

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

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Alter, Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Katy Borner, Marilynne Boyle-Baise, Maria Bucur-Deckard, James Capshew, John Carini, Richard Carr, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Les Coyne, Paul Elliott, Robert Eno, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Barbara Hawkins, Betsy Henke, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Laura M. Jezewksi, Elizabeth Johnson, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Grant McFann, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Elyce Rotella, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Bonnie Brownlee for Owen V. Johnson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shawn Conner, Aurelian Craiutu, Luis Davila, Christina Kuzmych, Andrew Lauck, Larry Thibos

GUESTS: Roland Cote (Registrar), Julie Knost (AAO), Brad Wheeler (OVPIT), Nicole Kauffman (Herald Times), Cathy Larson (College), Robin Murphey (BFC Office), Heather Reynolds (Biology), Ben Brabson (Physics Emeritus)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
September 5, 2006
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/09.05.06.htm>
September 19, 2006
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/09.19.06.htm>
2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)
4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. Updates from the IU Alumni Association (20 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Ken Beckley, CEO and Director, IU Alumni Association)

6. General Education at Indiana University Bloomington (60 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B5-2007.pdf>

7. Adoption of General Education Program for Indiana University Bloomington (5 minutes)
[ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B6-2007.htm>

8. Standing Committee Reports

9. Old Business

10. New Business

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Ladies and gentlemen, why don't we commence. Welcome to what promises to be a very important meeting. Firstly, agenda item #1. Can I ask for a motion to approve the minutes please from the last meeting, actually the last two meetings. I guess the last meeting was my Statement of Academic Affairs speech so I don't know in what sense it is being approved, but I guess it is being entered into the record. Can I ask for a motion to approve those two sets of minutes please? [Moved by Miller] Did someone get that? Okay, a second. Okay, all in favor? Against? I think that's carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Okay, let me move to agenda item #2, Agenda Committee Business, Ted.

MILLER: Thank you very much. I would like to just call your attention to a couple items that will be coming to us on either the next agenda or the one following that. This is just to wet your appetite a bit for it. One of the issues the Council has been dealing with over the last year or so is the revision of the Policy on Intellectual Property and it is our expectation that a draft of that policy will be here two weeks from today for a first reading that will hopefully launch an approval process that will be over quickly.

The second thing is that President Herbert has expressed an interest in coming to a BFC meeting. You all will recall that Provost McRobbie gave a speech a couple weeks ago on the State of Academic Affairs. The President has indicated that he would like to come to the BFC and talk about the campus in broader strokes, I guess. We are trying to schedule him on the next agenda although now there is some question whether he is going to have to be in Indianapolis on that day, so we are kind of in limbo about the next meeting from that point of view, but this is something that we will schedule as soon as we possibly can.

A third thing that I would just like to inform you of is another policy that the Faculty Council has spent a good deal of time working on. This policy may even precede my predecessor as President of the BFC. This is an effort to revise the Review Policy for Campus Chancellors. The University Faculty Council has been working on this for years. It has been back and forth, up and down, and the Trustees at their last meeting were on the verge of approving a policy; not one that had been approved by the Faculty Council as a matter of fact. It had some changes in it and then there was some last minute suggestions from the University Counsel to change it yet again which precipitated discussion at the Trustees meeting. They basically decided not to approve it last time so I am just telling you that there is another revision of this policy in process and I am hoping that we will be able to share it with you as maybe just as an information item, maybe not as a discussion item but an information item at least before the next Trustee meeting which will be in early November. We have two meetings between now and then and this is something that you would perhaps at least like to see what the final state of this document actually appears to be. That is my Agenda Committee report for today.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: OK, I've just got a couple of things to say under agenda item #3. I know a number of you have heard or read the address that I gave a couple weeks ago so there is a whole stack of things that I have outlined in there that are in the process of being started or will be starting soon and a number of things that are already underway that I referred to so I will not go over a lot of those, though I am happy to answer questions on them in the next agenda item or offline if anyone's got any issues or questions.

I just wanted to mention one thing that I had promised to get you an answer on. Someone asked the question—I have forgotten who now—someone asked the question about the buildings, I wouldn't call them buildings, but the various sheds and things by the Auditorium and when would they go. The answer from Vice President Clapacs is that they are there necessarily for a staging area for Simon Hall, which is a far way away but for whatever reason they have put them there. When Simon Hall is complete, which is still on schedule for March, they will be removed; that is what Vice President Clapacs told me. I said can I quote you on that and he said "yes" so I am now quoting him on that. All those rather unfortunate expenses there will be moved about March so in time for Spring. That is all I had.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Questions for the Question/Answer Period. Any questions for Ted or myself?

CARINI: Do we know when they are going to start on the parking garage?

MCROBBIE: Neil, do you know, Neil what the latest is on that? We can find out.

THEOBALD: Within the next couple weeks.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, it's pretty soon.

THEOBALD: Very soon. It's supposed to be open for next fall.

MILLER: The last discussion I heard about this was that it was planned to begin in early November.

MCROBBIE: John, if a precise answer is necessary, we can get you a precise answer.

CARINI: I just wanted to warn my colleagues since we live down there in that corner of campus.

MILLER: There is a rumor going around that there is at present always space available in the Atwater garage.

ENO: Shhh. [Laughter]

MCROBBIE: Any other questions?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I did have a question, when is the Digital Futures report coming out?

MCROBBIE: Any day, I'm just waiting for some clarifications coming from the chair any day, this week hopefully. I am in fact going to try to get him on the phone tomorrow morning to get it out. It is basically done and...

BUCUR-DECKARD: Ok.

MCROBBIE: I am sorry that it's taken a while but it has gotten caught up in people's schedules. Anything else? Any other questions? There being none let's move on.

AGENDA ITEM #5: UPDATES FROM THE IU ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

MCROBBIE: Lets move on to agenda item #5 and welcome Ken Beckley who is the CEO and Director of the IU Alumni Association and Ken is standing down at the end of this year and I guess this is sort of a valedictorian address Ken is going to give. He wants to sort of give a summary of the things he has done in the position and also to pave the way for his successor when that person is appointed probably late this year, early next year. Ken?

BECKLEY: Thank you very much, Provost McRobbie and Professor Miller, and it is good to see all of you. I know so many of you and it's good to be with all of you. I made a report to the Deans this morning and this is going to be brief in comparison to that for respect for your time and for those of you who heard me this morning, my apologies for having to hear some of this again. I will be stepping down at the end of January after a much-too-brief five years in my position. It is a job that I absolutely love and I hate to leave it, but the age clock on the wall says it is time for my wife and I to do some other things that we need to do in our lives so I am looking forward to what might happen after January 31st.

I wanted to take this opportunity, and I hope this really becomes a standard operating procedure for the Faculty Council, to invite the President of the Alumni Association at least every two years, if not every year, at least every two years to give you a very brief update on the status of the Association. I realize also that I stand between you and the discussion on Gen Ed so I will keep that in mind as I go along here this afternoon. The IUAA is absolutely vital to the success of Indiana University. It has always been and continues to be and as I leave I am very pleased to say that I think that perhaps never in our history have we ever been any stronger financially, organizationally, or structurally and that gives me a very, very good feeling as I prepare to step down.

Here are some of the things that we have done in the last now 4.5 years. We revised our by-laws and our mission statement; we developed a vision statement and a slogan and revised our logo. We revised our website, which we think is one of the best in the country for alumni associations, and we introduced that just a couple weeks ago as a revision. We added four new affiliate groups which are specialty alumni groups like Marching Hundred, GLBT Alumni groups as examples. We also added two new constituent societies and constituent societies are groups such as your school alumni associations. We have task forces of staff and alumni to look at virtually every area of our operation over the last 4.5 years. I came into the position believing very strongly that we had to know who we are and what we want to be and so forth. We have taken 4.5 years to use volunteers, volunteer alumni as well as staff, to staff these task forces and study all of these various areas. They have made a large number of recommendations over the period of years and of course many of those recommendations have been implemented and there are more that are under consideration.

