

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 4, 2018
Franklin Hall- Presidents Hall
2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

Members Present: Kyle Adams, Heather Akou, Carry Beam, Alan Bender, Simon Brassell, Fritz Breithaupt, Paul Brunner, Daniel Bullock, Todd Burkhardt, Selene Carter, Barbara Cherry, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, David Daleke, Joseph D’Ambrosi, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, Lori Dekydtspotter, Frank Diaz, Erika Dowell, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Alyce Fly, Philip Ford, Linda Gales, Lynn Gilman, Krista Glazewski, Dennis Groth, Kenneth Guerra, Diane Henshel, Maggie Hopkins, Pamela Jackson, Colin Johnson, Padraic Kenney, Peter Kloosterman, Robert Kravchuc, Ivan Kreilkamp, Moira Marsh, Meg Meiman, Eliza Pravalko, Eric Rasmussen, Angie Raymond, Lauren Robel, Susan Seizer, Jim Sherman, Patrick Shih, Katie Siek, Paul Sokol, Bruce Solomon, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Alex Tanford, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, Richard Van Kooten, John Walbridge, Nick Williams, Alex Wisniewski

Members Absent: AJ Asomani-Adem, Hussein Banai, Carol Hostetter, Michael McRobbie, Thomas Nelson Laird, Leslie Rutkowski, Thomas Schoenenmann, Marietta Simpson, Jacob Warner, William Winecoff

Guests: Michael Lundell (OVPU), Elizabeth Pear (Faculty Council Office), Jamie Prekert (VPFAA), Jeni Waters (Vice Pres/Academic Support)

Agenda

1. **Approval of [Minutes of April 17, 2018](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Elliot Sperling](#)**
3. **[Memorial Resolution for Daniel Ray Sharpless](#)**
4. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Moira Marsh, Faculty President

[B1-2019 Bloomington Faculty Council Members 2018-2019](#)

[B2-2019 Bloomington Faculty Council Committees 2018-2019](#)

[B3-2019 Summary of Actions Taken 2017-2018](#)

5. **Presiding Officer’s Report** (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
6. **Question/Comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President

Marsh by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.

- 7. Proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty** (45 minutes)
Jon Trinidad, Co-Chair of the Creation Merger and Reorganization Committee
Nick Williams, Co-Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
[Second Reading – Action Item]

[B6-2019: Updated Proposal 12](#)

[B7-2019: Updated Proposal 13](#)

[B8-2019: Updated Proposal 14](#)

- 8. General Education Report** (15 minutes)
Dennis Groth, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
- 9. Questions/Comments on the General Education Report** (30 minutes)

Transcript

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ROBEL: Feels like old times. Welcome back, everybody. Great to see you all. There's some of you, well, now, that I'm looking around the room, I'm not sure there are. Who's new to the council this year? Welcome, thank you so much for serving. I'm really delighted that you're here.

We have a packed agenda, it looks like. So I'd like to start as we typically do by asking for approval of the minutes of April 17th.

Can I hear a motion?

Okay, thank you, Alex.

TANFORD: I move the minutes.

ROBEL: And a second? Thank you, Katie. All in favor?

ROBEL: All right, that looks unanimous to me. We turn, as we always do at this point, for a memorial resolution, to our Vice Provost, Eliza Pavalko, and this is for Elliot Sperling.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ELLIOT SPERLING

PAVALKO: Thank you, and just to say, we have two today. So our first is Elliot Sperling. The very symbol of activity and vivaciousness, Elliot Sperling passing at the tender age of 66, took everyone who knew him by surprise.

Elliot Sperling passed away unexpectedly in his apartment in Queens, New York City, in late January 2017. The very symbol of activity and vivaciousness, Elliot's passing at the tender age of sixty-six shook everyone who knew him. He was one of world's leading historians of Tibet and Tibet-China relations, a MacArthur Fellow, and a relentless advocate for human rights. Elliot retired from IU in December 2015, having spent nearly forty years at Indiana University as a graduate student and faculty member in the Department of Central Eurasian Studies, seven of which as department chair.

Born and raised in New York City to a family that, not unlike many of the city's middle-class Jewish families, underscored the importance of education, hard work, modesty, and social responsibility, Elliot developed a political and social awareness from a very young age. Attending Queens College in the early 1970s at the height of the Counterculture era only served to kindle in him a youthful idealism that was never extinguished. While in college, Elliot traveled widely. Among other itineraries, an overland journey from Istanbul to Delhi with stops in the fabled cities of Erzurum, Tabriz, Tehran and Herat fueled his passion for the study of faraway lands. A short sojourn in India developed into something of a love affair with that country and culture; Elliot would revisit India numerous times later (including as a Fulbright fellow). Upon his return from Delhi, having encountered for the first time Tibetans in exile, Elliot decided to change his major to East Asian Studies.

Equipped with knowledge of Chinese made stronger by an overseas study of the language in Taiwan, Elliot matriculated at Indiana University's Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies (renamed Central Eurasian Studies in 1993), where his career would be shaped and developed for the next four decades. The Department was already internationally renowned, in part owing to the presence on the faculty of Taktser Rinpoche, the Dalai Lama's eldest brother. Elliot studied modern and classical Tibetan, perfected his knowledge of modern and classical Chinese, and completed his doctoral dissertation, *Early Ming Policy Toward Tibet*, in 1983. The dissertation has been widely acknowledged as the most influential study on the subject and is still (!) cited frequently.

A genuine product of the public education system, Elliot took his first faculty position also at a public institution, the University of Southern Mississippi (USM). Shortly after arriving in Hattiesburg, he received the prestigious John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Fellowship (1984-89). After a short spell at USM, Elliot returned to IU in 1987, as a faculty member. He would remain at the university, a much-loved and inspiring teacher, until December 2015, with occasional visiting professorships elsewhere, including Harvard University (1992-93) and the University of Delhi (1994-95). Over the years, Elliot mentored numerous graduate students who have pursued both academic and nonacademic careers in North America, Europe, Asia and the Middle East. His signature courses and seminars included "The Civilization of Tibet"; "Tibet and the West"; "Sino-Tibetan Relations"; "Chinese Sources for Tibetan Studies", and many others.

In his research, based predominantly on original primary sources in Tibetan and Chinese, Elliot focused on questions of sovereignty and boundaries; on types of political, social and familial authority; on Chinese policy toward Tibet; and on the complicated roles of Tibetan officials in the service of both Tibetan and Chinese governments. He wrote about bureaucrats, monks, mediators, and envoys to the Tangut, Yuan, Ming and Qing courts, and his research covered many periods, ranging from the ninth century to the present. In addition to his focus on the Ming period, Elliot is especially recognized for B4-2019 his interventions on the study of the Tanguts, on Mongol presence in and influence on Tibet in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, on the reign of the Fifth Dalai

Lama and other eminent personalities of his era, and on Tibet's status under the Qing. Elliot served on, consulted, or directed numerous professional boards and associations.

In his work, Elliot was a judicious voice in increasingly less discerning times. He censured the Chinese government's oppressive policies in Tibet, a rebuke he was unafraid to repeat in public while in China. He also criticized the Dalai Lama and Tibet's government-in-exile in Dharamsala, India, (including during his own visits to India) for giving up on Tibetan independence and for their ignorance of China's actual policies toward Tibet. He rejected the Tibetophiles' view of Tibet as an unspoiled bastion of pure spirituality. And he never had much patience for scholars who easily become groupies of academic fashions.

Elliot was a champion of human rights. Most recently, his public engagement was exemplified in the case of Ilham Tohti. Tohti, a Uyghur professor of economics at Minzu University in Beijing, was to spend a year at IU – at IU's invitation – in 2014 as a visiting professor. He was detained in the Beijing airport, just prior to boarding his flight to Indianapolis, on charges of "separatism" (charges that were characterized as completely made up by the U.S. State Department, the European Union, and many other international bodies) and has since been sentenced by the Chinese government to life imprisonment. Despite – and perhaps also because – the display of silence on the matter by the IU administration, Elliot became one of the most outspoken individual voices arguing for Ilham Tohti's innocence and release. This endeavor was not new for Elliot. He had served on the Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad for the U.S. Department of State (1996-1999), and he testified before the Groupe d'information du Sénat sur le Tibet (France), the Parliamentary Human Rights Group (United Kingdom), the Congressional-Executive Committee on China, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, and many others. His expertise was particularly requested on matters of human rights in Tibet, Tibet-China relations, ethnic minorities in China, and U.S.–China relations. His opinion pieces and commentary were published in venues such as The New York Times, The Los Angeles Times, The Times of India, Jane's Intelligence Review, and The Far Eastern Economic Review, among others.

Shortly after his death in late January 2017, services and symposia were held in his memory in the U.S., Europe and Asia, with obituaries and special websites announced in his honor. Elliot is survived by his daughter, Coleen. We request that this memorial resolution be presented in the Bloomington Faculty Council and be preserved within its archives. We also ask that copies of the resolution be sent to Elliot's daughter, to the Department of Central Eurasian Studies, and to the Dean of the School of Global & International Studies.

Ron Sela
Associate Professor
Department of Central Eurasian Studies

We requested this memorial resolution be preserved in the WBFC archives, and ask that copies be sent to his daughter.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DANIEL RAY SHARPLESS

PAVALKO: Second memorial resolution is for Daniel Ray Sharpless. Daniel Ray Sharpless was the first in his family to attend college. Studying pre-law at Potomac State College in the early 1950s.

Daniel Ray Sharpless was born in 1934 in Kitzmiller, Maryland. He was the son of David Woodrow Sharpless and Mary Kathryn (Sheetz) Sharpless. He came from a family of coal miners who settled in the middle of the Appalachian coal fields. While growing up in Maryland, he participated in a variety of sports including soccer, basketball, baseball and track. In addition to a busy athletic schedule, Dan also worked a variety of part time jobs. One of his favorite jobs as a teen was working as a movie theater projectionist.

