersede the legal constraints on minors and so this policy also then authorizes the Office of the Vice President for Research to make changes to keep it consistent with changes in the law. So it's a living document now, is that a fair statement?

**GELLIS:** Yes, that's right.

**MILLER:** Okay, Cecile?

**JAGODZINSKI:** I didn't know you had a problem with the title but I think we can make it shorter by one word by saying "Visitor Access to Laboratories" instead of having "by visitors" at the end.

**GELLIS:** That's perfect.

**MILLER:** It sounds like a friendly amendment to me.

**GELLIS:** Thank you.

**MILLER:** Okay, other comments please?

**DE SOUZA:** Just one note. So, aside from the aspect of access by visitors foreign to sensitive materials, this is largely already the way in many other institutions, both national laboratories as well other academic institutions operating like Cyclotrons and other places and so on. But what I observed and I don't think there really is much choice going down this path but for those of you that think that perhaps this is just a fait accompli and one should not dwell on it, I think what it really does, because I've observed this, it creates walls within even a department, within even a laboratory because in order to use a specific piece of instrumentation you have to scan in your card and if you're not authorized to use that piece of instrumentation then you can't start the machine or you can't access that room or what have you. So in building those walls, I think we need to take note of exactly what's happening to academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas and stuff like that. I think it's potentially big, has large ramifications.

**ARNOLD:** Am I correct Ann that that is a separate export control policy?

**GELLIS:** Yes, and it's just proposed at the moment. There was a meeting in May, a group of mainly at the National Academy of Sciences for universities and industry about the proposed regulations. Everyone is very very concerned. For one thing for example, over half of PhDs in Engineering now, not a concern so much for us in Bloomington, but over half are foreign born and so you would be basically eliminating engineers both from the schools and from the industry as well. My sense is that the meeting in May was at the Department of Commerce had no intentions of changing the proposal and that they would enact but I think they've gotten so many

comments that it may that we will see a softer approach. It's quite clear what they're concerned about, they are concerned about the Chinese and if they could eliminate having people from China in the labs, they would like to. So it's very frightening. I didn't think that they understood at all what we were talking about, but in any case...

**MILLER:** Well, alright, so our vote here today on this item is an advisory vote to the University Faculty Council. We are voting on pages one and two, to forward that on to the UFC. Is that correct?

**GELLIS:** Right.

**MILLER:** If there are no other comments, I think we need to move on. All those in favor please say "aye" [aye], all opposed [no]. I'm sorry, there was a no, there's one no. Thank you, Harold we'll make note of you. Okay, thank you very much Randy.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7: IU POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

**MILLER:** Our next two items are in a way a package. They deal with undergraduate admissions. The first of them is a document that is printed in blue. Again, that would make it a university-level document. As many of you perhaps know, the Mission Differentiation Project recommended that each campus develop its own separate admissions policy, something that is not the case now. We have an overall university admissions policy. So there's a question in this new environment, what the university-level policy is going to be if indeed there is going to be a university level admissions policy. The first document Professor Wheeler will present bears on that issue. The second document is a proposed Bloomington campus admissions policy. These are both discussion items and they will reappear on our agenda as we go forward through the year. I think we're hoping to approve an admissions policy here in Bloomington sometime in the earlier part of the spring semester. The Trustees agenda has admissions as an item, I don't know, is it March or April or one of those two Trustee meetings they'll be considering the package of admissions policies that are developed around the campuses and either approve or not approve them, I'm not sure what they're going to do. But we're proceeding under the assumption here that they are going to approve admissions policies; a separate admissions policy for each campus. Bill?

**WHEELER:** Thank you. Actually as I walk over here thinking back to the last time...I was four years old and my father was working on his Ph.D. in chemistry and we would go in the afternoons to pick him up. We'd jump out of the car and dash into the chemistry building and run all the way through the chemistry building all the way back to his lab and I guess I will no longer be able to do that under these rules.

You have before you these two documents and my job is to provide a brief introduction to the first one and then open the floor for discussion, perhaps to direct you through each of the items so that we can get feedback for this to take back to the University Faculty Council. Then with my co-chair of the Bloomington Faculty Council committee to walk you through the proposal for Bloomington. Unfortunately I do not have a 200, 300, 400 page manual to refer to, to tell you the

background of this one so all I'm going to do is to list for you by way of introduction some of the items that bear on the proposals before you and that have influenced their construction.