But these are areas that we have looked at in the past 4.5 years: the IUAA dues program, vast chapters network, studies on how to reach students on all of our eight campuses of the university. We had a strategic directions task force that has made recommendations for areas for us to focus on for the years 2005 to 2010. We studied our merchandise program, our membership and marketing program, the university ring program, our travel opportunities that we offer to alumni and faculty and friends of the university, and we have studied our schools and campuses constituent societies, their alumni associations if you will, to find out how they need to improve and how they can be enhanced.

One of the areas that I think I am most proud of as I prepare to leave office is our scholarship program. The Alumni Association, this past fiscal year, gave approximately 200 scholarships for students to attend Indiana University and that amounted to nearly \$300,000 and in our history we have given \$3.4 million for students to attend IU and we are very, very proud of that. Another area that we are proud of is the recruitment area. We have volunteers throughout the country, who work after training by the Alumni Association and the Bloomington Office of Admissions. They attend college preview nights, college fairs, throughout the country. They help to bring the brightest and best students to Indiana University, most of those come to the Bloomington campus and each year there are several hundred students that come here because of the efforts of the alumni volunteers.

We are a membership organization and we currently have just over 81,000 members. We are the eighth largest alumni association in the United States. As an alumni body of graduates of the

University we are the third largest, only Penn State and Illinois in the reverse order have larger alumni graduate bodies than do we, but because we are graduating more students per year on eight campuses versus what Penn State and Illinois are doing, one of these years, I don't think it will be long, we will be the largest alumni body in the United States. Currently, we have 490,000 living graduates of Indiana University. Membership has been a challenge for our organization as it is for all dues organizations throughout the country and alumni associations throughout the country have had a very difficult time of trying to gain in the membership area. We were no exception until the last 10 months. We have had 10 consecutive months of total membership growth and that is just unprecedented in the past 10-15 years of the Alumni Association. We are really, really proud of that. Why? I wish I knew, wish I knew why. Life membership now has more members than does annual membership because more and more of our alumni have chosen to become members through a life program, but what has happened in the last 10 months for some reason is our annual membership has also grown. That is just so exciting for us because membership dues account for approximately 15 percent of our total revenue. I urge faculty and staff to join the Association, if you are not members, whether you are alumni or not, you are eligible to join the Association. Benefits of course include the Indiana Alumni Magazine, voted this past year by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, as the best alumni magazine of the 300 plus alumni associations in the states of the Big Ten. We are very, very proud of that. If benefits are not of interest, and we understand to a lot of people that they are not necessarily of interest, I urge faculty and staff to join to show support because there are two reasons in particular that your membership support your school. The first is that dues funds come back to your school's alumni association providing its association with its sole operating dollars. But the second area is something that I think is extremely important.

The IU Foundation recently conducted research for us. I was curious about; is there a correlation between membership in the Alumni Association and contributions back to schools and campuses and the university as a whole. The answer is a resounding yes. There is an enormous impact that membership in the IUAA has on a person's likelihood to help the University. For the fiscal year, this past fiscal year, 36 percent of the IU Alumni Association members who are graduates of the Bloomington campus contributed funds to the university for a total of \$15.7 million dollars, that compares to only 9 percent of the non-member graduates from the Bloomington campus who contributed for a total of \$4 million dollars. Thus just over 16,000 graduates, all of them IUAA, gave nearly four times what 22,000 non-member graduates of the campus contributed and were four times more likely to contribute. We believe that makes the case for school to urge graduates to become members. Membership begets contributions. These are contributions that go to research, help build buildings, provide scholarships for students, and go into helping the university in a myriad of ways.

Giving back financially is not the only way that members help the university. They help through their service for their giving of time by helping to recruit students, working with alumni chapters, your school alumni associations and serving as volunteers in many, many ways. I urged the deans today to continue to provide as much support as they can for their alumni relations offices because, again, I do believe that membership really does help the schools.

We are privileged to work with some exceptional young people. Our Student Alumni Association was established here on the Bloomington campus in 1976 and I'm proud to say that

we now have student alumni associations on all eight campuses of the university. The SAA had more than 2000 members last year and I believe that we will exceed that number this year. These students engage in projects that serve the university; they learn to work with one another and they learn to become leaders. Leadership training is a very important aspect of the SAA program.

We operate a number of general programs that serve all of our alumni such as homecomings on the campuses, Mini University here. We also coordinate the nine, actually it's ten including the December commencement here, but ten commencement ceremonies around the university. We also coordinate Baccalaureate and Founder's Day here at Bloomington.

We have a very strong chapters program. All members of the association are automatically members of their local area alumni chapter. We have over 100 alumni chapters, 27 of which are located outside of the United States. We are charged by the university to be the official record keepers of all information. I already mentioned that we have 490,000 living graduates but our records department along with the IU Foundation maintains a database of approximately one million active records of IU graduates, former students, friends and others who have ties to the university. Each year our record staff downloads tens of millions of files in fulfillment of thousands of requests for alumni data. Our alumni data center is now able to produce very sophisticated reports of that data such as mapping to show for example where alumni live by campus, school, degree, or whatever combination a client might want. We've done a lot of work for the President's office, HHE, the Office of Government Relations and we stand ready to help any of your schools or any other entities here in the university. We are responsible for maintaining a large collection of alumni and student data and we take that security very very seriously. Our staff works very hard to protect confidential data and comply with all state and federal regulations. The data is highly protected.

When I became President it was clear to me that the Alumni Association had its challenges financially. I felt it was imperative that we create an operating endowment that would give us guaranteed income. So we received permission from President Brand to conduct a very limited campaign in terms of length—two years— and a very, very limited audience of target audience, if you will of prospects. That campaign ended at the end of 2005. We were successful in raising \$8.1 million for an operating endowment which has given us, in this current fiscal year budget, \$340,000 to help us with our operation. That was money that we did not have just a few years ago. So we're really proud of that.

I think we're going to be able to continue growing our programs and our services and hopefully our staff as long as our revenue streams, including the approximate 22 percent of our revenue that the university provides to us. As long as all of that remains constant, I'll look for the association to continue to grow.

Another way we serve the university is through the trustee election. As you know we elect as alumni, three trustees of the university. We are the only university in the Big Ten where all graduates of the university have the opportunity to vote and are automatically mailed a ballot. We're looking at—we're studying right now, whether electronic voting is something that can be permissible in the future. So we're looking at the feasibility and the legality of electronic balloting.

We've expanded our career services; we're really pleased with this. Young alumni in particular have told us time after-time-that they would like to have some type of career advice available to them after they graduate. So in January of this year we launched iualumnicareers.com where members of the Association can log on and look for jobs or get career advice. You are invited to sign up. Just simply going to iualumnicareers.com you can sign up to be a mentor. You can choose how often you want to be contacted and by what method and you can mentor young alumni, and not necessarily just young alumni. Certainly young alumni are looking for their first jobs but other alumni who decide to change careers or are exploring that or have lost jobs and they are looking. So we encourage you to do that.

Graduates told us that they would like to be able to keep IU email accounts. That really isn't possible right now after they graduate. But we're about to roll out a program that we think will come close to what they're seeking. It's called live mail. It's a partnership that we have with Microsoft. These will be web-based email accounts that have the extension alumni.iu.edu. So it's close to what they have now and we hope that they'll sign up for this. They'll be able to take advantage of other MSN services such as instant messaging, blogging and mobile access to email, and we really think this will be popular.