Dan was the first in his family to attend college, studying pre law at Potomac State College in the early 1950s. Upon hearing that the GI Bill was about to expire, Dan left college to join the Army. He was first assigned to a military office clerk position in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. After a conflict with an Army colonel, Dan was reassigned to Korea and worked with the 8th Army engineers in Seoul, Korea. While stationed in Korea, he traveled extensively throughout the country. He also worked part time teaching conversational English to the faculty at the Korean Military Academy (which was the equivalent to West Point).

In 1956, Dan returned to the United States and attended West Virginia University and majored in Education. He completed his Bachelor's degree in 1958 from West Virginia University and then enrolled in officers training at Fort Benjamin Harrison in Indianapolis, Indiana. Over the next ten years, Dan spent time in Fort Knox, Kentucky as the Head of the Finance Branch in charge of facilitating the pay of over 20,000 active duty soldiers two times a month. Dan was then assigned to Tripler Medical Center in Honolulu as the Recreation Services Officer. During his time in Hawaii he met his wife, a nurse, Yvonne Taeko Myagi, in 1961, and they were married in 1962. While at Tripler Medical Center, he was also able to attend the University of Hawaii and take Russian studies courses.

Dan left Honolulu in 1964 and went back to Fort Benjamin Harrison as member of their faculty to teach Russian studies. From 1965-1966 Dan commuted to Indiana University to take graduate courses in Recreation. In 1967, Dan was assigned to the 1st Infantry in Vietnam. He was the Chief of Recreation Services for the United States 1st Infantry position providing recreation services for thousands of US servicemen in a combat zone. During his time in Vietnam he was the project officer of the Bob Hope Christmas Show that included an audience of over 14,000 U.S. troops. The event was such a success that it was featured in an issue of Park and Recreation Magazine.

Dan returned from Vietnam and completed his Recreation Directorate at Indiana University in 1970. Following the completion of his degree, he worked in Washington, DC as the Chief of Recreation Services for the United States Army. Part of his job involved sitting in on Congressional Budget Hearings and traveling all over the world conducting studies on what soldiers wanted related to recreation service offerings on United States military bases.

Dan served a second tour in Vietnam in 1972-1973, this time as an advisor to a Vietnamese division and later with the Vietnamese government. Dan returned to Indiana University in 1973 and worked for Army ROTC. He was promoted to the Head of the IU Army B5-2019 ROTC program with rank of

Lieutenant Colonel. He retired from the military as Professor and head of the Military Science Department at Indiana University in July 1977.

After 1977, Dan Sharpless taught computer courses for Indiana University's School of Business. Dr. Ted Deppe hired Dan as a part time instructor to help establish the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation's computer classes in the late 1970s. In the early 1980s, Dan assisted with the establishment of the Journal of Park and Recreation Administration and served as its first managing editor. In 1987, Dan assisted in the establishment of the New York State Park Management and Recreation Institute at Saratoga Springs, NY. From the 1980s until 2010, Dan worked as a Lecturer for the Department of Recreation and Park Administration (now the Recreation, Park and Tourism Studies Department).

Dan has not only taught computer classes at Indiana University, but has developed and taught an Armed Forces Recreation course, established, coordinated and supervised overseas internships and practicums, and provided students in the Recreation Department with academic advising services. For over twenty years, Dan has linked hundreds of Indiana University students with overseas internships with the US armed forces military Morale, Welfare and Recreation Services. The internships have allowed Indiana University students to experience military recreation service offerings on US military bases overseas. Similar programs have been coordinated by Dan at Kilauea Military Camp on the Big Island of Hawaii and Edelweiss Lodge and Resort in Germany.

Dan Sharpless not only served his country with distinction (five Bronze Star awards and the Legion of Merit from the US Army, and one of only thirty service men to receive the South Vietnamese Tri-Color Fourragere), but he has also served Indiana University and the field of Recreation with great distinction. He has assisted in the education of thousands of park and recreation professionals throughout the world and served as President of the Armed Forces Recreation Society and as its representative on the National Recreation and Park Association Board of Trustees. Dan has impacted the lives of many young adults, those serving in the US military and students gaining an education in the field of parks and recreation. Dan was one of the early proponents of the idea that members of the armed services were entitled to the same recreation opportunities as those provided the people they were committed to protect. His passion for the field of recreation, care and mentoring to his students, and ability to motivate young adults is a true inspiration. His legacy is his commitment to seeking out new challenges and inspiring students to experience what the world has to offer.

Dr. Julie S. Knapp, Lecturer
Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies
IUB

Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you, Eliza. Please stand. Thank you very much. I turn now to our president for executive committee business.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MARSH: So good afternoon, everyone. Just a word of explanation before I begin, I have what the school of optometry lecturer refer to as a very interesting pair of eyes, which means that my vision is not very good.

When I had cataract surgery three years ago, they told me I could have lenses that gave me reading distance, or distance vision, or intermediate vision which is good for the computer, and God help me, I choose the computer.

Because that's where I spend most of my time.

So, if I appear vague and unfocused, it's not because I'm vague, but I am unfocused. So I apologize in advance for that. I wanted to begin by referring to an interesting conversation that Alex and Rebecca and I had at the end of the last semester, with a visiting delegation from Peking University.

They were here for a month to learn about how IU administers itself. And they talked to us about faculty governance and shared governance when they attended the Provost State of the Campus address. And they attended one of our more interesting BFC meetings in the end of March that year, as well.

And I found myself struggling to explain to them the concept of shared governance. They had a lot of questions. Does the administration rule the faculty? No, well, then does the faculty rule the administration? Clearly not. So what kind of relationship is this, exactly? So in trying to find an explanation, the simile that came to my mind was, shared governance is like a marriage.

And this is where, if I were braver, I would have cued the video clip from the Princess Bride with the very impressive clergyman talking about, marriage. The point being that a marriage is neither party rules the other absolutely but each party is accountable to the other. It's a system of mutual accountability and it's a system of being committed to the same project.

Marriage counselors tell us that a good relationship can survive all kinds of things. It can survive anger, it can survive misunderstanding and miscommunication. It can survive jealousy. It can even survive different values. It can even occasionally survive the occasional bout of hatred. But the one thing it cannot survive is contempt.

And so successful shared governance, to me, depends on trust, collaboration, communication, transparency, inclusiveness, honesty, and integrity. And with all this we can build a firm background of trust and shared commitment, and with that, we can have beneficial or useful conflict without contempt. I'll end this bit with a quote that's now on, we now have a little page on the BFC website about what is shared governance.

There's a quote on there that I find very useful. It talks about the fact that sound shared governance depends on academic freedom. And the quote is that the freedom generated by the tenure system, is the freedom to act in concert with others to develop something together. Not because someone is ordering you to do so, but because you are embarked on a common project.

And so, we are embarked on a common project. I today need to just draw your attention to three circulars and two bits of paper. So everyone would have received these very nice BFC brochures. Some of you, we had these at the retreat. We've handed them out here today just to remind everyone that one of our big priorities this year is to grow new membership for the BFC.

So take these brochures, we have lots more. And share them with your colleagues liberally and talk to your colleagues about BFC, about coming to see what we do let alone get involved. But we look to all of you to help bring in new parties to the Shared Governance Project.

And you also have a very handy two-page sheet for the Robert's Rules of Order for Dummies. You may laminate this, bring it to future meetings because our meetings are run according to Robert's Rules and Lauren will insist on that. The three circulars that are in the agenda. We do this every year at the beginning of the year, the three circulars are always there.

First is, where are we? Yes, the list of who we are, BFC council members for the year, that's us. The second one, the list of all the BFC council committees and their membership. How many people here are chairing or co-chairing a standing committee at present? A lot of people, that's great.

And I expected everyone here, if anyone here who has not yet found a committee, please let us know because we would be happy to find one for you. Most of the work at the BUC does happen in committee, it doesn't happen here. This is just the fun and games spot.

And then finally, is the summary of actions taken last year. So that's what we did last year. We're going to pick up right from where we left off there with a very active agenda this year. Thanks.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you, that was terrific. What a great kind of call to action for the year and a reminder of why it's important to think about shared governances of a piece with academic freedom.

It is certainly conceptually related. I'm going to start on two happy things in my report. The first is, I was at the summary of the Capital Campaign results until now and the faculty and the staff of Indiana University have contributed almost \$90 million to the capital campaign.

When you think of the way that will play out in the lives of students, support for students, support for colleagues, support for research, just the foundational work of our campus, I think that that's pretty stunning. And I want to thank Jim Sherman for leading the faculty campaign, and for doing the work of walking around and talking to people and getting us to put into writing, and what it is that we really believe in about our mission and how we want to support it.

SHERMAN: Someone interested in finding out what it's about, I'll be glad to talk with them.

ROBEL: Thank you, Jim, that's outstanding. The second thing I wanted to just brief you on quickly is the Center for Rural Engagement. I had talked about this in the State of the Campus address last year.

I think I talked about it in the State of the Campus address the year before. But we didn't actually get any funding for it, the center, until March, when Lilly gave us a wonderful \$10 million gift to get started with this. This came out of a study of Southwest Central Indiana that was done in preparation for the Lilly endowment, thinking about another economic development kind of gift.

And it had a tiny little piece in it about Indiana University, and for a good while, I had a hard time really trying to figure out what to do with that piece. How do we think about Indiana University's relationship to the rural parts of our state? Not just the ones that are right around us, but all of the rural parts of the state.

So I'm gonna walk through what's happened in the couple of months since we got this grant, because I want you to know what's happening, so you can think about how your own work, but also the work of your colleagues might fit in. So here's what the mission and the vision of this center is:

It's really for us to serve as a national model in the 21st century of how a great research university can be connected to its region, and to the rural parts of the region. We're not a land grant institution like Purdue. We didn't start out with that in our DNA.

We're not Wisconsin that started out in the last century with the Wisconsin idea. What does it mean for us to be engaged with our state and with our region within our own mission? And how can we kind of think about the next way for universities to do that?