On matters of admissions policy, the thing I think is faculty concern about the overall quality of our undergraduate student body. We've talked about that in our Council meetings earlier this fall. At the first or second meeting we adopted a resolution expressing the faculty sentiments on that matter. Then there are certain things from the state. There's the 2003 Indiana Commission for Higher Education Plan for Higher Education in Indiana. They call for the Bloomington and West Lafayette campuses to become research campuses and to focus on students who have higher qualifications than those who'd be attending the other public institutions in state. There's the 2004 Reilly Efficiency Report on Higher Education. The chair of that commission is now one of our Trustees and that one called again for the Bloomington campus to focus on research and to establish a system that had a large role for community colleges. At the high school level there's the Core 40 and Core 40 honors high school diploma requirements, both the existing ones and the new ones that would take effect next year. In connection with the Core 40 there's the Senate Bill 200 that was adopted by the state legislature last spring. It states that the Core 40 or an equivalent high school diploma should be a minimum requirement for admission to any state institution of higher education, any four-year institution. The Ivy Tech and Vincennes were excluded from that. There's also the 2001 Regional Campus Agreement between the Indiana Commission of Higher Education, Purdue University and Indiana University that was signed by President Brand on behalf of the Trustees that makes certain commitments concerning admissions to regional campuses and to IUPUI that fully implemented would say that Core 40 should be not only necessary but sufficient for those campuses under certain provisions.

There's also the Mission Differentiation Report that Ted alluded to. There are concerns about the economic viability of various IU campuses especially perhaps IU East. There's of course the U.S. News & World Report college rankings that shape many peoples perceptions of where they should apply to college. There's a soon to be announced ranking system being developed by the Carnegie Commission that we may have occasion to talk about publicly later but which has certainly influenced the discussions of committees. Then there's the history of Indiana University and our status and role as a public institution. This is a list of the things that have influenced the construction of this. I certainly don't have time to go into the nature of each of those things but from time to time in response to questions we may need to refer to some of those items.

Turning then to the blue thing that says admission policies. This was discussed at the UFC meeting last week. The title is probably going to be changed to something like Indiana University Guidelines for Admissions Policies. If the Trustees follow the recommendation of the Mission Differentiation Report then each campus will have a separate admissions policy and what would happen at the university level is that we would adopt a set of guidelines to guide campuses in the construction of their admissions policies. I thought that you would have a copy of the current Handbook statement on admissions policies but that's not before us. Let me just say that this policy began with the existing policy but then we've reorganized things and made some changes in it. The proposal then has an introduction which is a statement of values and also obligatory reference to affirmative action. There's a section called academic preparation in both

proposals where the proposal set forth what courses one should take in high school, how many college prep courses one should take and to what extent those should be in specific areas.

**MILLER:** Bill, could I just interrupt for a second? One of the things that, this blue document was discussed last time at the University Faculty Council and at that Council, I think one of the points that you tried to make clear was that this blue document was not a proposed policy but rather a set of guidelines that the campuses should use as they go forward to set their own admissions policy. That's the way you are viewing this blue document.

**WHEELER:** That's right. And that's why I said the title is likely to change to be, rather than just saying admissions policies on line 3 saying "Indiana University Guidelines for Admissions Policies." And on Academic Preparation that again sets forth the number of college prep courses that a student should take and also how those college prep courses should be distributed among the various disciplines. Let me mention in this regard that this is where there is substantial connection to the Core 40 requirements. Our existing—we need to recognize that contrary to what we frequently hear in the press or in the media the Core 40 high school graduation requirements as a set of requirements is actually weaker than our current admission policy. Our current admissions policy calls for students to complete 28 college prep credits. A Core 40 degree can actually be obtained with only 26 college prep credits. And so this is one of these subtleties that these admission policies attempt to address then is that the Core 40 requires not as many college prep courses as we do but at the same time it has much greater specificity about the distribution of those—a distribution which is influenced more by the business and Education Roundtable than by the pedagogical considerations of a liberal arts university.