In conjunction with the Provost's office, our SAA hosts the Spring Recognition Banquet where faculty members who earn the student choice award are honored. This year's winners were Robert Boch of SPEA, Glenn Gass of the Jacob School of Music, Orville Powell of SPEA and Geoffrey Sprinkle of the Kelley School of Business. At the banquet, the five recipients of the Elvis J. Stahr Distinguished Senior Award are also honored.

Then the SAA runs a networking series. It's something that was done last year for the first time. It's going to be expanded. It's a series of networking nights where students can meet and mingle with career representatives during events that are co-sponsored by the Career Development Center here at Bloomington. Each networking night features IU alumni and other professionals who have pursued careers in a specified field. This year the program will expand from a series of eight to twelve nights and we're very pleased with that.

In closing, while I'm responsible for all alumni relations within Indiana University, it takes a large number of people to make sure that alumni relations are conducted well. Thousands of volunteers serve us and certainly we have alumni offices on each of our campuses and your schools have wonderful alumni offices as well and I've really enjoyed working with them. As I said at the offset, I love this job and I appreciate having had the opportunity to lead the alumni association and to work with all of you. I just wish I were ten or fifteen years younger. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: You'll take some questions?

BECKLEY: Yes, I'd be glad to.

ENO: On the new website where you invite alumnae to participate as mentors and career searches, have you had a good percentage of people coming in to take advantage of that opportunity?

BECKLEY: Yes, we currently have about 500 mentors and we've got about 1400 alumni who have signed up to be counseled, if you will.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I am interested in this new IU-related email account that people can sign up for. So people who sign up for those would have access to the log in required to resources like IUCAT and the digital resources through that?

BECKLEY: Are you talking about being able to go into OneStart? Brad you can help me here. This is not tied to that. This is just strictly email.

MCROBBIE: Just email.

BRAD WHEELER: It would be just email; it would not be IU credentials for any of the services that we have.

BECKLEY: It's just strictly email.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's just an email account.

BECKLEY: Yes. One of our goals, and of course working with Mr. Wheeler, would be to some day have a possibility for our alumni to go into just one portal and to be able to access a great deal of material from the university.

BUCUR-DECKARD: And for programs that have a lot of contact with the alumni, is there a website that we can forward to our alumni to let them know about this or do you contact them directly?

BECKLEY: About the LiveMail?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yes.

BECKLEY: Yes we will be promoting that heavily to all the alumni of the university. Yes.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? I think we're done. Thank you very much.

BECKLEY: Thank you, thank you for your time, I appreciate it.

MILLER: Thank you, Ken.

AGENDA ITEM #6: GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

MCROBBIE: Ok, I think we'll now move to I guess what is going to be one of the most important issues that BFC has considered for a while which is the General Education Policy. You

should all have copies of the policy, the proposed General Education Policy. You all have copies of it. It is the result of many months, actually depending on how you view it, many years of work by many people to get it to this stage. We have an hour allocated to its discussion and at the end of that I'm hoping that the resolution will be put for its adoption. I think that the best way to probably start this is I'll ask Ted to introduce the item and to then open up for general discussion.

MILLER: Thank you, I would also like to recognize that many of you have been part of these discussions. This has been an item of discussion on the Bloomington campus for—I'll just estimate 10 years, to pick a round number. We've had a variety of different proposals that have been considered. Many, many people have been involved in it. One of the significant facts I think, is that this idea has had a lot of faculty support over this period of time. We have now come to a version of a proposal that we're ready to take some action on and I'm hoping that all of those people who have been involved in this over the years are feeling good about the fact that we have come to this particular point today. I think if we approve this it will be one of the most significant actions, I think, that the Faculty Council has taken during my period of time on the Bloomington campus. This will have a very profound effect on the academic programs in Bloomington.

Well, I wanted to just give you a little guide to the documents that you have in front of you pertaining to this item. We have the current draft of the proposal dated October 3rd 2006. We have a resolution, a very simple resolution that we will consider as the next agenda item. We have a document; one of the significant aspects of this proposal as you'll recall is that there will be constituted a General Education Committee on the campus. There's a document here that indicates that this committee will be roughly the size of the Bloomington Faculty Council. There will be 47 members initially appointed to the General Education Committee. That may seem like a very large number to you but I hope that you will reflect on the amount of work that is going to have to be done, detailed work in various areas of the curriculum to produce a final proposal for action by the faculty. So this rather large committee we envision being separated out into a bunch of sub-committees each one of which would focus on a particular curriculum area, arts and humanities for example, and would go off and do that detailed work, evaluate courses, try to create a proposal for a course list that would be appropriate for that group and then we would bring that together to this broader committee. I'm hopeful that once we get through this first phase, which is really kind of a development phase for the program, and go into maybe what might be called a maintenance phase for the gen ed program that the gen ed committee, that we can figure out a way to have a smaller gen ed committee that would kind of tend this on a year to year basis. But right now it does seem to me to be appropriate to have a very large committee that represents the faculty fairly well in terms of developing this more detailed material.

Then you'll also find in your material, an amendment that is going to be proposed dealing with—the amendment basically will be to add something to the Shared Goals part of the curriculum. This is an amendment that deals with Environmental Literacy and Sustainability and that will be presented and discussed as we get into this.

Now, the document that we're looking at here today, the October 3rd draft has been under development for the past month. You'll recall that we had a discussion on a draft in early September and we had comments from various people. We solicited comments and there were

various comments made. We've had several meetings of what I call the retreat group, which is kind of a combination of the Educational Policies Committee and the Campus Curriculum Committee, that have discussed a variety of these suggestions that have been made.

So we have a revised draft that is in front of you which deals with some of the issues that have been brought up and deals with some of the problems that were fairly clear in relation to that first draft. I think I would just stop at that and ask for the discussion.

MCROBBIE: Discussion?

ENO: Are we discussing the amendment?

MILLER: The basic document. Sooner or later there's someone here who's prepared to make the amendment; to move the amendment. This is not from the Agenda Committee. This is from...

MCROBBIE: Yes?

MCFANN: I'm curious about the rationale behind the terminology "Mathematical Modeling", this is under the Common Ground and "Natural and Mathematical Sciences." From the perspective of a user of this document, it seems wanting of clarity.

MILLER: I'll start with the second part of it, the "Natural and Mathematical Sciences" part. One of the underlying principles of this program is that it seeks to reflect perceived strengths of the Bloomington campus. One of the things that—if you go back and look at this committee structure, you look at the number of members of this committee coming from the various undergraduate units on the campus, you'll see that the College has 27 members. The next largest number comes from Music with four members. This reflects the proportionality principle that was the basis of the structure of this committee and it implies that the College, of course this is something that we all know, is a monster unit on the Bloomington campus. It is extremely significant. The structure of this program, in part, reflects that fact. So these labels that are used here, including the Natural and Mathematical Sciences, these are College labels and this is one of the ways that this proposal has been put together to reflect the importance of the liberal arts and sciences on the Bloomington campus. So that's why we're calling it Natural and Mathematical Sciences. That's what the College calls that curriculum area. Well, that's the rationale for it. Now, Professor Wheeler perhaps could talk about the Mathematical Modeling end of it.

WILLIAM WHEELER: I'm fine. [Laughter]

MCROBBIE: Jim?