The mission of the center's pretty straightforward, it's to improve Hoosier lives in rural communities. And we do that through collaboration, partnership, trust, community focus, sustained involvement, and accessibility. But we do it within the boundaries of our mission as a research university. And this is the world we focus on, this is a slide that came from the School of Public Health.

So those of you who were in the school, thank you for this, I have internalized it over the last several months. We really aren't thinking directly about economic development. Rather, what we're thinking about are the social determinants of health that sit underneath any possibilities for economic development. The neighborhoods, the built environment, access to health care, the social capital in a community.

Its connectedness to the rest of the state and its education, and particularly its connectedness to Indiana University. The goals are very tiny there. I'm very sorry that they're in such small print. But from my perspective, I really want to use this as a way to demonstrate the many ways in which the state's investment in Indiana University results in better lives for the citizens of the state.

Okay, so how do I flip it? One is applied research. What do we do, I'm having trouble going back. Help me, thank you. Applied research, and so we've really focused in on health, on educational attainment, on quality of place, and on resiliency. And on the third, we're having a little workshop on data needs for the future for rural Indiana, trying to pull together the people who have data about rural spaces in this country and really think through, what do these data tell us?

What kinds of data do we not have? In applied research, we've focused in the beginning on health because healthcare was a huge issue. Katie Siek is one of the investigators in this set of projects. When I was going around Southern Indiana and listening to communities talk about their perceived needs, one of the needs I heard over and over again was not phrased in a way that we could be directly involved in.

People would say our community members get old, and then they have to move away because there's no place for them to be when they get older. When I drove down to French Lick recently, I saw a sign out in front of a house that said for sale, I'm old, and I have to move out.

Katie and Kay Connelly are doing a wonderful project that focuses in on the incredible work that's happening in their groups on aging in place using sensor technology and social media. And what I thought when I first heard this story and then connected it in my mind to Kay and Katie's research, was how utterly impossible it would have been for somebody sitting out in the counties in Indiana to have made that connection.

If you're thinking about that problem, you might have thought about the School of Public Health or Nursing or Medicine. I don't know what you would have thought of. But you undoubtedly would not have found Kay and Katie. So part of what the center does is funds applied research that is or will be of use to rural communities.

And you can see a few of the kinds of things that have been funded through the center so far. The second big area of applied research that we're funding is in resiliency really. How can communities remain or become more resilient environmentally? How can they become more resilient and sustainable?

How can they take advantage of the natural resources that they have around them? And you can see that we funded several projects, including a wonderful one with James Farmer, who's now at SPEA, that is connected to the emerging areas of research grant that he got, but that really thinks about food deserts.

There are a lot of communities in Southern Indiana that are struggling with a lack of places to buy food. They're food deserts. Grocery stores close and it's hard to attract new grocery stores in. And we also sit on this campus where we feed, what, 12 to 25,000 people a day, so we're huge purchaser of food.

Can those things be put together in any way that might help in southern Indiana? James is working on that. And then the big surprise for me is Hoosier quality of place? Ed Comentale of the English Department in the Arts and Humanities Council and David Brenneman from the museum have really asked the question, how can we be helpful in the arts and humanities?

What do they have to bring to southern Indiana as southern Indiana thinks about quality of place and rebuilding place? There's been a huge amount of interest in quality of place initiatives that involve taking advantage of the wonderful cultural assets that we have on the campus. And there's been a lot

of interest in whether our faculty could help foster communities or conversations in communities about inclusiveness.

I think those are astonishing kinds of opportunities for the university. And I've been really quite moved by the requests that we get. It's led already to a proposal for a certificate in rural arts administration, which would be the first in the nation. And I think it was responsible in many ways for the Mellon Grant we got recently that focused a lot on research behind the public humanities.

We've been running for the last year a pilot in Lawrence County in applied teaching, perhaps some of you have participated in this. Epic Ann is consortium of universities, about 35, that do applied research. But they do it for the most part, in urban areas, which makes sense. We're the largest one already in rural areas.

Last year, we did a set of projects that involved six schools and a college. 20 classes, 15 faculty and 550 students in Lawrence County. Those are the classes. One of the classes put together a complete streets initiative, which is I've learned somebody from SPEA could describe this much better than I but a way for everyone, whatever their ability or their age to be able to use the streets more easily.

And the city council of Bedford passed it. A lot of these other projects are also things that are in train even now. There are things that these communities could not have done in a million years. And the question is how can we take the next step with these communities to assure that these are not one off projects but they're ongoing relationships?

We just kicked off the second year of sustaining who's your communities, the supplied teaching project. This is in Orange County, we kicked it off in French lit last week. There are 17 classes involved, 14 faculty leading classes in this semester, about 350 students involved. This is Lauren Travis, she's a graduate of Indiana University.

She came from Washington State, she was planning to go back to Washington State. She's now working here in Bloomington, Indiana for a nonprofit because after having participated in sustaining who's your community she decided that there was a whole world of possible employment in local government and local non-profits.

But she could, that she was really interested in being engaged in. And so you'll see her around town, she works for regional opportunity initiative. And then finally, you know that we kicked off IU Corps last year, at the very end of the year. It's an effort to give students on our campus who are interested in working in communities, through these many, many, many organizations.

The opportunities to connect with communities around the state, and frankly, around the world. Cassie Winslow-Edmondson, who is the director of this, has been very busy trying to assure that every student on this campus who wants to be engaged in service. In the state wants to be engaged in service to work many communities or wants to be engage in service period has a way to get there.

So, that's that. If you know people who would like to be involved, have them get in touch with Bill Brown, who is the center director. This has been, for me, a really moving and exciting way for our university to be engaged with our neighbors. So with that questions for me?

Comments? Yep, Alex.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

TANFORD: For those of you who are new and don't know me, I'm Alex Tanford. I'm past president of the BFC and at the law school. I have volunteered for a test pilot program this year where I am the ombudsman to the misconduct and grievance process for the faculty.

As part of our thinking through whether we have the right resources in place, or whether we just dump it all in a license office to deal with the grievance and misconduct, and review process for faculty. So as representatives of your units, you may be contacted by colleagues with a question about misconduct, or grievance, or what to do?

First step this year, send them to see me. You can also get to me by going to Elizabeth Pair, the executive director of the Faculty Counsel Office.

ROBEL: Other questions or comments? There was a submitted question, and I hesitate to read it because the answer's no. And it's a long question, but I will read it:

As we know each campus school is allotted a certain amount of money per undergraduate credit hour taught in that school. One might wonder how each school actually uses that tuition revenue to pay for undergraduate instruction. In particular, one might wonder how much a school spends on each of the following categories of instructor AIS adjuncts plus visiting faculty, MTT instructional faculty, and tenure-track faculty.

Question, do there exist publicly available data that would allow one to indeed determine how much money each school spends on each of the above categories of instructor? If so, where do those data exist, and how could one obtain them? The data that seem most difficult to obtain are those about AIs.

I don't. Actually know how to answer that question, because there's lots of publicly available data. I think salaries are publicly available, for instance. It would be possible, I think, to go and sort. There might be ways to put this together, but I think the short answer is, we don't put it together.

And so if, I just don't have a really good place to point you. Compensation is obviously most of what people spend their budgets on, so. All right, are there questions? Great. I turn now to Jon Trinidad and Nick Williams for the second reading—that was a long pause—of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the Bloomington faculty. Great, Jon and Nick, I'll turn it over to you.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty

WILLIAMS: Last April, on something of a cliffhanger, we passed amendments 1 through 11, but 12 through 14 remained. And I thought that it made sense to remind you of what had been passed then, and for those who are new to the council, to talk a little bit about what was passed then.

Because the main proposals that were passed then provide a context for the remaining two. Because we're going to remove one of the three. So only two remain for us. Let's see, not all of the proposals from last year came from the non-tenure track task force that John and I shared, but a number of them did.

And the main proposal that was passed last April had to do with non-tenure track representatives on the BFC. As things currently stand, many of you will remember there are three NTT members on this body, one drawn from the group of lecturers, one drawn from clinical faculty, one drawn from research scientists and research scholars.

There is no representative of professor of practice at this point. What our proposal was, and what was passed, was a new way of allocating representatives to non-tenure track faculty basically following the same principles by which tenure track faculty are chosen. In the by-laws there's a provision for approximately, for every 50 tenure track faculty, they'll be one representative.

And we basically suggested creating election units for non-tenure track faculty along the same lines with the proviso, as I quote here on this slide, that the number of voting tenure-track faculty and librarian representatives shall be no less than 60% of the total voting membership of the Bloomington faculty council.

So that suggests a limit on the number of non-tenure track faculty. But within that limit, they would be chosen along the same lines as tenure track faculty. What this means in practice is that from the current three non-tenure track members, we would arrive at approximately 15 members. And that's not an exact number because it really depends on how you group together the various schools and departments.

You could end up with different numbers but should be in the neighborhood of 15. What that means for the size of this body is that we would expand to approximately 80 members. So the remaining two constitutional amendments concern the issue of maintaining a manageable size for this body.

Proposal 12 that I'm going to give you a look at here soon, it has to do with the at large members of this body. And suggest reducing them from ten to five. And proposal 14, suggests reducing the number of graduate student members from four to three so just to take a look at those.

Currently, the language in the constitution says, there shall be ten council representatives elected from the Bloomington campus at large from at least two must be on tenured. Such representatives must be person's qualifying under section 1.1 and 1.2 1.1 defines tenured track faculty. 1.2 defines librarians so it's those two categories.

We're suggesting replacing this language with the following: There should be five council representatives elected from the Bloomington campus at large. Such representatives must be persons qualifying under section 1.1 and 1.2 of this constitution. So the at large positions are not available to non-tenure tract faculty and we also, as you no doubt notice, suggest eliminating the notion that two of the at large should be untenured.