In comparison of the two on the way then the UFC-EPC has been of the opinion that we should not weaken the current university policy in terms of the minimum number of college prep courses and so it continues to call for 28 credits. There has been some realignment of where those credits should be taking into account the Core 40 but at the same time, as in accord with the university's lobbying with the state legislature last year, we do say afterwards that we are interested in a Core 40 or equivalent. Students should have a Core 40 or equivalent degree. That language is intended to meet the needs of the School of Music and other schools that may have some very special needs in terms of what their students should take. Gary Potter from the School of Music has eloquently articulated the fact that if a student really does intend to gain admission to our School of Music that they may well, during their high school period, take courses in music theory and music performance in order to be prepared for the very competitive admissions requirements to the School of Music and that we need an admissions policy that is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the needs of the School of Music, and perhaps the School of Fine Arts and other liberal arts and arts colleges.

By contrast the yellow policy for Bloomington, calls for more it calls for 33 college prep courses, five more than the 28, and it places more emphasis on the liberal arts nature of those things and actually calls for 4 credits in foreign language, something that is only suggested or recommended in the blue one. So that's one place where the Bloomington campus proposal is much stronger than the university proposal.

Section Three is a section on Academic Abilities, Achievements, Motivation, and Maturity and it attempts to describe some of the factors that campuses and admissions offices may take into account in trying to determine who should be admitted. It mentions both standardized exams, high school ranks and grades, GPAs, but also goes beyond that to mention essays, extracurricular activities, letters of recommendation, community service, work experience, so on and so forth.

Now Sections Two and Three have been set out by themselves so that they could be referenced in each of the next three sections. The next three sections are entitled First-Time Undergraduate Students, External Transfer Students, and Inter-Campus Transfer Students. In the current policy sections two and three concerning coursework and GPA requirements and things like that are actually inside the paragraph on first-time undergraduate students or in the current policy what were called Freshman Students. And so this proposal takes out sections two and three from being inside just the considerations for Freshman Students, puts them in separate sections, so that each of the sections four, five, and six can refer back to them and indicate how, in the case of transfer students both external and internal, the relevance of sections two and three varies depending upon the prior education or higher education of the student.

Section Four used to be called freshman, it's now called First-Time Undergraduate Students and it simply says that students should meet the requirements under academic preparation and what was said under Academic Abilities. It also notes that admissions decisions can take into account other factors such as strengths and weaknesses are the applicant's college preparation programs. Some high schools are known to be more challenging than some other high schools and the trends of the applicant's grades also deals with issues of having been out of school for 3 or 4 more years.

The section of external transfer students, internal campus transfer students are largely as they have been. There's a new paragraph; section 7 there specifically charges the admissions offices to advice students who are not admitted on what they should do. And then section 8 says that campuses have an obligation to try and make wise decisions on what their standing should be and they have an ethical obligation both to their faculty and to their applicants to make certain that they have realistic requirements both in terms of the likely success of students if they are admitted. Section 9 is new. It specifically charges the campus Chancellors with responsibility for the admissions procedures following their campuses and for ensuring compliance with the goals and guidelines set forth in terms of achieving satisfactory level for student academic quality and success. When I read the newspaper this morning and looked at the to-do list for Chancellor Gros Louis I was pleased to see that one of the items there corresponds to item number 9 under accountability.

I believe I've been told then... so the floor now is open then for questions and discussion of the blue document and I believe that Vice President Nelms perhaps had wanted to say something about paragraph section number one; the statement of values and the reference to affirmative action regulations.

**NELMS:** I have difficulty hearing you, can you hear me? First of all, I appreciate the opportunity to make some brief observations. In the context of the Mission Differentiation project that I had the opportunity to work with for almost two years now, I want to be on record

as saying that I'm in support of raising the admissions standards on all campuses of Indiana University. And I say that because of the strong correlation between... strong positive correlation between academic preparation, persistence and graduation and I think that over time if we're going to be able to change—you've observed or read these articles in the Indianapolis Star and other newspapers talking about the low level, the relatively low level of graduation rates for Indiana colleges and universities period. I think long term we have got to change that. We have to be very clear about what we expect from students and try to hold students to those expectations as we go forward.

As you know that it was noted in the Mission Differentiation Project, we indicated that we felt that the university has outgrown this notion of a one size fits all admissions policy that we've had for a number of years. And when we began looking into all of this, we discovered that on some campuses, as many as 40, 50, 60 percent of the students were being admitted as exceptions to the policy, which would suggest then that there is no policy in effect. And so we think that there is a need to address that and I think the whole notion of having some guidelines for campuses to work within should prove very useful to that.