CAPSEW: One thing I was wondering, I shared this proposal with my faculty in History and Philosophy of Science and it looks like there's something between English Composition and Mathematics and that's what we do, we do logic and scientific reasoning and things like that. I was just wondering whether or not that is considered a foundational skill that we would like to encourage people to do that? Now I notice on the Shared Goals information fluency is relevant,

that's fairly general and could be discipline-specific. But I was wondering whether there are courses in history and philosophy of science, philosophy, and informatics that deal with logic and scientific reasoning as a field of study and a basic competency. So I'm just wondering about whether that might be something that we should think about including.

MILLER: These are College courses that you're talking about. Do they now have a home in the distribution requirement of the College?

CAPSHAW: Some of them do, yes, some of them do.

MILLER: Well I would think that they would have a similar home in the framework of this program, at the very least.

CAPSHAW: But it seems like the English and the Mathematics are elevated in some way, doesn't it?

CARINI: Right and the reason is that virtually every student on campus has such a requirement. There is no such requirement for logic at present. [Laughter]

MILLER: There also are—this obviously also has a pragmatic dimension to it as well. If we send 7,000 students to your department to take courses in this area—one of the things that is true is that there are lots of good ideas. One of the proposals that we heard was that everyone should take a course in biology. It's very hard to argue that that wouldn't be a good thing given what's happening around us in the world; the importance of biological sciences and so forth. But we really are not geared up to teach everybody a course in biology and if we were to try to gear up to teach everybody a course in biology, we would probably have to restructure the campus considerably to do that. So there really, in a campus the size of Bloomington, there really are some very pragmatic aspects to this.

MCCROBBIE: I think it's important to add to that that this shouldn't be seen as being set in stone, that this is as they say, best efforts based on many years' work to distill out something that is generally agreeable to most people. But there are mechanisms for changing and modifying it over time as well, in light of what Ted just talked about and other possibilities as well.

PRATT: I was just going to comment that in the year plus that I've served on the BFC, this was the first topic that actually caused people to send me messages as a BFC representative and ask questions. I got lots of messages. There was one topic that came up from several people and I did not know how to clarify it. It had to do with the Foundations, the Math. The Mathematical and English foundations, asking in what way is this related to the rising level that we expect for admission to Indiana University and is this not really just an admission requirement rather than foundation requirement. In other words, how many of the students with the new higher admission requirements would be exempted from this and would it be a significant proportion of the student body that would just place out of this requirement and not really engage it on the campus as part of their general education because they would already come on board with the foundation requirement taken care of. I said I had no idea what percentage we anticipated

clearing that hurdle before they got to campus once we put the new requirements in place. Does anybody...

MILLER: Well I think the easiest one to deal with is the math one. The math requirement was really fairly specifically structured to mesh with the new admission requirement.

PRATT: Does mesh mean a significant number of students would clear the hurdle before they got here?

MILLER: No, the admission requirement brings them to a point where they could reasonably be expected to go into the math courses on this list and succeed. That was the effort in developing this particular list. Now that doesn't mean that there won't be other people who in their high schools go beyond what we're requiring for admission, and those people may well waive out of this foundation requirement.

MCROBBIE: That is item three of the requirements.

MILLER: Yes, but the requirement was structured in such a way so that it's expecting people that will have that better high school preparation that we talked about in our admission requirements last year.

PRATT: That's wonderful. That's just the answer that I needed; it's already taken care of...

MILLER: In the English area is a little less clear to me what the situation is, I'll have to say that.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: Can I ask a closely related question which is actually under the English requirement you've actually specified...

MCROBBIE: Could you speak up just a bit.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: In a closely related question, the English requirement specifies the SAT score or ACT score or advanced placement scores needed. In math it does not specify the AP score to be required. Is there some reason that was left out of math and is in English?

MILLER: Bill, go ahead.

WILLIAM WHEELER: Well I suppose it's not there because there are standards set for when a student goes through orientation and then the University Division materials, there the guidelines that say to make this advanced placement score then you can get credit for this or you can be excused from this. So that information does exist. It wasn't put in here because this is actually, it is my understanding that, for example in the English area, this is exactly what's in the College's bulletin for satisfying the English and it also constitutes a campus-wide standard for the English. So it's spent on several different requirements—several different requirements where these courses can be used for satisfying the English requirement. So it's important to have it upfront because it is not something for just the English department. All departments actually

know about it. But I suppose the answer for the math department, the advanced placement scores are specific to particular math courses. So that information does exist, it's just not in this document.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: Is it going to create an extra hoop for people or will they have to do something extra to get that AP credit?

WILLIAM WHEELER: No. No changes are anticipated in the advanced placement mathematics.

MILLER: This is a question that stems out of the grayed-in material in the document. I hope you saw the little note on the previous page that tries to explain what the shaded areas represent. Basically these shaded areas are not actually part of the proposal that we are going to act on today. They are meant to illustrate the kind of detailed information that is going to have to be developed in all of the curriculum areas to actually implement this proposal. That's going to be the job of this General Education Committee and ultimately all of that is going to come back to the Council for consideration. But right now we're viewing these grayed-in things as just illustrative material. So, whether you like those or not is not a critical issue at this moment. There'll be a time for you to object to that kind of stuff later on.

PRYOR: Maybe I'm being a trifle pedantic about this but I thought Mathematical Modeling was giving the mathematical tools that might be abstracted whereas the Natural and Mathematical Sciences gave an examples of how those are used within atmospheric science or the biological sciences. By having the Natural and Mathematical Sciences being potentially fulfilled by one course, they might lose some of the breadth. You know I see that A and B both requiring six credits but for C they can get away with a single course.

MILLER: Well I think that's right. With the way this is written right now if they take a five-credit course, and there are a number of five-credit science courses that include a laboratory component, a single course like that would satisfy this requirement.

PRYOR: And that has been discussed and people were satisfied with it?

MILLER: Well, that's where we are right now. Yes.

WATSON: This is a picky question but could that then, since it's specified so clearly that's its one five-credit course or two three-credit courses, what happens if you've got a two-credit lab and a three-credit course? I'm assuming that's going to be the same thing.

MILLER: If the lab is attached to the course in some way, is that the idea you have in mind? That there are actually are two courses that are kind of linked but they are separate courses?

WATSON: Well, since I teach one of them, yes, the content's linked but they require you to be registered in both courses. So it obviously would only work for the people that are. But, it's just the distinct wording of it that makes me worried.

MILLER: I would say that this document is going to be worked over by the General Education Committee. At this point, I'm not sure that we actually have had a good sense of what the range of science courses actually are on the campus and what configuration they come in. I don't think that's really been clear to the group that's been discussing this. But hopefully out of these 47 people that are going to be appointed to the General Education Committee, there actually will be some who actually know something—know a lot— about the science courses that are offered on the campus and will be able to put something together that actually deals with what's there. This was a point that was discussed in our meetings; whether this was really the right formulation, one course with five or two courses with six, everybody didn't have the same feeling about that. I'm sure that's going to be an issue that is going to be revisited by the gen ed committee.

MCROBBIE: Bob?

ENO: Just following up along these lines, I like Lisa, I had mail on this which shocked me. It's never happened to me before. So I actually had to look at the proposal and one of the things that I noticed and I hadn't noted it before was that the resolution we're going to vote on actually does not lock in stone this proposal even if you take out the gray stuff. It points to a committee which is going to be composed of people who not only will be directed towards this particular issue, as opposed to BFC which is directed to all issues and not chosen for this particular issue, but also people who are working with specific course lists, getting deeply into curricular issues, which is really inappropriate for the BFC to do as a body and it would be very hard for the Educational Policies Committee to do as a body and then communicate. It's a more appropriate group to deal with some of the issues that are coming up right now. We will then be approving or not or working with the GEC towards the final proposal that will come back to us in the spring. So I think a lot of the questions that I might have picked up when I looked very closely at the proposal are ones like the ones that are being raised now which we really ought to pay attention to and list and figure out where they exist and then assume that we're going to stay in touch, perhaps through the Agenda committee or perhaps through overlapping membership with the new General Education Committee to work towards a proposal with the goal that when it comes here in the spring we're ready to approve because we've been involved in the process. On that basis I think that a lot of the particular problems I may have picked out, because I'm pretty picky too, I'm not concerned about it at this stage.