Part of the rationale for this is that it doesn't make much sense. It didn't make much sense to us that untenured people be acknowledged, particularly in the at large. Being an at large member kind of requires cultivating a broader acquaintance among the faculty. So it made less sense to us to say that the two untenured people must be here rather than in the departmental positions, the ones that are attached to particular departments.

So we would suggest that chairs of departments should recommend to their untenured faculty that they might stand for membership in the BFC, but it didn't make so much sense to have them be at large. And as I said, proposal 13, which was the most difficult thing to argue for because its only rationale was filling a space in the constitution so that somebody didn't have to renumber paragraphs. And try to argue for that, that's a very difficult thing to argue for. Secretarial neatness is not a very moving rationale for a constitutional proposal. But the lucky thing is that we don't need to reserve the space in the constitution anymore. So we're going to propose withdrawing proposal 13. Therefore you needn't pay any attention to it, I don't think.

The other one is proposal 14, which has to do with the graduate student representatives and Jon's going to talk about that a bit.

TRINIDAD: So currently there are four representatives. I don't need to read the existing text, but vice president, president of the Student Association, so those would be the undergrads and then four graduate students.

We had originally proposed reducing the number to two, but in consultation with the graduate student representative last year, they made a push for three which we thought was reasonable. So what we're proposing to replace that section too in particular is three graduate students selected in accordance with the procedures that graduate and professional student government.

So three students. Although, it's, of course, up to them how they're going to allot those positions.

WILLIAMS: The one other thing I can think of to mention is just to remind you that Approval of Constitutional Amendments by the BFC is just a first step. If the BFC approves Constitutional Amendments, they then go onto the whole faculty.

So I think that needs to happen in a month or six weeks, sometime in that timeframe. Yeah, but that's all we have.

ROBEL: So these have been circulated already, they come from a committee, I don't think they need further action for us to be able to act on them.

So is there discussion? Yes.

R. COHEN: Can I just get a clarifying, you said that when dropping from ten to five, that the at-large members would no longer be allowed to be untenured, or is it untenured and tenured?

ROBEL: Tenure track, right?

WILLIAMS: I don't think it said they wouldn't be allowed to be untenured but there'd no longer be a requirement that two of them would be untenured.

So I think it's fine them to be untenured but it's just not that we'd have to have two untenured.

R. COHEN: Okay.

ROBEL: Great. Other questions?

HENSHEL: Could you clarify whether or not we really have a problem with space?

WILLIAMS: Hmm, Elizabeth is good on that aspect.

PEAR: Did a little bit of looking into this, actually, and there are already 80 seats around the table.

So we could accommodate that many. We could also add eight if we had to by changing the configuration a little bit but that maxes us out. We do not have space beyond this configuration in any other space other than Presidents Hall.

ROBEL: My own view, these are not decisions that should be dictated by the size of the room. They should be dictated by the ability to have a collegial conversation, and get to the conclusion of a set of actions, and that's what I think you're getting at, right? It's not just how much room we have.

TRINIDAD: Yeah, my sense, and maybe Nick can weigh in then.

Last year, I mean, the task force is really trying to respond to the various comments that people had given us throughout the process. And while we hadn't taken a vote per se, the comments seemed, at least the people who had opinions, seemed to think that the BFC was, from a managerial point of view, getting close to maxing out.

I guess I'm somewhat agnostic on that particular opinion, but that's the concern we were trying to address with this amendment.

ROBEL: Yes, Bruce.

SOLOMON: If these proposals are adopted, are you saying the size will go to 80 or 80 minus 6, I wasn't quite clear. And I just, to expressed my opinion, I think the BFC is already quite large and it's sometimes difficult having been here for several years now to have a thorough discussion which all the people who want to comment get to comment.

WILLIAMS: If both of these proposals pass then the net gain of members would be 5, what am I saying, 12, what am I saying?

It would be 6, it would be 6, because 12 team members minus 6 current members. If they don't pass then the total would be 12.

So it's the difference between 6 members.

SOLOMON: I see, so if they don't pass, it's going up to 80 from 68, and if they do pass, it's going up to 74.

WILLIAMS: I think that's right, yeah.

ROBEL: Okay, other comments? Yep, carry on.

RASMUSSEN: I like the idea of having a lot of at large members, because those people are maybe more interested.

But I also like the idea of limiting the size. The alternative would be to reduce everything else proportionately. Right now, is it 30 to 35 members or something? 35 faculty per member?

WILLIAMS: Right now, at least according to the Bloomington faculty council manual, there are 50 elected tenure-track faculty members and 3 elected non tenure-track members.

And then there are six administrators and other categories, but elected people it's 50 tenure-track, 3 non-tenure track.

RASMUSSEN: What I'm wondering though, the alternative is to reduce everything else proportionately so we have fewer Kelly members, fewer college members and so forth, and keep the size the same.

What would we have to do for that?

WILLIAMS: I think you'd have to change the proportion of existing faculty members to representatives.

RASMUSSEN: Right.

WILLIAMS: Currently it's 50 to 1 and I guess you'd have to jiggle that.

RASMUSSEN: Would it be 60 to 1 then or what do you think?

WILLIAMS: I haven't done the math, but, yeah, it would be something like that.

ROBEL: Okay, other comments? Yeah.

MARSH: One just comment in general about at-large members, and I speak having been an at-large member. If this body is a representative body, it's not clear. Most of us who are representing a unit have responsibilities to report back to units, to be a conduit between the unit and this body.

But how can you possibly do that through the entire campus? I never figured that out, so in a way it might be that having 10 at-large members is more than we need in that category.

ROBEL: Okay, yeah, Alex?

WISNIEWSKI: Hi, everyone, I'm Alex Wisniewski, I'm the student body president of the Indiana University Student Association.

And very thankful for the student turnover that we have. But would you be able to, or because of that, would you be able to explain the rationale for going from four graduate students to three graduate students? And kind of how you did come to that conclusion with the previous GPSG president.

WILLIAMS: Our proposal of moving from four to two sparked a response from him that graduate students at least needed to have representatives in the three areas that they thought of as important. It wasn't exactly teaching research and service, but it was leadership, teaching, and research. And that made a good deal of sense to us.

WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

ROBEL: Great, Alex?

TANFORD: One of the explanation on the reduction in graduate students, the old system had two officers of the graduate and freshman student government. And two other people started to materialize out of nowhere. They have been on and off the faculty housing for many years.

In many years, those other two people who are not officers of the graduate student government never showed up. They reorganized essentially to have three officers and I think that was part of the reason why we went to three. But the reason for the reduction was simply because we had trouble filling all four slots.

ROBEL: All right. Well why don't we do the seriatim, and could you put up proposal 12 please?

All right, so there's the proposal. May I ask for a vote at this point? All in favor?

All right, opposed? Two, three, four? Okay, I think that passes pretty decisively. Okay.

Do you want to go to 14? And again, may I ask for a vote? All in favor? All right, all opposed? One, two, all right, three. Thank you very much, and thank you for all the work on this. And what a cliffhanger!

So nice to get to a conclusion.

At this point I think we turn to the general education report. Dennis?

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT

GROTH: Yeah, usually the cliffhangers sets you up for the new season

And you learn that somebody has survived or not survived into the next season. So thank you very much. Professor Marsh asked me at the retreat, came to me and says, I know it's really short notice.

What do you think about making an agenda presentation at our first meeting? And I sort of thought about it, and I said, what the heck. Let's just go with it. We'll get up and present what we have. We always have information that we can talk about on general education.

If I were to present later in the year, it might be different. But I wasn't able to come last year because of all the scheduling constraints last year getting things in. So I'll just talk a little bit about what I'm going to do today. I want to send regrets from our colleague Jonathan Michaelson who was the co-chair of the Gen Ed committee last year.

He was not able to be here today so he sends his regards. But I thank him for his service. So as always, I tend to share a little bit about data, what's going on in general education. I'm also going to talk a little bit about assessment and where are we.

What do we know about coverage of learning outcomes? So for example, the faculty have identified learning outcomes for each of the general education areas. Are there any that nobody's touching upon? Are there any obvious gaps? And let's just take a look at a little bit of data there.

I'm going to talk a little bit about General Education Committee actions over the last year. And then an update and next steps on the issue of diversity in the US requirement within the general education. So where do we stand? We see this trend of credits coming in. I'm just going to sort of read them off left to right.

The numbers don't really matter too much. You can probably make them out. IU has a dual credit program. It's an important program, that's the left-most column. It's called the Advanced College Project. It's a program where students in high school take classes that count simultaneously for college and high school credit.

There's a second category, which are credits received by other tests. This is a variety of everything from advanced language credits students have received. Special credit, international baccalaureate, to a variety of other things along the way. You could say you're up to about 9,000 credits in the last year.

And then there are transfer courses. These are all, all these numbers are for our beginners. A beginner is a first-time freshman. They were in high school last year. And you could see that this number, this transfer number, and then the AP test number are growing and continuing to grow pretty substantially.

The transfer population there, these are not transfer students, but they are taking dual credit, but through another provider in the state. And if you can't see what the trend is, let me just draw a little bit of trend line on here.

You might have noticed that these numbers are going up.

They have been going up. And also I circled a couple of, for any quants in the room, there's a big spike in the last year. But it's just one data point, so it's not yet a trend. It's just what it is. We'll see what happens this fall as we start taking a look at our incoming data.

Yes, I'll take a question. Jay?

DUNCAN: Sorry, just to clarify. These look like absolute numbers. So can you give us an idea if they are increasing more rapidly than the student population is increasing?

GROTH: Yeah, I've got a chart that will show-

DUNCAN: Excellent.

GROTH: We'll show that.

DUNCAN: Thank you.

GROTH: So this is just, these are absolute numbers of credits. So basically you can divide them by three. That's the number of classes that students are carrying in, typically all general education courses or courses that could count for general education. Alex?

TANFORD: How many of these categories are limited to students who got the credit somewhere else within the State of Indiana?