With regard to the Bloomington campus, as you know from the Mission Differentiation Project and from the mission statement that will be considered by the Board of Trustees for the Bloomington campus later this week, even though the term is objectionable to some people it is a term that is there based on the work of the Deans and others on the Bloomington campus and crafted, and this body, and crafted a proposed mission statement for the Bloomington campus. So, as the "flagship campus", whether you like the term or not, whether it continues to be there, I don't know, but as the flagship campus, that suggests then that there is a differentiation between the admissions policy with regard to expectations for this campus, and let's say for East or Northwest campus where I have spent some time working. It seems to me though that is you effect an admissions policy for Indiana University, any of our campuses, must seek the balance to broad in our notions. And one is broad access, which is something that is very much a part of Indiana University as a state institution. Broad access on one hand and one which would call for an optimal kind of preparation, such that students would be able to be successful. Where all of this is going to come out in the end, I'm not sure. But I want to offer some specific comments as was noted about the values piece, and I would just read to you the statement that I sent to Ken this morning so you, and I'll be happy to give it to you.

"I'd write to share with you my concern regarding the draft IUB mission policy as well as the proposed university policy. In both policies, it is stated that admissions decisions will be made "without regard to sex, age, race, religion, ethnic origin, veteran status, disability and sexual orientation". To not consider race is contrary to what we currently do and it is inconsistent with the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the *Grutter v Bollinger* case, the University of Michigan admission cases three years ago in 2003. Please note that there will be a significant decline in ethnic diversity in the student body on the Bloomington campus if the policy is implemented as proposed. And the same is true for the other campuses of Indiana University. While I support the goal of increasing admission standards at all IU campuses, I'm strongly opposed to relying too heavily on quantitative measures. I'm not aware of a single CIC or AAU university where race as a matter of practice is not considered. In addition, a number of CIC schools consider gender since disciplines in which there are small numbers of females and they wish to change this whole

predicament. It seems to be counterproductive to say that we are committed to full diversity which is reflected in the mission statements for each of our campuses, including Bloomington, and then ignore the issue of race or gender. Whether we like it or not, race and gender are significant societal indicators of equality. Currently we are facing a situation where there's a decreasing percentage of males in higher education and unless affirmative measures are taken, this situation will become even more problematic."

There are some pieces in the policy that, in both policies, that I have questions about. For example saying that a person with a GED must have been out of school for three years or more, I'm wondering what's magical about 3 three years when you're getting an increasing number of people earning GEDs. So, little things like that, but the point I really want to make today has to do with this whole issue of race and gender and I think that long term that is counter productive of what we want to do as Indiana University. Now I'm not here to suggest for a moment that race ought to be the determining factor, nor am I going to argue that gender ought to be the determining factor. But I would say to you unequivocally that I believe that gender and race, among other factors, should be considered in making those decisions and I'll be happy to respond to any questions. I have a copy of the Grutter case that I'd like to just leave with you so you can see exactly what the court said, I didn't make it up. I think there's a compelling case for diversity and it's all wrapped up in something called academic excellence and if we're going to prepare student to live, lead and work in an increasingly global society, we cannot ignore the issue of diversity. Thank you.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much Charlie. If I might just say Bill that there's a note on the yellow document, there's a note. I think we're aware that this section is not consistent with some of the recent Supreme Court case you mentioned and that's certainly is an item that we're going to follow up on and hopefully at some point we'll, with the advise of the university counsel, with Julie Knost, we'll get some language that will reflect some of the ideas that you're talking about. I don't think anybody is opposed to what you're saying.

**NELMS:** I would encourage you to this; while I have every respect and everything for the people in university counsel and for the Affirmative Action Office, they're wonderful people, they're good colleagues, but those of us who work in this arena everyday, that's devoted a lifetime to doing it, I hope that you will consult with those people as well because we're the people on the ground trying to do what the university as indicated it's interested in doing. And that is to attract, retain and graduate our diversity body in al regards.

**WHEELER:** Let me just say a word though about the history of this because the phrases there, except for the last three words "and sexual orientation", are what is our current policy. The same "without regard to sex, age, race, religion, ethnic origin, veteran status and disability", is what is currently in the Academic Handbook as being found in the Affirmative Action Office. So this language is not new language. This is the language of the current policy was simply taken directly over the sentence I don't have in front of me, I had hoped that you would have in front of you that current policy from the Academic Handbook. To the best of my memory, it says Indiana University supports and complies with affirmative action regulations and admissions decisions would be made without regard to sex, age, race, religion, ethnic origin, veteran status and disability. So that is the language that the affirmative action office put into our current thing.