MCCORMICK: Just to follow up from that. I was going to ask for clarification on in fact what the resolution that we're considering in fact states. What does it mean when you say "as outlined in this particular circular"? What do we mean by "outlined"? Are the categories set, is that what we're approving? Is it the number of credits within the categories? Is it the concept of general education? That's one of the questions that I have in terms of what are in fact approving today or considering for approval.

MILLER: Well I think if the BFC does approve this proposal, I think that given the history of this discussion on our campus, that the General Education Committee is going to have to think long and hard before it deviates significantly from the structure of this proposal. But there are an awful lot of details along the lines here that really are probably not essential to what we're really trying to accomplish here. So at that level of detail I think we're going to see some changes and shifting around. We'll certainly see some clarification about what are the mathematical sciences,

for example. That's a question that a number of people have asked. Is my field part of the mathematical sciences? Well, that's something that we're going to have to answer. I hope that the proposal that comes back to us is going to be very faithful to the overall structure of this because I think if it isn't then it's not clear what would happen.

MCCORMICK: And part of the charge to the Gen Ed Committee in this circular is in fact to do unit impact evaluations to be prepared by each school. So basically what we're doing is proposing this and then looking at the impacts it will have on education and professional preparation in the units in the university.

MILLER: Yes, there is a question about just what it means to do an impact analysis. Just how detailed an assessment that actually would be. My understanding is that in some units before the real nitty gritty stuff gets dealt with, they really would like to see what the final proposal looks like. So in this first phase maybe we're talking about a more general kind of impact analysis. Whether there's a sense on the part of the faculty in the unit that it's going to be feasible to do this without actually getting in there and rearranging everything and creating new documents and all that kind of stuff; but a more general assessment of how this is going to work for them.

MCROBBIE: Other comments?

TERRY: I actually have a question for you, Michael. I think that compared to most campus committees, to get its work done, this one is going to need staff and support. It's going to have a lot of stuff coming into it, a lot of stuff to review and a short deadline and I'm just wondering if since this is a campus committee, you're prepared to provide the support that it needs to get this done.

MCROBBIE: Yes, definitely. This is very important and we'll definitely do that. Other questions?

STERN: I have a question about the use of the term "recommended" with the Shared Goals. It seems like the Common Ground part and the Shared Goals part are two of the parts in the general education program. But then the document says that one is required and one is recommended. I just find that to be a little confusing. Does the shared goals mean recommended? How much of this part is expected or if there is none of it in a program is a program in some type of violation of the spirit of this? I suspect, if you look at the extremes, on one extreme we would probably recommend every program to have every item listed in the list. Will this be fleshed out some by the committee, do you think, as to expectations?

MILLER: Well what the word "recommended" means to me is that the members of the Bloomington Faculty Council are recommending to the faculty, say in the School of Business, that that faculty ensure that the students in your programs have opportunities to do this list of things. I think that's what recommended is meant to mean. It's not that we're recommending that every student do this, it's not quite that direct. We're recommending, the faculty is basically saying, that we believe that these things are important. We also think that they are things that are best done within the context of a particular degree program because they have elements that could be tied directly to the content of that degree program and we are recommending that the

faculty in the degree program work to make these things available to their students. Now, at the end of the day, will all students do these things? May be not. This is going to be one of the elements of evaluation of the program, let's say over a five-year period. Hopefully there will be some data, we'll be able to collect some data about what's actually happening in the degree programs with regard to these things and if it turns out that there are problems in doing this and students aren't doing this, well, that would be something for the Faculty Council to reconsider at that point in time as it kind of reviews the action that we're talking about taking here.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

WATSON: I think I am still a bit confused about this idea. It seems to me that if we feel that this is part of a gen. ed. program, why wouldn't we be requiring the individual faculty to develop programs to meet these goals rather than recommending that they do? Because it seems to me that we're all...

ENO: There is a history behind the stretch of the design of the core in a general education program and what we found in the past that failed the test is that the larger you try to make the core, which is required for all schools, the more significant and justifiable pushback you're going to get because of what you're pushing out of individualized degree programs often that have licensing requirements or other types of professional requirements. The more you're going have to have units opt out of clause eight asking for a special exception, for reasons that are entirely justifiable. So in designing a gen ed core that will actually work to unite the campus to the greatest degree, making transferability of requirements as students may change from school to school an actual practice for the most part, if you keep the core relatively small, and then indicate areas where you would want programs to know development in certain directions will allow more easily for an expanded core in the future, you probably have your best shot at having an expanded core.

WATSON: So even if you're not specifying courses that each unit devises to fulfill those goals, do you think people still will resist? You are not telling them what courses to teach. It seems to me you are asking them to create an environment in which these goals can be achieved as part of their existing or new course structure. I don't think that is the same. I don't think that we are saying exactly the same thing.

ENO: I see.

HARBISON: The word "recommended" really confuses me tremendously. If it simply said to be sort of structured by the faculty of this degree program etc., it would make more sense. This looks like, oh yeah, we can opt out of all of this. That's not clearly what we were trying to do I don't think.

CARINI: Part of it is to give the schools room for creativity in fulfilling these goals so it doesn't even have to be a course. It could be several courses.

HARBISON: The word "recommended" does confuse that issue.

MILLER: You can make a motion to make an amendment to make it clearer from your point of view.

HARBISON: I would like to make a motion to strike the word “recommended” and the semicolon and if its grammatical appropriate to capitalize the “to”.

AGENDA ITEM #7: ADOPTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

MCROBBIE: If the motion is going to be amended, first we need someone to propose the motion as per the document in front of you so I believe if that people are ready to start considering the motion proper, and then start considering motions to it.

BINGHAM: So moved.

ROTELLA: Second.

MCROBBIE: Now we move to discussion on the motion. Discussion directly on the motion which can include, I guess, moving amendments.

HARBISON: I'd like to propose we strike the word “Recommended” and begin with the “To be structured”.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Isn't that a formulation that is parallel to the first number one Common Ground “Required” versus “Recommended” that there is a way to create a parallel structure there? People from the English department?

WATSON: I would recommend “Required, To be structured by the faculty of each degree program.”

BUCUR-DECKARD: Then strike both “Required” and “Recommended”.

MILLER: Well another way to think about this would be one of the things that we are contemplating doing as we go forward with this process, as we were talking about a few minutes ago, about this idea of evaluating the feasibility of actually doing this in the context of a particular degree program. Under the language that is here basically what I would expect to happen is that in a particular unit the faculty would evaluate, whether they can actually do this stuff in a reasonable way and whether some of this fits into the program that they have so another way to look at this is that it would be a part of the assessment, the evaluation, the feasibility of actually incorporating this stuff into all of our degree programs.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: I think I agree with that depending on how we end up interpreting this, whether its every student or just that you offer these things and then students take it, I would be opposed to the changing that to the word “required” or anything that requires at this point that we have to structure it. I like it the way it is. Again just thinking for example as we think about all of our own cases, in my department in psychology we have to up to 1400

undergrad majors and it would be lovely if every one of them could do a service learning or research project. In reality, again unless you want to expand our faculty to hundreds, we cannot do that. I have a problem with the word “required”. I think that we should leave it to the next phase, until next spring at least, for people to explore and for people to give examples and to think about how it applies to their departments or their degrees, but I think this may interfere too much with degree requirements that programs have already carefully worked out for their own undergraduate department. I am opposed to the “required.”