Versus like the AP test you can be from Illinois presumably or-

GROTH: You could be from anywhere in the world for the AP test.

TANFORD: Okay. What about ACP and these great transfer courses?

GROTH: Some of each of those bars, the transfer course and the ACP course are from other states as well.

But the majority of these bars are for Indiana residents. In this case a lot on the AP test is for non-residents. I'd say. I don't have those exact numbers, I can report on them if you would like, okay. A little bit of a global number, what has happened with general education over time?

Jay, this is getting a little bit at. You can see, we have grown our student population since 2008. Why I went back so far, 2011 and 12 is when the common general educational program that we have in place now, went into effect. And so you can see what has happened over time, the different bars.

The height of the total bars, the total number of credits. That our entire undergraduate student population earns in any given year. You can see the light blue number. Those are students enrolled on our campus in courses that can count for general education. The gray bar are enrolled on our campus in courses that do not count for general education.

The fact that one is larger than the other should not be surprising, students study in majors and they often have minors and other majors. So they're never going to take the majority of their credits proportionally in general education. But it's still a large proportion. As you can see here, about a third or so.

The orange bar are transferred general education courses and then the yellow bar are transferred other courses. Any time we transfer something in and I've said this before, it's important to know that a course transfer is because a faculty member on the Blumenthal campus at some time Perhaps, this year or a recent year, but in some cases maybe quite a while ago, made a decision to look at the particular course.

And in their judgement, decided that this course was equivalent to our course and that's why they got credit for it. There are a whole range of state regulations that mandate, for example, that we give credit for AP scores of three or greater. But the state law does not mandate what they get credit for by doing that.

So you'll see if you start breaking it out that there's a range of undistributed credit. But we had a long record of giving credit for AP scores before that regulation went into effect. You can see that in general education, if you look at just the blue and the orange together, there is a bit of a spike in 13-14.

There was also a spike 11 and 12, if I unfold this within just the College alone. The College had a substantial increase in general education credits in that period of time. But you could see that that's starting to go down. We're about in total number of credits consumed by students on our campus about where we were in 2008 and 9, and we obviously, have a larger student population than that.

So proportionally students are taking less general education on our campus, but it's still a very large number of enrollments, obviously.

What percent?

ROBEL: Dennis, there's just a quick question, if you could go back. The transfer general education credit, is that credit that includes both pre-college credit and credit that students take once they're on the campus from other providers?

GROTH: Yes, yep.

ROBEL: Okay, and will you break those?

GROTH: I will break that out a little bit.

ROBEL: Thank you.

GROTH: Yeah.

HENSHEL: You're going to be breaking it out now?

GROTH: I have just one more number slide, I think.

HENSHEL: It would be nice to know what this would be if it were corrected to the number of students.

GROTH: You need to—

HENSHEL: Sorry, it would be nice to know what this would be if we corrected to number of students to see whether or not the trend is that the students themselves are taking more outside or whether that trend is actually reducing.

ROBEL: The students are taking more outside.

GROTH: Yeah, the students are taking more outside.

HENSHEL: It'd just be nice to have the-

GROTH: Yeah.

Oh wait, yes?

FLY: Regarding that jump in the advanced placements, did the SAT or ACT scores rise at all this year, on the campus?

ROBEL: The ACT or the SAT score stayed about where it was last year.

GROTH: Yeah, but we have been bringing excellent students to the campus and excellent students in high school are going to have opportunities for both dual credit and advanced placement. And so that's a lot of what happens pre-matriculation is pretty much a done deal. I can't say we're not fully saturated or whether it's going to go up, I don't expect it to go down.

We'll have to just keep watching that particular trend. You can see here these three curves represent what percent of a student is enrolled in general education courses overtime. Back in 2008 and 9, about the same, there was transfer of general education courses, but not that much. You could see there is a slope down on this, and a gap separating between how much the students are taking on our campus versus the total number of general education credits.

And the difference between the blue and the orange is essentially the transfer. Again, that transfer population that's coming through. Now the college is our largest provider of general education

courses at the beginning of this time frame. They were offering somewhere around 81% of courses, 81% of enrollments were General Ed courses that counted for general education in the college.

It hovered about there until two years ago, where it went up to 81, 82 then down to 80. And then two years ago it went to 79 and then last year it went to 77 which is that we see that kind of spike happening there in that incoming population.

Which is the sort of the largest best explanation I can provide for that today. You can see that I use this terminology college plus plus. I'm a computer scientist, so this is sort of the College plus, the Media School, the School of Global International Studies, and The School of Art, Architecture, and Design.

When we look at all our numbers, we try and make as many apples to apples comparison. So we look back over time, to see how we can make as many comparable good comparisons we can make over time. So who's enrolling in Gen Ed in the college, in the college various schools.

You could see, this is a breakdown to look at, before general education, and we have this for every school. If you were a professor in the college teaching general education, at 8% of your students came from the business school and about 30% came from the college and a little bit over half were in university division.

Over the last 10 years, of course, university division has shrunk as direct admit populations has grown, and so these dynamics have changed. When it was implemented in fall of 2011, you can see that there were some very slight changes to these percentages. But we had a larger university division population there and that's why that explains that.

But you could see now, if you're in the college, that it's 11.5% of your students taking that are in business. But this is representative of the shifts of students majoring in the college and the college areas other than parts of campus. But they're still taking classes in the college.

One of the trends that we're really looking at now, and trying to unpack is the trend of growing number of students doing post matriculation transfer. So these are students that, this is not AP transfer or dual credit transfer. This is a student on our campus. They're already taking classes here.

They might be taking classes in the summer. Going back home or they might be taking classes here in the community, say at Ivy Tech, or Vincennes. Might be taking an online class somewhere. We're trying to break that all out, but we're up to about 46% of graduates. These are graduates, so these are students that have graduated in each of these years, have at least one course transferred post matriculation.

So we're trying to better understand this trend, so we're going to actually talk to students directly to understand why in their words are they doing this. Is it availability of courses? That it's online, does it better meet their schedule or learning style or what is it? Yes, Colin?

JOHNSON: Sorry, does transferred in from study abroad factor into this?

GROTH: This would be part of that, I can break that out, yeah.

JOHNSON: Because I think that's a growing effector of transfer credit, Maybe not as much Gen Ed credit though, because, well, maybe, we'll see.

GROTH: Yeah.

JOHNSON: We'll see.

GROTH: Good question. As I said, once we start looking at data, we share something, and then somebody asks a question.

And then we go unpack that, and we learn something new, it's very interesting. Yeah, Barb.

CHERRY: At the BFC retreat, we were talking about the issue about Ivy tech transfers. How much of this is due to transfers from Ivy Tech?

GROTH: A substantial amount.

CHERRY: Substantial.

GROWTH: Yeah, and that shouldn't be surprising that they're here.

CHERRY: Okay, one suggestion, I talked to one of my colleagues in the media school. Matt Pierce, who is a senior lecturer and also a state representative, representing a good portion of Bloomington in the Indiana legislature. And I talked to him a little bit about what we were discussing, about Ivy Tech and this post matriculation transfer credit.

And he was very much in support of talking to students directly as you're talking about. And he raised something else that I was less familiar with. But I didn't know to what extent it's being factored in here. He explained to me that there were significant legislation passed in the last decade.

And maybe you guys know more about this but I knew less, about ways in which credits were being required to be transferred among IV tech and IU. And he shared with me his understanding of the original reason for it, but there may be unintended consequences now. And so part of the research that might go into how we address this is, in addition to talking to students themselves.

Also looking at the original reasons for why the legislature got involved and required. He indicated to me his recollection was he was tied more to enabling students who had maybe getting associate's degrees at Ivy Tech. And then coming over to IU and not having to start all over again.

And that's a totally different purpose than a course here or there as we're seeing. So he just suggested we look more into that and that's where he recommended Jeff Linder, I believe it is.

GROTH: Yeah.

CHERRY: State Government Relations. So I'm just offering, like what you said, go back and talk to your people.

GROTH: Yeah, yeah.

CHERRY: So just saying, he was emphasizing that the government relations piece and going back to the original reasons. Because that could be important for figuring out what we can or cannot do about it as well. So I just wanted to share that, thank you.

GROTH: Sure, this is why we're really in investigation mode here, we're not in an action mode because we want to really understand what's going on.

In my head I was saying, okay, there's five pieces of legislation that actually apply here. One of them I already referred to, that was the advanced placement. The legislation having to do with mandating credit for advanced placement test scores of 3 or greater, and so we've already talked.

CHERRY: And Matt was just sharing some specific legislation, very targeted specifically-

GROTH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I'm just saying there's five, there's one, there's a second one that has to do with mandating transfer of credit for DOD and veterans under a set of legislation. And that was linked to CLEP examinations and Dantes, there's a range of things going on there.

We of course support our veterans and DOD personnel coming and attaining a degree. The third is the establishment of the core transfer library. The core transfer library is a communication mechanism that describes how class is taken at public. And also, now, independent colleges in the State of Indiana transfer throughout the state.

So that particular legislation is sometimes confused that it mandated that we accept transfer courses. What it did was it mandated that we communicate in a standard way however course transfers. That has grown to some other things inside of there that if it is in the core transfer library, then you have to give credit for it.

But what we give credit for is determined by faculty on our campus. And those courses go through a currency review cycle to check them on a periodic basis whether they continue to meet our standards. There's the Transfer Single Articulation Pathway legislation that mandated the establishment of standard 2 + 2 articulation agreements between.

The associate's degree granting institution, which is in the Indiana Ivy Tech and Vincennes, and all of the public institutions. For that, all of our faculty have worked very hard over a number of years, Bloomington now has 16 students that are doing that. So I'm going to say, those are important pathways for students, that particular one is not a material, in this particular number.

Sixteen students, eight are in social work, eight are in the school of education, one is a pre-business student and one is in the school of informatics. And then there is the Statewide Transfer Gen Ed Core legislation that established that we had to have this package of general education competencies.