And so the fact that it's here, is simply that is it was member of University Faculty Council said of the UFC/EPC, said "well we should add a sexual orientation" and Kelly observed in that sexual orientation was not one of the protected categories in affirmative action law. And so, in order to include the phrase "and sexual orientation". The part beginning "without regard... [Tape 1 side B ends, some comments lost]...we comply with the affirmative action regulations, to being put in front of it so that one can put in something that was not an affirmative action category.

**MILLER:** But the point of our meeting here today is to try to come to some understanding as we listen to the members of the Council; where the issues are in these policies. This is a point where there's an issue, point taken okay.

**BRADLEY:** Obviously that language is inconsistent with the Affirmative Action Policy and therefore it has to be changed. I do however disagree with my understanding of what Charlie said that *Grutter v Bollinger* holds. *Grutter v Bollinger* simply says that an Affirmative Action that the University of Michigan had in place was okay, that it didn't violate the constitution. It really doesn't in anyway compel universities to have an Affirmative Action Policy. Now, Indiana University has already decided to have one and I think this document is just a mistake to the extent that it suggests that it won't have one but nothing in *Grutter* compels.

**NELMS:** Now I'm not—let me correct that I'm not saying anything to suggest that we are compelled to have one, but this permits. This is a permissive kind of thing, to consider race among other factors. So it's permissive, it's not one that we can make.

**OGREN:** You indicated where there were changes from the past policy and I just wondered on Section 3 reads "the top 45 percent", is that a change or has that gone up?

**MILLER:** Are you in the yellow document?

**OGREN:** I'm in the yellow document.

**MILLER:** The yellow document, Number 3.

**OGREN:** Yeah

**WHEELER:** Oh, I see so as opposed to Number 2

**OGREN:** Number 3, "applicants who are in the top 45 percent in their graduating class", is it presently 50 percent and is Bloomington 45?

**WHEELER:** Yes, the current one says that Indiana residents need to be in the upper 50 percent of their graduating class and so...

**OGREN:** Anyway, to be consistent I think where you're indicating the changes, where you've done in some other places.

**WHEELER:** So, if you'd like to, we can certainly go through and tell you exactly where those are. At the moment we were still looking at the blue document, if the Council is ready to move through the bill of document...

**MILLER:** We have 25 minutes, why don't we go to the yellow document since the blue document is meant to be guidelines shaping the yellow document, let's spend our time on the yellow document and see where we come out there.

**WHEELER:** John, well, I'd like to call on John at this point then to say some words about the yellow document.

**MILLER:** Do you have a copy of that Bob?

**CARINI:** So I did the first draft of the yellow document and I obviously borrowed heavily from Bill's draft for the university guidelines or policy. I thought that was appropriate even if that is not adopted the way its been presented today because he does touch on all the things that we talked about, all the elements that he discussed that were factors in trying to come up with a policy are addressed I think in those guidelines. So I started with that and started to modify it. One thing you might notice is right at the top it says Fall of 2011, that's no accident. It's because the new CORE 40, the CORE 40 honors requirements that the state will be instituting will apply to high school graduates in Spring of 2011. So, we were always thinking in those terms, in terms of when the new policy should really apply and also to give people long enough time to adjust to these changes. As Bill has already pointed out, we kept Section One realizing there were some problems there. So I started modifying Section 2 based on our discussions in the committee and also between Bill and I about exactly where to try to draw the line. Our goal is always to ensure that we had well-prepared students for work here at Bloomington. So that was always our overriding goal. And yet we also didn't want to weaken our current policy which requires 28 academic credits. But we only add to that in specific areas that we thought were justified by that criterion of academic preparation. So particularly adding a specific requirement for pre-calculus for the mathematics requirement, that's in Section 2.B. Adding 4 credits of foreign languages and then in other areas making our course requirements more specific. For example, adding two sections of two credits in laboratory sciences and two in social sciences. So, if you compare these courses to the ones that are in the CORE 40 requirements, they obviously don't agree because the CORE 40 starts with 26 academic courses. Our current requirements are 28 and we're asking for 33, so we're just trying to be very specific about the areas that we think students need to be well prepared for working in Bloomington.