MCROBBIE: Bill?

WILLIAM WHEELER: I agree with those comments. I have reservations at this point in time changing it to the word “required”. It might be in the spring that I feel comfortable with that. On the things that are listed in the Common Ground, we are confident that those are feasible and that they fit into all degree requirements. As those things that are listed as the Goals, we do not I think yet have the same level of confidence that they are feasible or that all degree programs would embrace them fully. I would hope that perhaps the proposer of the amendment might actually consider waiting until the spring semester or perhaps recommending it to the consideration of the General Education Committee as to whether it could be strengthened from the current language. I myself today, cannot vote in favor of changing to the word “required” because I think there is just too much that is not known and that it would be premature for us to impose a requirement as opposed to leaving it as it is currently written.

MCROBBIE: Pat, do I take that...

HARBISON: I like striking the word “required” at the top too. I don’t see that it adds anything and to me it seems to me easier for everybody to embrace the Shared Goals than it is to see how the Common Ground requirements fit into every degree program across campus. That seems harder from my perspective than embracing the Shared Goals and embedding them into the current curriculum or having them in non-credit bearing activities.

WILLIAM WHEELER: Well we have, last spring, there was a sensitive discussion with all of the schools and the Common Ground thing does fit within every degree proposal.

MCROBBIE: Yes, it’s worth commenting, just backing what Bill said that the Common Ground there. There has been extensive meetings over weeks, weeks with Associate Deans and others and the Campus Curriculum committee and so on and the feeling that is feasible and plausible what’s there. I would be very careful about changing the word “recommended” there because if its made mandatory the schools will simply say that this isn’t going to be workable and it automatically immediately destroys the creditability of the document from day one. I would again agree with what Bill said in terms of taking that into account to try to find a stronger way of addressing that whether the committee would be sensible way to go here so that it does not undercut the force of this document.

CAPSEW: I’ve got maybe a compromise here there is recommended at the bottom of the paragraph. I would just cut that “recommended” and keep the “required” and then on the Shared Goals cut the “recommended” so just get rid of that so it would be that “Goals are for inclusion

in every degree program” and then under Shared Goals “To be structured by faculty”. So that way you don’t have to use those words about recommending. Is that clear enough?

MCROBBIE: Could you just repeat it?

CAPSHAW: The bottom sentence of that paragraph, page 2, the bottom sentence of that paragraph, “Goals are for inclusion in every degree program” just strike the “recommended” then leaving the “required” in the I. Common Ground and then II. Shared Goals just strike the “recommended” and then the sentence...

MCROBBIE: So that is page 7?

CAPSHAW: Page 2, so under Shared Goals you just strike the “recommended” and then you be done with it.

MILLER: How is that different from the motion that is on the floor?

HARBISON: It strikes an additional word, that is the only thing that is different. It actually makes it more consistent within the text and the outline and I like that Jim, personally.

MILLER: It is accepted as a friendly amendment then?

HARBISON: Yes.

MCROBBIE: It is accepted as a friendly amendment. Forgive me but you actually did move it formally didn’t you. Who seconds it? Did we get that?

WATSON: I’ll second it.

MCROBBIE: So now there’s been a friendly amendment to change it to what Jim recommended, is that correct? So now we should have discussion of that let’s go over that amendment. Bob?

ENO: If I understand what you’re proposing correctly the Shared Goals would essentially become that there would have to be a requirement that units demonstrated that they had accommodated each one of the Shared Goals in some context of a course. In terms of the Common Ground, the assessment of whether units are complying is whether the registrar will graduate the student because the courses, the specific courses in the course list, will all be designated as fulfilling or not fulfilling the various Common Ground requirements. Is your suggestion that every unit have specific courses that are designated to accommodate each of these now existing Shared Goals?

HARBISON: No.

ENO: How would they demonstrate?

HARBISON: It says they could be non-credit bearing and it also might be embedded in current curriculum.

ENO: How would we know whether it was compliant?

CAPSHAW: The Committee.

ENO: But how would we know that there is compliance with what the committee said if there are not specific courses and the registrar cannot determine whether a student has fulfilled the requirements or not.

WATSON: While I'm concerned about this point, I hate writing documents in public, and I think this could go on all afternoon actually. I think that my concern is that the Shared Goals seem to be something that can be totally ignored so my concern is not with they are required or recommended but that some strong statement ultimately be made to indicate a strong commitment for units to come as close as conforming to this as their structure allows and I don't think for my purposes that we do that here today. I am just concerned that it happen.

MILLER: So what you're saying is that the faculty in a unit, might not take the Faculty Council's recommendation seriously?

WATSON: Because it is only a recommendation, I think you have made it very clear distinction between what is required and what is recommended. And it makes it very easy...

MILLER: But there are loads of things that are not on the recommended list that could be.

WATSON: And there is going to be a motion to add...

MILLER: Yes, so my own view is that this is a serious part of the proposal and the fact that this list is not 30 items long implies that there is some seriousness to these particular items.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

BOYLE-BAISE: I'd like to speak on behalf on leaving the word "recommended". The things that are recommended under these Shared Goals are things that I greatly value and my colleagues in the School of Education greatly value. But also I will sit on, I'll just speak for one small moment in this Shared Goals, I also sit on the COPSL Community Outreach & Partnership and Service Learning Advisory Board, and community service learning is my area of scholarship and it if we were make this required at this moment, it would be disastrous because we speak on the advisory board, we see it as something of great promise and problems. The office is severely under-resourced at this time and if you do this even as recommended there will have to be some modifications made. So the idea of waiting until spring to do something like this and taking a look at what the implications of this actually are for our students seems wiser to me.

MCCORMICK: I'd also like to speak on behalf of retaining the original language and not striking "recommended". I do think to echo Bob's point that there are real pressures in

implementing a very expanded core. I don't think recommended is weak. I think as self-governing body of faculty it is our responsibility to ensure that those recommendations are carried out and we're responsible for ultimately saying whether or not those recommendations are in fact carried out faithfully. But I can tell you within the school of HPER that if this was a requirement that this becomes a problem.

MILLER: Other comments?

CARR: I guess as the elder statesmen here, at least the baldest, I can throw in a little history. I must say that I concur very strongly with the last two statements. We are at this point where we were about six or seven years ago. The last time we pushed this idea of general education, Sharon Brehm was very excited about the idea. The Educational Policies Committee worked diligently and came up with something which is not as solid as what this committee has come up with. But nonetheless it was wide ranging, tried to take into account all sorts of things that were suggested on the floor of the Council and it was shot down because the schools felt that they could not accommodate so many hours within their degree programs. I think we are asking for a rejection if we push too much. Remember, degree programs are decided by schools and schools have requirements above and beyond these core requirements. The College, for example, already has an advanced writing requirement and others can be certainly implemented when schools feel it is necessary. I think to reiterate what has been said by the last two speakers, "recommended" is a recommendation to the schools. It is felt to be something significant and the schools in the wisdom that they have looking at the requests within the context of their own degree requirements can best decide what is suitable and what is not.

MCROBBIE: Pat?

HARBISON: Maybe I'm naïve but I don't see the Shared Goals as mandating any additional hours. It is more a question of how people teach what they are going to be teaching to me. It is more a question of making sure that a class that could have a writing orientation does have a writing orientation. I mean if that is a deal-breaker then I will withdraw the amendment.

[It is a deal-breaker]

HARBISON: Really? Okay I am startled but I withdraw the amendment. I am startled.