That would transfer, that if students finished them at their first institution, then their receiving institution would document that. We're bringing about 30 beginners each year that have that and 30 inter-campus transfer students that have that and a little bit more transfer students. If you look at those numbers, you have about 100 students in play there and you have about 3,400 students here, so there a variety of things going on.

CHERRY: May I offer one additional piece before I forget that Matt shared with me. He said he thought possibly to the impact of the recent legislation requiring that students finish their degrees in four years. And the effect on the funding is such that some students, because they'll lose their funding in the fifth year, it may be inducing them to take more credits.

To finish up, to graduate in time, and that could feedback to why maybe students of certain income levels can better afford that strategy than others.

GROTH: Yeah.

CHERRY: So just another thing to add.

GROTH: Yeah.

ROBEL: That's the 21st century program. And those students are among the neediest students on the campus.

So it would be surprising to me but it's worth looking at.

CHERRY: So he was just offering, I just want to share to the group things that he said we should make sure we look at.

GROTH: Thank you. We are.

ROBEL: Thanks for asking!

GROTH: We're definitely looking at things like, the majority of these students are students that graduate with GPAs above 3.

So it speaks a little bit, perhaps, to the higher achieving students are going about this. But as we unpack it, I just share this so you see this as something that we're looking at and then working with the academic units on. Onto assessment, you don't need all of these slides, Elizabeth, you can post this for the Gen Ed so they can have it.

But they're all generally available on the Gen Ed website and also, the Gen Ed bulletin. So there are learning outcomes for each area, the English composition area has seven learning outcomes. And then this is the data that shows that we reported, in our comprehensive evaluation from the Higher Learning Commission, on what our faculty were assessing.

They're assessing, in this case, the English faculty had determined that one in two are buried in everything else. So they're not breaking those out, but they are reporting on these. And so what we ask the faculty when they report A variety of things. One is a copy of the syllabus, then what learning outcomes, which general education learning outcomes does their course cover, and then what are they assessing.

We ask them to assess at least one learning outcome per year, and then we ask them just to report how many exceed, how many meet, and how many do not meet their expectations. Nobody but the faculty member is setting that particular bar. So, I'll go quickly through this, but just to show, as we look at math modeling.

Math modeling, they cover one and two. Number three, they've determined it's all tied into just completing math and they don't assess for it separate for anything else. The natural and mathematical sciences, we have five learning outcomes. And you can see that somebody's touching on all of these learning outcomes. The Arts and Humanities has a much longer list, seven learning outcomes again.

At least one course is touching all of these, every outcome is being touched by some course out there, and social and historical studies similarly. And then world languages and cultures because it encompasses a set of learning outcomes that are about the world cultures courses, that are distinct from the world learning objectives again.

So the high level take away from this is not about are we doing enough assessment, because we have faculty that are teaching general education courses. I don't know their names, but they're probably in this room who have not submitted assessment for the last year yet. It's wide open, you can still go to the learning outcomes repository and provide your assessment data.

But we don't have any obvious gaps, and this is something we present back to the General Education Committee, and the General Education Monitoring Subcommittee, on what's going on. So that we can look to see, are there any problems? If you would see, we have a learning outcome that nobody is evaluating, does that mean that it was a great idea but nobody's actually decided to look at it?

Or does it mean maybe it wasn't as great of an idea as we thought. So that's what the value of this high level view is. A little bit about the General Education Committee, its membership is 66 voting faculty, proportional to the distribution by campus unit. So it has more faculty than the Bloomington Faculty Council.

I always like to point that out, it's a great committee. It considers proposals for courses, and it handles those two subcommittees that are chaired by faculty members. And the members of the General Education Committee are nominated by their academic units and then appointed by the Provost. We do that typically in October or November, so we're getting ready to pull together that particular group.

So if you're wondering how you get picked to be that from your school or college, talk to your Chair, who then talks to your Dean. And we work through that chain to get the list of nominees, I don't know how they choose those.

Last year, there were 62 new courses proposed for inclusion in the general education curriculum. 48 were approved, and 14 were not approved. We also continued currency reviews for math modeling courses, and for all variable title courses that were originally approved with blanket approval. You know when you have a variable title course there, they're approved assuming that every single offering is meeting the general education and learning outcomes.

And so because that commitment was made up front, we're going back and checking those now. There were two subcommittees that raised concerns about these. One was a natural and mathematical science course, that they were concerned that they weren't meeting the learning outcomes.

And then a world language and culture course. There was some concern and, in fact suggestions, that the course, had it been proposed as a standalone course, would not have been accepted as a general education course. So we're follow up on those. These are the subcommittees from last year, I think. The subcommittee chair, as you can see, there's one for each of the areas.

And we did take a couple of other actions, one was we refined course eligibility rule number five. You're probably dying to know what are these rules, how many are there, I'll talk a little bit about those. But had I presented last year, I would've reported that we refined course eligibility rule number five last year as well.

So it used to say, the breadth of inquiry courses must be offered at least once every two years. Last year, actually two years ago. Two years ago because of requests from academic units and perhaps small programs that weren't able to offer their courses on that two year frequency, the request was made to change it to four.

That was discussed and voted on. And then this past year we realized that, wait a second, we left out the world culture courses from that. So we wanted to roll them in here, and the Gen Ed Committee approved that courses must be offered at least once every four years.

We also provided a tool to the program, so they could see what courses were perhaps at risk of falling out of compliance moving into the future. So that they could decide to either remove them or offer them. If the course doesn't get offered, then of course a student can't take it, but there are lots of courses that students are taking.

So this was a bit of important and necessary bookkeeping. We also did some codification of assessment for the double counting courses. Where you can count for a world culture course simultaneously with either arts and humanity, or social and historical studies, or natural mathematical sciences. And we codified that if this is one of these double counted courses, then when you do assessment, you have to assess for both areas that you're counting in.

So it's just kind of a basic thing.

Okay, onto what we did with the diversity in the US. When we last left us off in spring of 2017, the charge was to carry forward and create a subcommittee to actually define what we meant by diversity in the US.

So the subcommittee was formed and you can see the members here. They were brought together, and their charge was to define learning outcomes and propose them so that we could evaluate them.

Make this available please, so that people can read it.

You could see that these are the learning outcomes that they've proposed, both in the area of knowledge, analysis, and interpretive skills, and then intra and interpersonal skills.

I think the our colleagues did a very thoughtful job and worked closely with the students to come to a set of measurable, assessable outcomes that then programs can take a look at to see, are we actually doing that in our program? They made some further recommendations. That if its courses are proposed to meet a requirement, then they must go through an approval process similar to the Common Ground courses.

And that makes sense because it will be a set of learning outcomes, and then a syllabus that describes how they're going to achieve that. And then faculty who are more expert in the area to make those judgments as we have in the other areas would review that and make a recommendation.

They also recommend that, if it is courses, that they must meet at least two learning outcomes from each category. So you have to have some breadth there. Celine was on it, so I won't ask you to say anything, but if you want to you can. And then the third was they recommended to seek approval from the Gen-Ed committee, then the BFC, then to the academic units for comment.

This came at the very end of the year and of course, we didn't bring it to the BFC. What I have done is I've provided it to the academic units for comment to do their initial gap analysis to see, okay, here's what the faculty are saying. Remember from our previous reports on this that we did along with Simon Brassell from Education Policy Committee, that most every school is doing something in this area.

Now we have a yardstick that they can measure against to see what they're doing. They're to report back in a meeting with me on September 20th. We've put on to the agenda for September 28th at the EPC to discuss what we'd learn from that. And then from there, we'll start moving towards implementation.

But I don't know what that implementation will quite look like yet until we get that feedback and let the process continue. I want to acknowledge my co-chair, Jonathan Michelson, all the chairs of the Gen Ed common ground subcommittees, Kathy Smith, Chris Connell, Julie Van Vorhees, Peter Todd, Margaret Gray and Nathan Endsmaier.

Many of these colleagues have been co-chairs and chairs of these subcommittees for many years, so I thank them really deeply not only their work, but their continued work with this and the years of experience they bring. All the members of the IUB General Education Committee, the chair, Michael from OVPUE who helps oversee and directs the activities of the general education committee.

Marie Crow from OVPUE, Clinton McKay who developed some of the software to support all these activities. Bloomington Assessment and Research for the data, and all the faculty that have provided assessment information, served on review panels for the CTL and TCEP panels, supported undergraduate education at IUB. I thank you very much, I've answered questions along the way.

I might have gone long, but here I am.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENT ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT

ROBEL: Okay, there are a few questions, Diane?

HENSHEL: Okay, I need to go back to the transfer question. And that is, what is happening and how is Purdue Global going to be assessed or evaluated in terms of these automatic transfers? What have the legislators done, what have they done so far? So what's happening with Purdue Global now that it's officially sort of a state university?

GROTH: The Indiana Commission on Higher Education has signaled that we are to treat Purdue Global as a State of Indiana public institution. Their courses will be considered over the next two years in different batches.

And will be reviewed by our faculty here to determine whether and to what extent they match courses at IU Bloomington. Those faculty then will report that back through the process that we have been doing anyways, with all of these core transfer library courses. So that's what's going on with Purdue Global today.

ROBEL: Okay, Jim?

SHERMAN: Thank you Dennis. Could you please check my understanding and my memory of things that I think I learned at the retreat? Number one, and this is in response to I think a comment that was made about students wanting to finish quickly, so they need to take more courses.

As I heard or understood it, there are possibly many undergraduates already enrolled who are paying for 18 hours but not taking 18 hours. And then, paying at somewhere like Ivy Tech or another institution to have those credits, so that's number one. Number two, if there is a requirement, let's say in the Psychological and Brain Sciences, for someone to have Psychology 101, that they may be enrolled already at IU but take a course at Ivy Tech in Psychology. And the credits can transfer but the Psychology Department does not have to accept that as part of getting a major in psychology.