And then there's also this CORE 40 Academic Honors diploma that actually requires 34 courses, 34 credits and we thought that was actually too strong of requirement on our future students even though many of them currently come in with the Academic Honors diploma now. They've actually strengthened that requirement for 2011; requiring, for example, two AP courses or two college level courses to get an academic honors diploma in the future. One of the problems of the CORE 40 as its currently set up is that there's actually no well defined, I think, college track in the CORE 40 short of the Academic Honors diploma and so we didn't think that we could require that level from all of our students, that we couldn't justify.

So other areas where we've changed things are in Section 3 as Bill has already pointed out. There previously was only a statement in terms of abilities and achievements. There were two in our old policy. One was that we expected people to be in the upper half of their graduating class and secondly that they should be above the average as far as their standardized exam score. And so in those two specific areas, I think we're keeping the requirement about being above average on the standardized exam scores and increasing the class standing requirement from 50 percent to 45 percent. I realize that that's somewhat of a token change but the point was to demonstrate that there's a real change going on there. And one difficulty with class standing as many high schools are no longer reporting class standing and many student are actually unaware of their own class standing, and so we try to come up with alternate ways that students could demonstrate their achievements in high school courses, mentioning a specific grade point average of B or better or showing other evidence such as some of the subject exams. For example, their SAT subject exams, their AP exams, there's the ISTEP+ subject exams, they'll be implemented over the next few years. The idea was to come up with various ways for students to demonstrate their level of academic achievement.

I think the other important place where we've changed from our current standard is in the transfer policies. Our current policy specifies a 2.0 grade point average and we've now set 2.3 as the level we'd like for Indiana residents transferring in or a 2.5 for non-Indiana residents; that's coming from a non Indiana University campus, and 2.3 coming for students coming from one of the other Indiana University campuses. Sorry?

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** We can't hear you.

**CARINI:** Oh, sorry. So that grade point requirements, I think the other important place where we've changed from our current policy.

**MILLER:** Okay we have questions. Lisa?

**PRATT:** John can I ask a quick question about the 4.0 scale, how do you deal with the fact that so many high schools are adjusting their grade point scale for the honors and AP classes? Some schools use that for class rank for other students and some don't. Do we re-norm the high school students back to a 4.0 scale if the school for instance awards an extra grade point for an AP class, what do we do with that?

**CARINI:** Well right now I don't think we actually look at the grades. So, we're going to have to figure that out. I think the 4.0 scale is something that we all understand.

**PRATT:** But since there is large variation across the state, I mean, it even varies I think within the two high schools in Bloomington. I only know what they're doing at North which is...

**CARINI:** Right, there are 3 different levels.

**PRATT:** Yeah, and it has a very large impact on grade point.

**CARINI:** Right it's a concern that we would re-norm things.

**WHEELER:** The presumption is that we would re-norm things.

**PRATT:** So we would take out... it strikes me as going to be a bit difficult to do and some thinking has to go into how we handle the fact that most schools no longer have a straight forward 4.0 scale because they weight the honors and AP classes very heavily.

**HARBISON:** I have actually 3 points; one is that class rank is also impacting the students attending more than one high school and that is something that we would have to find away to consider I really think. These days a lot of kids tend...it's very common to have kids within 3 schools in 4 years.

**CARINI:** I agree. That's why we wanted to add criteria that students could use.

**HARBISON:** Second point, we should be prepared for the unintended consequences again, public relations wide, of not having a CORE 40 diploma automatically makes someone admissible to IUB. I agree with, at least in principle, with what we are attempting to do here but I think that there could be a PR spin that is negative from that. Okay and the third point is I appreciate Bill's comment about the School of Music, which is where I live. Probably we'll need an equivalent course work in some cases, who would decide that and how would that policy with School of Music, then they'll set their own separate but equal admission standards, because this has to be considered on a case by case basis.

**CARINI:** The same words appear on the State Senate Bill 200.

**HARBISON:** That's a toughie.

**WHEELER:** In the yellow copy it specifically says some schools and degree programs, may accept equivalent course work. That's certainly saying that it's the school that undertakes to do that.

**HARBISON:** Right. Now could that school establish their own policy and what would the mechanism for that be because if each student, our admissions office told me that if we had to go through it on a case by case basis and examine everybody who needs to do this in this year's freshman class where the SAT score by the way is almost 150 points higher than the campus norm, it would have to look at over 100 cases of students we admitted who aren't admissible to by this criteria. Who establishes that policy? So, that's just something we need to chew on.