MCROBBIE: Okay the amendment has been withdrawn and we are now back to the actual motion itself.

BUCUR-DECKARD: What is the motion again?

MCROBBIE: The motion is exactly is what is on...Kevin?

HUNT: I wonder what the reasoning was behind having the requirement read "up to 31 credits". Why don't we put the requirements as 29 credits as what is required?

MILLER: Well the basic reason is that some students will be exempted from these requirements say by AP credits or SAT scores or whatever. So some students will not actually earn 31 credit hours in this material, but that is the maximum that they could earn if they did this.

HUNT: Gotcha.

MCROBBIE: It is the case, if I could just counsel again, it is the case that the Gen Ed committee, as you can read from this is, actually given a fair latitude in terms of what it can do. So there are bound to be lots of little issues that I would suggest that maybe we could refer to them and maybe we could focus on the big issue of an up/down vote on this.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I have a friendly amendment that I will hope that is going to be completely uncontroversial. I came here from a meeting where we revisited all the foreign languages that we teach here at IU and there is quite a few that are not on this list. I could read them quickly and then refer Kelly to Henry Cooper who is currently dealing with that particular issue.

MILLER: The list was created with the understanding that it did have everything in it that we thought. Well then we will be happy to add whatever needs to be added, I think anyway. I don't think that is....

BUCUR-DECKARD: Uyghur, Kazakh, Azerbaijani, Tajiki, Turkmen, Catalan, and Twi/Akan.

MCROBBIE: Could we maybe unless anyone has an objection we could just refine that?

BUCUR-DECKARD: And Serbian-Croatian is one language at IU. I happy to say. Serbian-Croatian is one language at IU, not at any other place.

MILLER: It is clear that we need specialist to get into this material.

MCROBBIE: Let's just assume that we will clean that up.

LARSON: It is just that the languages that she mentioned are not offered in a four semester sequence so they could not fulfill the requirement that is there, consistently offered through four semesters. The ones that are on the list currently are offered in four semester sequences.

MCROBBIE: Bob?

ENO: Since it says they include, it doesn't exclude anyone. We can always modify that. The committee can modify that.

MCROBBIE: That's right. The committee has that right. I think that covers that.

HENKE: I was only going to add when the GEC is being outlined and the campus charge that there be some language of proportional representation of faculty as well as student. I know that their charge on the bottom says developing assessment metrics for evaluating ongoing

experiences and effectiveness, and I think that would definitely constitute some type of student feedback as well. I think if we are going to pioneer this that would be effective to have some students participate in that.

MCROBBIE: Bill?

WILLIAM WHEELER: I think that point is well-taken. I think it would be appropriate to have non-voting representation from students. I think we certainly want that type of feedback. The voting mechanism that is there is specifically constructed to address concerns of the schools and so I would certainly support ex-officio membership from the student government and things like that, just as we have student members on the curriculum committees in the College and elsewhere. I hesitate at this point time to tamper with the voting rules that are there though so I would hope you would be agreeable to leave the voting composition as it is and to say that the committee is always able to add ex-officio members.

MCROBBIE: Yes, it says that explicitly “to conduct its work the General Education Committee may add ex-officio non-voting members as needed.” And I think we would definitely take that into account. Any other comments? I would like to see if we could move this to a vote. There is an amendment around.

PRATT: Well I will go ahead and speak on behalf of the amendment.

MCROBBIE: Lisa could you speak up just a tiny bit.

PRATT: I will speak on behalf of the amendment that you have. I’ve been asked by a broad-based coalition of faculty and staff to bring this to the meeting today. I have also asked Heather Reynolds to be here who could speak to the membership of the individuals who brought this forward. Jim Capshew can as well. I don’t think we need to read it out loud. You can read through it. I will simply add my personal perspective on this that I was willing to bring it forward because I think the current set of Shared Goals are relatively bland. You could find them at almost any university and I think that it is important that at some point that we show a little more courage here and step up with some Shared Goals that really resonate with our campus physically and philosophically and I think environmental literacy and environmental sustainability might begin to move us in that direction, where we do something more than just responding to what other schools are doing we show some intellectual leadership. You have it again here.

MCROBBIE: Lisa, do I take it that you are formally moving it?

PRATT: I am formally moving it and looking for a second.

MCROBBIE: Is there a second?

CAPSEW: Second.

MCROBBIE: Second. Okay discussion on the amendment. Discussion?

MCCORMICK: As valuable as it is, I am concerned that as we continue to expand the Shared Goals we reduce the chances that the recommendations will actually be enacted. While this is a legitimate recommendation, I would argue that from multiple perspectives that I would argue that personal health is a legitimate addition as well, given that we rank in the top five per capita obesity in the nation every year. Yet we have no Shared Goal on personal health that cuts across all disciplines so I am speaking against the motion.

MCROBBIE: Other speakers on the motion, the amendment to the motion. Yes, John?

CARINI: Well I would also say that how each one of these, worthy goals though they may be, there are not actually currently shared on the campus where as the four things that are on here are widely practiced now if not by the majority, very large numbers of the students do each one of these things now. That is one reason why these things ended up on the short list and we were not able to accept other recommendations. Now I think that during the next 4 to 5 years if a program could be developed with enough student interest in taking these courses, you could bring that to the General Education Committee as evidence that we should indeed add that to our list.

MCROBBIE: Bill?

WILLIAM WHEELER: Are there any schools currently have such a requirement in these degree requirements?

PRATT: Is there any...not in this language as currently written it would certainly be in many degree programs as a shared goal. For instance degree programs in SPEA and degree programs in geological sciences and geography so there are many places where this philosophy is actively part of the curriculum, not as a single identifiable course though.

WILLIAM WHEELER: Within particular departments, within particular majors there are majors...

PRATT: or certainly within SPEA.

WILLIAM WHEELER: but the other schools I am not aware of other schools having such a requirement.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

BINGHAM: Well I'm at SPEA and I certainly support the principle, but I'm trying to put myself in the shoes of people in the Music School. How do they meet this goal?

MCROBBIE: I think there was someone over here that was trying to speak.

PRYOR: I was going to make the same point. I think it's a fantastic idea, and given the city has a sustainability initiative, its great but I am not sure how people outside this sphere in COAS, or the College sorry, that they could necessarily fulfill this.

COYNE: I think it adds a level of complexity to an already very complex issue to the General Education Committee and I would hate to not give it a chance but I think that might be just what creates enough a problem and issue in that second component of the proposal.

MCROBBIE: Jim?

CAPSHEW: Well it seems to me that those four Shared Goals under C, Diversity in the United States, I see this as a similar kind of aspirational kind of goal that would be reflected in the Environmental Literacy and Sustainability and it seems like Lisa was saying that we should get out in front a little bit on that. I do think that diversity is also something that I don't see it practiced in our course development at all, actually. So I am just wondering if we are going to strike the Sustainability goal, than I would think we might want to consider striking c.

CARINI: In contrast, there are schools that currently have a diversity requirement, the School of Education, Social Work, and Journalism are the only three that I can think of on the top of my head, so a lot of students are doing this now in a school specific way and so that's why it is not in the Common Ground.

MCROBBIE: I'm not convinced anybody's minds are going to be convinced by sustaining this, so unless there is an objection I would like to put the amendment... Unless there is any objections. Lisa?

PRATT: Michael, in the spirit of moving this meeting forward as we did a minute ago, I am willing to withdraw this amendment. I simply hope that it is something that philosophically we will see these Shared Goals as a way not to just pattern ourselves around every other school using the same language but seek language that identifies Indiana University as being a special place, a place that would attract a certain kind of student.

MCROBBIE: I think you made that point very well.

PRATT: I will withdraw the amendment to speed up the vote.