GROTH: Okay, so the first one was, I think asked me to confirm whether there are students that are taking classes simultaneous during the semester, co-enrolled in the fall or spring semester?

While here, our students as a whole enroll in about 14.9 credits per semester on average. So that would tell me that every student on average has space for another three credit course that they

could take here. That doesn't mean they should or will, but I'm saying, are there students that are taking it simultaneous while there at here, the answer is yes.

There are some that do that, perhaps a large number.

SHERMAN: Sorry, a related question I guess is, I think I heard that if students were to take, let's say a Math 117 or a Psychology 101 equivalent at Ivy Tech but failed, that it wouldn't be reported somehow. It wouldn't be on their transcript.

GROTH: It would be on their transcript from Ivy Tech. And if they tried to transfer it here, we would not accept it for a transfer credit and so would not have shown up. But it would be in the bowels of the student record that they took that particular course.

But those courses do not show up on the Bloomington transcript.

ROBEL: And then there was a second part to your question, Jim, that was basically, I think, a student takes psychology, let's say the entry level psychology course. Does Psychological and Brain Sciences have to recognize it as General education or as counting towards their major?

SHERMAN: Counting toward their major.

GROTH: Well, there's where you would have to adjust your curriculum, probably. Each of these cases will have to be looked at. There's probably a certain number of patterns if a program wanted to try and do something. The data that I showed earlier, those are for graduating students.

So the fact that they did that was not any barrier to their success. You may be asking, are there students that were not successful that did that? The answer to that is sure. About 77% of our students graduate. So the majority of students are going to be successful that come to Bloomington.

About 9% leave in the first year and so they're probably not really in this population at all. So there's another 10% or so that's hit there that are potential for this population. Can you mandate that they take the class again? You could, but there's probably a different way of architecting that inside your degree.

The Psychology 101 course could be something that goes through currency review, and if it's determined that, across the state, that students are not, that that course is called the same number everywhere, but it's not the same course then that's what you should say. And then we'll deal with it from there but it should be based on that intellectual position that this is not the same course.

In the past, the faculty have looked at it and said, this is the same course, or enough of the same course, to say that it is.

ROBEL: Other questions? Susan?

SEIZER: Is it on, okay, thank you. Now, I'm not sure if this is the right forum for this question, but you present a lot of information about the General Ed in general, and you talked about how unwieldy a committee it was.

I'm partic-

GROTH: No, no. It's a great committee, I never said it was unwieldy.

SEIZER: Well, you said it was large.

GROTH: Yeah, but that doesn't-

SEIZER: Larger than, okay.

GROTH: That's a great committee.

SEIZER: I just inferred the unwieldy, okay.

GROTH: Yeah, nope.

SEIZER: It's a great committee.

So. You also gave some numbers that for the World Arts and Cultures, there were 66, I think you said proposed, 42 accepted, and 14 rejected?

GROTH: There were a total of, the total number of classes, it wasn't just World Language and Cultures courses. There were 62 courses proposed for general education, across all the areas.

SEIZER: Oh, okay.

GROTH: 48 were approved, 14 were not approved and I don't have the numbers from the previous year but this is about the same that we see every year.

SEIZER: I see. So it's not particular to the world languages and cultures.

GROTH: No, no and I could get that breakout if you'd like.

SEIZER: Yeah.

GROTH: And usually, it's why is a course not accepted?

SEIZER: Right.

GROTH: Typically, it's because the faculty experts in that area, and those are the people who make that recommendation, that they've determined that this course does not meet the learning outcomes-

SEIZER: Right.

GROTH: For that area.

SEIZER: So that's what I wanted to ask you about is like, do those learning outcomes that define the decisions that get made about what courses are rejected, and which are accepted, do those change every year with the makeup of the committee?

GROTH: No, the learning outcomes themselves have not changed.

So those were set earlier. They could change, or somebody could make a proposal that says we would like to propose changing that. And I guess maybe the data on the coverage could inform that kind of dialogue, to say, well, we're not seeing enough in this particular area, so it might create a conversation about that.

But the faculty have looked at these particular courses, and defined the learning outcomes in a way to be broadly indicative of what these areas are intended to cover. But the faculty aren't required to take those learning outcomes verbatim and put them into their course.

SEIZER: Right-

GROTH: The faculty have their outcome and the faculty, this outcome that I have for my course achieves this learning outcome in the general education.

SEIZER: Right, I'll tell you where I'm coming from briefly about this. Many of the courses that were denied world arts and cultures credit were anthropology courses, which teach about world arts and cultures. And they were denied for one specific reason, and that was that they taught methodology. And so I was wondering whether there was a way we could talk with the Gen Ed committee people about why methodology doesn't count as a Gen Ed requirement.

GROTH: I'd have to go back and talk to the Chair about that and we can get the explanation for those. And that was the only answer.

I don't have those with me. But it wouldn't be that because you have methodology, you can't be in general education.

It would be you're not covering these other outcomes. So your question might be, can we make methodology be one of the learning outcomes that what the subcommittees look at is not, are you covering one, they're looking for covering multiples.

SEIZER: Right.

GROTH: In there.

SEIZER: I mean yeah.

So I guess I'm wondering who one would talk to about changing those. Because these courses that, as a group were rejected do teach many, have many different outcomes and do teach a lot. One of the things they teach is our methods.

GROTH: I'll go back to the sub-committee chairs and then we'll see what the process here could be.

SEIZER: Great, thank you.

JOHNSON: Dennis, one of the things, you know how I feel about our general education curriculum. And one of the compromises that we made when this was adopted, when we adopted the distribution system, was that we sort of were trusting the fact that students with good advising would adopt the spirit of general education.

And actually act on the impulse to kind of distribute sort of their interest and opportunities broadly and sort of take full advantage of all the resources of a world-class research university, in terms of cultivating a set of skills that were sort of transferable. And we also adopted an assessment regime that actually does all of its work at the level of the individual course.

Which is to say we can assess the effectiveness of general education by looking at whether certain learning objectives are met in the context of a particular course. But, to my knowledge, there's actually no mechanism to sort of assess whether or not, holistically, our general education program is speaking to those broader sort of principles of general education.

And so, that's at least my impression of it, right? Which is, we know, cynically, perhaps, but indulge me. And so my question for you is, sort of anecdotally, at that larger level, You know what we hoped would happen with Gen Ed in its current form in terms of the kind of intellectual culture that it would cultivate amongst the undergraduate population at Indiana University.

Almost ten years in, I'm wondering if you, and I don't want to put you on the spot, but if you could speak to what you think our current system is doing well, and where you think, based on having watched this history unfold, and been present at the discussions at its inception, where you think it's falling short of our aspirations as they were sort of articulated optimistically almost ten years ago.

And subsequently what we should be doing or thinking about in order to sort of enrich or improve it to bring it closer to meeting those actual goals, right.

ROBEL: It is great, great question.

GROTH: Right, yeah, Colin, thank you very much. I know exactly how you feel. But you and I share a lot of the same feelings about this.

I think I view this as faculty are approaching it, often from the standpoint of, here's a course that I can offer general education. It's a great topic, and also maybe I can get students to enroll, and then credit hours will flow. I think that could be part of why faculty and departments do this.

You could see we largely have a fixed number of general education enrollments going on. So if somebody is growing, then somebody else is shrinking. And students are approach the distribution model as I think nobody would be surprised, you would approach a distribution model, which is as a check box kind of thing.

I have to do one of these, I have to get this done. How do I get this done? And as much as we would like to think that students are really thinking deeply about the kinds of courses that they're going to take, and I would love to hear from Alex more on this because I think students can share a lot of insight into this, I think one of the first things they look at is does it meet my schedule? But that's a necessary thing. But there are probably dozens of courses that I can meet the schedule. And how do they choose the one that fits there, and I think there's something worth looking at, in terms of intellectually, are we accomplishing what we want?

It could be that we accomplished what we could, ten years ago. Now here we are. Are we accomplishing what we could for our next hundred years, and something that would really be distinctive about the IUB experience? And I think at the heart of it is a question that the faculty should ask and answer, which is, what does it mean to get a degree at Indiana University Bloomington?

Is it the general education? And I think, well, that's part of it. I think students come here. They don't come here and say wow, I came here because of the awesome general education. I think they know they have to do that. And I think we do have very good courses and excellent faculty that are teaching these courses in the general education, that deeply care about what they're teaching and about what the students are learning.

But they're really, students, by and large, are coming for the disciplinary knowledge they're going to get in their major and in their primary academic program. When students say they graduated, they say they graduated from Anthropology or from the Kelly School or the School of Informatics and Computing Engineering. So that's where their main identity is.

And so, how do we get at, as a faculty, this important breadth component, which we're expected to do? Society and the accreditation standards basically do say, you have a general education, but they don't say what you do. So I think there are different models, and I am presenting a list of potential speakers to come to campus this year who are doing, maybe not different General Educations, but different things within their General Education that we can look at and maybe learn and get some good ideas.

Because I think maybe we have an opportunity to, because, while it's declining, it's not like it's a cliff. It's not like it's gone to zero. There's still a lot of teaching and learning going on in that area. But it's a time to be reflective about that and to think about it, in a measured way to really go through that.

I'm going to call upon Alex, to see whether he has any other comments about, from a student perspective on the general education, or whether I'm way off.

ROBEL: No pressure.

GROTH: You can tell me I'm nuts, but.

WISNIEWSKI: So yeah, I think you hit it spot on with availability first.

That's usually the first thing, because I think if it was up to me, I wouldn't wake up at 8 AM to take a course that I could take at noon the next day. And I think the scope of the courses are, yes, they're looked at in twofold with availability being the first one, and then the course itself being second.

Lot of students do have intentions of taking courses that are semi-interesting to them. They don't just sign up randomly, no matter how much you think we are interested in your course or not. There is a reason, right? So I think it's a little bit of a twofold approach there, availability as well as interest.