**MILLER:** Bob?

**IVIE:** I have a question but I want to preface it by saying that I just in terms of attitude support the committee's effort to raise the admissions standards. I think that's an important project and I also want to underscore that I think we need to find the exact language to facilitate diversity, whatever that means I think I want to be supportive of that.

Now my question is, it's been 10 or 15 years since I was in high school so I have kind of forgotten how many classes a student takes and so I don't know what the portion 33 credits is of a 4 year high school student's experience.

**CARINI:** So, at Bloomington North it's about 50 percent because you have 8 slots per year in 4 years. Now at South it would be a little bit different because they use a trimester system. So it might be a little bit more than 50 percent.

**IVIE:** Let me... I assume some of those elective credits that don't play into these kinds of decisions about meeting language requirements and that sort of thing. I don't know how to structure it but if a student is taking, I don't what to call these courses, courses of the kind that are included in the 33, do they still have a lot of choice after the 33?

**CARINI:** I think so.

**IVIE:** ... for taking ...

**CARINI:** Again, they're taking 4 academic courses in a semester, that's 32 right there. So there's probably two or three other courses that can be taken at the same time.

**IVIE:** Okay thanks.

**MILLER:** Bryan?

**MCCORMICK:** I do have a question on Section 3, is there a reason that the SAT reference is to mathematical average is opposed to a percentile because it references the median score in the blue policy and it's referencing state average in the yellow copy?

**CARINI:** Yeah, because what's reported, I think, is the mean score. So if you look up on the SAT site, I think it's actually the mean but I don't think there's probably a huge difference between the mean and the median average.

**MCCORMICK:** Well, I'm just curious but I'm assuming they're not identical right?

**CARINI:** I changed it to make it...

**MCCORMICK:** Well I wasn't sure if it was because that percent of the rank is more...

**CARINI:** That's right.

**MCCORMICK:** I was curious if the average was more selective than the median?

**CARINI:** I don't think it is significantly different.

**MILLER:** Kevin?

**HUNT:** Bill I know you want to move this forward here so I want to ask for a very brief answer to this. But I wondered if Vice President Nelms could tell us if he would advocate to striking this entire sentence, the first sentence of that second paragraph, or whether he has alternative language to offer that would be appropriate.

**NELMS:** What the sentence again?

**HUNT:** I'm working on the yellow one but it's the same in the blue one. In the second paragraph where it says "Indiana University will base its admission decisions on the academic quality" and so on. If we struck that whole sentence and we just say its admissions policy as IU supports and complies with affirmative action regulations. So we probably, because we have the issue of sexual orientation, we probably don't want to strike the whole sentence, but I wondered if you have because you objected to that sentence, I wondered if you have some alternative language to suggest just as we consider this, so we can think about where it might move?

**NELMS:** You know in an effort to, I would probably go with the sentence as something like the following, and I'm sort of making this up because I haven't had a chance to think about it very seriously until you asked this. I thought about it, but not for language that would be suitable for saying put this in the policy. Something like, in an effort to ensure broad access and diversity, every effort will be made to consider issues that can contribute to the diversity in addition to grades, or something to that effect. Because see, as a matter of fact you all, people with disabilities receive certain considerations with regard to admission. The same is true for veteran status and so, and some of that, we don't have as much control over it as you think. I wouldn't be as concerned about it except that in this instance we're saying that we're going to start following the policy as it is implemented and we're going to hold each of the chancellors accountable. And so that would suggest then that the admissions office ought to get that action implemented in the policy as it is written. But I would probably suggest language to the fact that in an effort to ensure broad access and diversity, consideration will be given in addition to grades and other considerations that add to that diversity, something to that effect.

**MILLER:** Thank you, Charlie. Elizabeth.

**JOHNSON:** Is it the intent of the policy to only consider a GED diploma for an applicant who has been out of high school for three or more years?

**WHEELER:** The committee hasn't discussed that, that's the existing policy. On the basis of this discussion we'll look into that. That was just something that was from the current policy.

**JOHNSON:** It seems to me like if we're looking for flexibility allowing access to all kinds of students that would certainly be something you would want to consider, it shouldn't be limited to people who've only been out of high school for three years. There's more and more students who have that.

**WHEELER:** Our current policy thinks that people who've been out of school for less than three years should satisfy the same requirements as people who just graduated from high school.