MCROBBIE: The amendment is withdrawn. We are back to the actual motion itself. Are there any further proposals for amendments?

MCFANN: I move to make an amendment to page 8, item 2 recognizing the commitment of this body has always made to hearing students formally and recognizing Betsy's earlier statements. I would like to add a point c to number 2 that reads "a representative from the IUSA and a representative from the GPSO."

MCROBBIE: Okay, Bob.

ENO: Are you intending these as voting or non-voting members?

MCFANN: Voting members.

MCROBBIE: We need a second for that too.

HENKE: I'll second that.

MCROBBIE: Okay, Betsy second it. Okay so we now have Betsy's suggestion made explicit as a point c under [Tape 1, Side B ends; some comments lost]

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: The only...more carefully is that I know a lot of work has gone into trying to figure out the proportional representation and making sure that each school is relatively fairly represented in proportion to the number of faculty they have and of course students from those two organizations could be from very different schools and could throw off that proportion. And that would be the concern that I would have about that. I think I oppose the amendment because of that.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Yes?

PRYOR: Do students have the right to dictate curriculum in other forums?

MCROBBIE: I guess it depends from school to school. Bob?

ENO: We have always had student representation on the Educational Policies Committee and I think student representation is very appropriate. I think that the point that Amy makes concerning proportional representation is a very important one. This was a very very carefully agreed upon negotiation on the proportional weight of units that have a history here and is in fact probably the single most difficult point in this whole proposal. I would be happy to have a motion that directed the GEC, the General Education Committee, to include student representation and not necessarily limit it to one IUSA and one GPSO representative. But I do think that I couldn't vote for a proposal that included voting representation for the reasons that Amy laid out.

MCROBBIE: I am going to put the motion. If you want to continue with the motion as you stated it. So that is to have one IUSA and one GPSO student as voting members. That's your amendment? Ok. I'm going to put that motion. All those in favor? Do we need to count on this? Those against? The motion for the amendment is lost. We are now back to the motion. Any other amendments to the motion? Yes?

TERRY: I'll move to amend the last paragraph in part 2 to specify that "To conduct its work, the General Education Committee may add ex-officio, non-voting members, including student members, as needed."

MCROBBIE: Just tell us again where that is.

TERRY: I am in the last sentence under paragraph two on page 8. Inserting "including students" following "ex-officio" and before "non-voting" as a mandate to seriously look at adding students as ex-officio members.

MCROBBIE: Yes, I understand. Do people follow that? That is another amendment. Do we have a second for that?

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: Second.

MCROBBIE: Alright. I'm going to put that one too. All those in favor of that amendment to the motion? Those against? Ok that motion is carried. So the document has now been amended by the addition of those words as Herb described. So now are there any further amendments to the motion otherwise I want to put the motion itself? Any further comments?

AGENDA ITEM #7: ADOPTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

MCROBBIE: Ok, I will now move to the motion itself. That is Circular B6-2007. Does everyone have that in front of them? Ok I'm now going to put the motion. All those in favor of that motion?

BOBAY: I think we should have a roll call vote.

MCROBBIE: There is a proposal to do a roll call vote so we should do it. Yes, let's do a roll call vote.

PRATT: Can I ask for a quick clarification?

MCROBBIE: Yes.

PRATT: There was some discussion earlier of the word outline. Did that end up as a, was that just informational, did that go anywhere, I got kind of confused when that was brought up earlier if that was an amendment or what that was?

MILLER: Basically my response to that question was basically to say that this document, Circular B5, that we've just now been talking about is not a totally complete product. It is possible that the General Education Committee will, at the level of detail, present us with a different set of ideas when it reports to us later in the year. But the outline of the program, that is to say, the general structure of it, is something that the Committee will have to take very seriously for the very reason that we have seen here today. Moving too far off of what we have here is just problematic.

MCCORMICK: Ted, just as a point of further clarification. So what we're really looking at is what's outlined on page two of this particular document. Not necessarily the narrative that fills it out but, I mean there are some very specific things on page two that identify requirements in certain areas and then Shared Goals.

MCROBBIE: There's also the description of the Gen Ed Committee too and that's part of it.

HARBISON: Can I ask one more clarification on the description of the Gen Ed Committee? Did we decide that department chairs are administrative appointments or not for the purpose of this?

MILLER: They would not be administrative appointees for the purpose of this. You know one of the things that I hope will happen is that the people who will be appointed to the Gen Ed Committee will be people who actually know something about what we're talking about here. This would be extremely helpful.

MCROBBIE: Seems like a good policy. Ok. I would now like to move to the motion. And we'll do a roll call and I think Herb has been practicing the pronunciation of people's surnames so he will call the name and will tally the vote. So I will ask Herb to start and work is way through it and we'll all answer with a "yes" or "no".

TERRY: I'll just start at the beginning of the alphabet, this is our first roll call vote of the year.

GEORGE ALTER: YES

MOYA ANDREWS: YES

LISA BINGHAM: YES

JULIE BOBAY: YES

KATY BORNER:

MARILYNNE BOYLE-BAISE: YES

MARIA BUCUR-DECKARD: YES

JAMES CAPSHEW:

JOHN CARINI: YES

RICHARD CARR: YES

KEITH CLAY: YES

SHAWN CONNER:

ANGELA COURTNEY: YES

LES COYNE: YES

AURELIAN CRAIUTU:

LUIS DAVILA:

PAUL ELLIOTT: YES

ROBERT ENO: YES

DENNIS GROTH: YES

PATRICK HARBISON: YES

ROBERT HATTEN: YES

BARBARA HAWKINS:

BETSY HENKE: YES

AMY HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: YES

KEVIN HUNT: YES

LAURA M. JEZEWSKI: YES

ELIZABETH JOHNSON: YES

OWEN V. JOHNSON: YES (BONNIE BROWNLEE)

CHRISTINA KUZMYCH:

ANDREW LAUCK:

DAVID MACKAY: YES

ERIC MACPHAIL: YES

TERRENCE MASON: YES

BRYAN MCCORMICK: YES

GRANT MCFANN: NO

MURRAY MCGIBBON: YES

THEODORE MILLER: YES

LISA PRATT: YES

SARA PRYOR: YES

AMY REYNOLDS: YES

PAUL ROHWER: NO

ELYCE ROTELLA: YES

JEANNE SEPT: YES

ROBERT SHAKESPEARE: YES

SARITA SONI: YES

JERROLD STERN: YES

ALEX TANFORD:

ROBERT TERRILL: YES

HERBERT TERRY: YES

NEIL THEOBALD: YES

LARRY THIBOS:

DAVID WATERMAN: YES

MAXINE WATSON: YES

CARA WELLMAN: YES

WILLIAM WHEELER: YES

JAMES WIMBUSH:

MCROBBIE: We'll get the exact number in the minute. The motion has carried. [Applause.]

WILLIAM WHEELER: I want to express my admiration for Ted's leadership. It has really been remarkable, it is insightful, it is wise, and I really want to thank him for his contributions he has made to the Bloomington campus.

MCROBBIE: I think Ted has done an outstanding job and deserves all of our congratulations and we should congratulate him. [Applause.]

MILLER: Thank you all very much for your help.

MCROBBIE: I think the Council should be very proud of this accomplishment. I think this is just outstanding and I think it will resonate through the halls of the university as a very positive achievement. Very well done to everybody. Thank you for the debate too.

TERRY: If I counted correctly it was 43 YES, 2 NO.

MCROBBIE: So now we have Standing Committee Reports. Are there any Standing Committee reports? No reports. Any Old Business? Any New Business? Seeing no old or new business the meeting is adjourned. Thank you all very much.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.