BENDER: Yeah, so Dennis, this 14 proposals not being approved out of 62? So that seems like a pretty high failure rate. And I'm wondering whether any sort of guidance could be given to faculty members who were thinking about submitting proposals. Some sort of rubric, maybe, that you could give instructors for each of these requirements.

I think the hope would be that every proposal is really good and will have a really good chance of being accepted. So I'm just wondering what you think about that.

GROTH: Yeah, there's one view that you could say this is about what, 75% acceptance rate and that's roughly.

But in the global perspective for these areas, there are hundreds of courses in each of these areas. So adding another course to the offering doesn't necessarily create more opportunities for the student. Something else either goes away, or you have competing offerings at the same time or something like that.

We do provide feedback on the courses from the review, and the form used to submit does provide the instructions, not only on what you have to provide, but also why. I mean, which learning outcomes are you proposing that you cover here and demonstrate that you are. So we can provide more information if that's necessary.

WISNIEWSKI: Have any students provided input on the diversity learning requirements that the general education committee created?

CARTER: I'll speak to that. The students were present during the construction of the learning outcomes and they were as was mentioned. They were very instrumental in stating what they felt was essential and necessary and they really drove the conversation and drove the process.

But I'm not sure about the review of the feedback.

GROTH: Well, Tom Sweeney and Erica Wesley were members of this community. I actually think there were two additional students that tended to attend as well.

CARTER: At every meeting that I attended, there were at least two students present and very empowered to actively participate.

GROTH: Yeah, I think we did a very good job of including the students' perspective and voice and listening to it, not just providing them an opportunity to say something but actively engage. And I know that Tom came to me afterwards and I can pull up his email about how thankful he was and how he really felt that it was a group that had authentically listened to the students' perspective on this.

CARTER: There were also really nice dovetailing from the students in terms of what's happening in the residence halls or what's happening in the sororities and the fraternities. So it was a really good education for the faculty to understand how some of these items are addressed or not addressed in other settings besides courses.

GROTH: Thank you Celine.

WISNIEWSKI: Yeah, thank you it's something that students are really passionate about providing input on, so I'm really glad that on the list I didn't see IUSA on the bottom there. I apologize about that, otherwise I could have answered my own question, so thank you.

ROBEL: It's tiny. Better?

KENNEY: I'm interested in the recommendation from that subcommittee that courses address at least two from each of the three areas of learning outcomes, is that right?

GROTH: That's what they recommend.

KENNY: Right.

That strikes me as rather unusual. That means that anybody offering a course in that area has to have learning outcomes that will map onto six Jenna had recommended outcomes.

Are any of the other areas recommending anything like that?

GROTH: Well the English composition one. Basically you have to cover them all, which is like seven, they only assessed five of the seven, so in terms of scale, it's like that.

It might be pointing out that this is going to be challenging to do and, I'd say, well, it's a complicated area and it probably will be challenging and it's probably going to be worthwhile that we go through that challenge.

I tried to phrase it as if, it is a course. I've also been in various meetings and, I'm happy to say, if we as a faculty think that we could offer a course and say, students go take that course on these important topics, I don't know, pick one out of each area, I think it could be challenging even to do one.

But I think we have to look at it more broadly, maybe it can't be done in one course. Maybe it's a combination of coursework and work across the curriculum because we have some programs that have it embedded throughout their curriculum. In their accreditation standard, social work for example has that, as does nursing, you'll see that.

So if we said everybody has to take a course, they would come and say we need an exception for that because we already cover it here and we would say, yes, we agree that adding another course on top of that because we have that 120 credit Legislation as well, so there's all these constraints. Or is it a combination of course work, residential learning that occurs and is assessed and measured, a little bit of all of these things going on.

That's why I think the implementation side of this, it's good, but, at least for once, we have an articulation of what we mean. Before it was that single sentence that said, students will learn about diversity in all of it these various dimensions.

KENNEY: Yeah, and I recall that's sort of the problem, that students model into these courses and they feel a mandate to do some stuff that faculty care about. And so having clear outcomes is liable to make students feel more of a connection and have a better understanding what the course is all about.

What I'm wondering is whether this might end up, then, being a model for more of Gen Ed. Where, rather than simply choosing a few of the outcomes, faculty might be expected, if they're going to teach Gen Ed courses, to have a larger number of the outcomes covered.

GROTH: I guess it's possible. I think, for me, the story this indicates is, from where you start, you say everybody should do a diversity course, to here, where now, we're getting closer and closer to implementation. Now you realize, faculty in your schools and in the college are going to have to look, how can we do this?

How does it fit? How does it fit within the 120 credits? How does it fit early in the curriculum? What are we going to give up? Do we have to give something up? Maybe they can't give something up because that places other learning at risk, I don't know. And that on top of the renovation of Ballantine Hall.

So let's say that we had a beautifully packaged curriculum here that we're going to do it, then I'm going to say... But I think there's room for creativity here in the implementation, as long as the faculty are engaged in thinking through and don't outsource it. So if they say, yeah, there's going to be courses that you can take, but also there's experiences in the Student Life and Learning area.

But the faculty can still stay connected to that activity in a fundamental way, I think, is important. Because this is about learning, and learning happens all over the undergraduate experience, not just in courses. The only a course 15 hours a week, right? So there's a lot of other hours that learning can occur and does occur.

ROBEL: All right, Fritz?

BREITHAUPT: Well, thank you first of all for that presentation, very helpful, very good, I'm also a big fan of General Education. I think it serves a very, very vital role. Communicating the values of all campus here to all the students by means of these general courses.

So all of, but I wonder still, when we talk about the values of our campus, as there has been systematic effort to compel what we are doing to other campuses in that regard? I mean, when we create a major in some other field that's chemistry or finance or so, we kind of know what the colleagues are doing in the other departments and what the employers want in all of these things.

So we have a direct kind of feedback system built into our courses and our recommended outcomes. But it strikes me that, at least, when I've looked into some of the other universities, it's much more odd. I mean, this is very difficult that people do that.

GROTH: Yeah.

BREITHAUPT: We should look into some other possibilities.

I mean, looking at the paycheck you're displaying right on the first category of knowledge, strikes me as ultimately narrow actually right now. I mean, I should really read this more carefully, I mean I'm not.

GROTH: Mm-hm, yeah please do.

BREITHAUPT: Yes I need to so I can call the trucks.

GROTH: Do we look at other areas? certainly when the general education—

BREITHAUPT: I mean, other universities—

GROTH: Yeah.

BREITHAUPT: —how they have done it.

GROTH: Yeah, we do. There was, for this particular activity of the sub-committee, there was information that I provided from other universities on how they were doing it and I don't have that in front of me and they were encouraged to look elsewhere and explore.

Most everybody has things that are publicly available, and if not it's probably not worth trying to uncover it because there's so many universities where it is publicly available you can get a good sense of what's going on.

In terms of overall general education, our model of general education is comparable to almost everybody else's. There are some variations, there are some maintain a core curriculum, so that would be a very small curriculum that every takes no variation. And then leaving more room in your disciplinary area or in deeper study at some more of a depth. There are others that have little

components to their general education that are, I think unique, and those are the kinds of people I want to bring in.

So, University of Maryland has a kind of a multidisciplinary education component to their general education. It'd be like one of their distribution areas is a multidisciplinary component, and it's entirely driven by the faculty that are coming together to do that. Others have, Virginia Tech, for example, you can look at theirs. They have a classic model. So it's like Coke Classic, that's the distribution model.

But then they also have this new sort of minor or cognate kind of area model that they think students would gravitate towards. So you won't have the breath of all these areas, but you're going to have more depth in one but not as much depth as your major.

And I've talked to the people on this campus about this, an idea that I refer to as the color wheel kind of thing, that if you're majoring in Germanic Studies then you can satisfy general education through perhaps the classic model.

Or you could satisfy it through an alternate disciplinary minor, but it should be something opposite on the area so maybe that would be fine art or something like that. Not that Germanic Studies doesn't consider art—

BREITHAUPT: A very general one, but a brief follow up, is there a specific organization that connects universities to debate this?

I mean, to compare different models of general education, for the disciplines, we know how this works. It's a lot of communication, but is the head organization that kind of access information.

GROTH: Actually there is an organization, there is a network that's called the Reinvention Collaborative. And we're a member and I attend these meetings, so it's basically other institution, research-intensive institutions, discussing not General Education, but undergraduate education.

So when we get together, which we get together twice a year, we don't really talk about the things that scholars typically talk about, our scholarly advances or things like that. We talk about other fundamental things exactly like this, from everything from perhaps General Education to things like how do we get students more engaged in under graduate research or activities like that.

So there are groups that look at that, and of course and we have the Big Ten Network.

It is Big Ten Academic Alliance, sorry.

ROBEL: Thank you. The alliance.

GROTH: Yeah, The Alliance.

ROBEL: Can I take a minute here at the end to recognize our president for something that I think is quite important?

MARSH: Okay, I neglected to do this earlier today, so I want to take a few moments just now. So we just passed that the two proposals that we voted in earlier today on commending the constitution represent the culmination of literally years of work by all kinds of faculty. So I wanted to propose just a vote of thanks to the non-tenure track task force, who were headed by Nick Williams and Jon Trinidad.

I don't have a list of all the members handy, but they were the group who took that years of work and for a full 12 months brought it to fruition, which we saw the conclusion of today. And I think that is just marvelous, so I think that deserves a vote of thanks.

ROBEL: I also wanted to remind everyone the first Thursday of the month is this week. First Thursdays are back up and running. They're over at the Fine Arts Plaza. And right immediately after, what looks like it's going to be a great first Thursday, is the poet laureate of the United States, Tracy K Smith, who is speaking at the Neil Marshall Center at 7:30.

She's phenomenal as a poet and wonderful as a memoirist, and really good company if you want to spend some time with some poetry. So, I suggest you all, if you have the time, find your way over there.

All right, I think we're at the successful conclusion of our agenda today. May I suggest we adjourn in the usual way?

Thank you.