**JOHNSON:** But if they didn't go to high school, if they were educated in some other way, it would be hard for them to come up with those credit hours.

**MILLER:** Richard did you have a comment?

**CARR:** Yes I had a question for John. Taking into account the various changes that you've made, I'm talking about the yellow sheet, the changing of certain requirements and so forth, do you have a rough idea what differences you make with regard to any of our incoming classes, in taking the freshman class that we had this year, will this reduce it significantly? What is the change going to be there?

**CARINI:** Well, I think that's not necessarily the intention. I think if you did apply this it would make the class smaller.

**CARR:** I'm trying to get an idea of the character of what we're doing now and what we intend to achieve.

**MILLER:** Well let me respond to this. Charlie mentioned that in going through the Mission Differentiation process that there was some assessment of the admissions practices on the various campuses and what proportion of students are admitted as exceptions as opposed to those meeting the policy. In Bloomington, it turns out that our admissions office doesn't admit anybody as an exception. They admit everybody as a regular student, whether they meet the criteria in our policy or not. If you look at the data, which the committee has done over the last couple of years, we have roughly 25 percent of the student body in Bloomington that really do not meet the existing criteria and if these criteria are upped by a couple of percentage points here or there, it would be more than that. So we...

**CARR:** Well then I have a follow-up question. I knew about 5 years ago we had all sorts of trouble here because the freshman class was smaller than anticipated and we lost a tremendous amount of income and so forth in tuition. How do we balance this? I applaud your notion of trying to raise admission standards, but we have conflicting forces here.

**WHEELER:** I think I may respond to that because you know this is a discussion draft and the concern you're expressing is certainly one that we want to have an answer for before we pass something. But you know, this is a discussion draft to find out what types of things people would like in this and then after we have something like that, then it becomes the responsibility of Student Enrollment Services and the Admissions Office to come back with the answer and the scholarship clearinghouse. In other words, at this point in time, we are trying to find out what are the types of things that should be in here. So you're asking for, have we run the numbers. The answer is that that's the step after this discussion. This discussion is occurring today because the Trustees are meeting on Thursday. In other words, the Trustees are taking up the Mission Differentiation part and have an initial discussion on mission policies at that time. This comes to this Council for especially this time so that Ted will be in position at the Trustee meeting to say the Faculty Council has begun a discussion of this. The detailed analysis and the monitoring of impact is something that is going to be undertaken by various committees in the Council as part of the resolution adopted at the first meeting. The Budgetary Affairs Committee is charged with

trying to assess the budgetary implications of a variety of different scenarios. And so those things will come into the campus in due time but as for today, this is a preliminary discussion. We're certainly all aware of those issues, but it has never been the intention to try and have an answer to that detailed portion because we have to... there's an issue of what scenario should we try and cross out.

**CARR:** No, I'm not talking it in specific terms, I'm sorry; I know as a mathematician you seem very precise. But I'm thinking in terms of guessing because quite obviously there is a reality that drives a policy and as ideal as we can make it, there's a different vision outside. When Ken was Dean of the College, that's going back a few years, he had a number of changes for admissions to the college and after the committees came up with these, people were a little uncomfortable so he called a meeting of principles and I remember one, and this is a principal of a high school, man who answered me in particular when I was trying to explain the rationale for these changes in requirements. He said, "Can you give me one good reason why I should tell my seniors that they should take all of these extra courses when they could be earning more money by working at the Shell station down the street". Now this was a high school principal mind you. I really appreciate what you're doing and I think it has to be done but somebody else mentioned we've got to think in terms of our audience out there. It's a very ticklish undertaking.

**WHEELER:** I think the best response to that is that Mary Ellen Anderson, Director of Admissions, sent me an email message this morning which she says she strongly supports this proposal.

**CARR:** Well I'm sure she would.

**WHEELER:** That the changes in this are in accordance with what the admissions office would recommend.

**CARR:** They seem minimal.

**MILLER:** But the actual criteria, the change in the criteria seemed minimal. But our practice in terms of admitting, as I say, we have 25 percent of our students who today do not meet these criteria. So getting out from under that is going to be a long term project over many years and we're going to have to go slowly, a step at a time, to mitigate the kinds of concerns you're talking about.

We have reached the mandatory adjournment. Thank you very much for your attention. This item will be on our agenda again as we go forward.

Meeting Adjourned