

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**

December 6, 2022 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ashlbrand, Ashley; Bala, Hillol; Bielasiak, Jack; Bridges Jr., Chandler; Brinda, Chelsea; Cohen, Rachael; Cavar, Damir; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Deeds, Anna; Deliyannis, Constantine; DeSawal, Danielle; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Giordano, Anthony; Groth, Dennis; Guerra-Reyes, Lucia; Gupta, Nandini; Herrera, Israel; Housworth, Elizabeth; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Ossi, Massimo; Pavalko, Eliza; Peters, Chuck; Reck, Cathrine; Seibert, Kyle; Sela, Ron; Sheldon, Rebekah; Sherman, Jim; Shrivastav, Rahul; Simpson, Marietta; Sinadinos, Allison; Singh, Kashika; Smith, Wyatt; Svetina, Dubravka; Tanford, Alex; Walton, Christi; Whitworth, Cale; Wyczynski, Stephen

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Arcuri, Toni; Asher, Sofiya; Cole, Shu; Davis, Allen; Eaton, Kristine; Frazier, Lessie; Furey, Constance; Gupta, Nandini; Kalentzidou, Olga; Kollbaum, Pete; Kubow, Patty; Michaelsen, Jonathan; Olcott, Courtney; Pastore, Bell; Perry, Brea; Ramos, William; Raymond, Angie; Sapp, Christopher; Shy, Katie; Siek, Jeremy; Sterling, Thomas; Tracey, Dan; Wu, Jiangmei

**GUESTS:**

**AGENDA:**

1. Approval of the [minutes of November 15, 2022](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for Phillips Cutright](#)
3. [Memorial Resolution for Benito V. Rivera](#)
4. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)  
Cate Reck, Faculty President
5. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)  
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
6. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes) Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Reck by emailing [bffcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bffcoff@indiana.edu). Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
7. Proposed Change to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty (5 minutes)  
Rachael Cohen, Parliamentarian and Chair of Constitution and Rules Committee  
[Action Item]  
[Current BL-ACA-D8 Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty](#)  
[B20-2023: Proposed change to BL-ACA-D8 Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty](#)
8. Questions/Comments on Proposed Change to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty (10 minutes)
9. Task Force on the Future of General Education Report (15 minutes)  
John Arthos, Task Force Co-chair, English

Clark Barwick, Task Force Co-chair, Business

J Duncan, Task Force Co-chair, Informatics

Micol Seigel, Task Force Co-chair, American Studies and History

[B18-2023: Report of the BFC Task Force on the Future of General Education](#)

[B19-2023: Summary of the Report of the BFC Task Force on the Future of General Education](#)

10. Questions/Comments on Task Force on the Future of General Education Report (25 minutes)

11. International Affairs Committee Updates (10 minutes)

Jose Luis Antinao Rojas, Committee Co-chair, Indiana Geological and Water Survey

Israel Herrera, Committee Co-chair, Spanish and Portuguese

12. Questions on International Affairs Committee Updates (10 minutes)

**SHRIVASTAV:** Good afternoon, everyone. Meeting is called to order. Just as a heads up, microphones are still being repaired, I guess, so we will be using these handhelds. I'll try and speak in this one and Cate's got another one to pass around as needed. So hopefully we'll make it work effectively.

#### **AGENDA ITEM ONE:**

**SHRIVASTAV:** We will start as we always do with approval of the minutes for November 15th meeting. All in favor, please raise your hands. All opposed. Motion. Minutes are approved. Thank you very much.

#### **AGENDA ITEM TWO:**

**SHRIVASTAV:** Our first order of business is a memorial resolution for Phillips Cutright. As we always do, this will be read to us by Eliza, if you're ready, Eliza.

**PAVALKO:** Just getting the microphone. Thank you very much. Phillips Cutright received his PhD at the University of Chicago in 1960. Phil moved around a good bit early in his academic career. He was Assistant Professor of Sociology at Washington State University and Dartmouth College before working in two positions with the Social Security Administration, from 62-65. After spending three years at Vanderbilt as an associate professor and another as professor of sociology at Washington University in St. Louis, Phil took a position as Senior Research Associate Joint Center for Urban Studies at MIT and Harvard University, from 69 to 71. In 71, he came to Bloomington as Professor of Sociology and he spent the rest of his career, 23 years, here, before retiring in 1994. Phillips Cutright was internationally renowned for his research in the areas of political sociology, policy studies, development, comparative research methods. But he's best remembered as an outstanding demographer. He was a prolific scholar. He authored two books and co-authored more than 130 peer reviewed journal articles and book chapters. He turned to questions of demography, fertility in the family and social policy while at IU; he worked extensively with area data, counties and states in the United States, and nations in cross-national comparative work. Several cross-national studies involved in valuation of impact of family planning programs on fertility rates in less developed countries. A major study of the US

Family Planning Program was the first evaluation of the US program. Phil was one of the first to present research findings that documented the importance of improved health conditions for teenage pregnancy. Arguing against what he termed the myth of the teenage sex revolution in the 70s, Cutright argued that improved health conditions contribute to increases in the teenage pregnancy rate in two ways: better health and nutrition increase the likelihood that out of wedlock conceptions are carried to term, and they reduced by one year the average age at which girls are able to reproduce. Cutright pointed the importance of access to effective, medically supervised contraception and legal abortion to save many people from traumatic out-of-wedlock, pregnancies, illegitimate births, botched illegal abortions, and disastrous youthful marriages, unquote. His findings and arguments are highly relevant to continuing debates on these issues.

### **AGENDA ITEM THREE:**

**PAVALKO:** Our second resolution is for Benito Rivera. Dr. Benito Rivera, a beloved member of the Jacobs School of Music, passed away in Bloomington on November 2, 2020. A renowned scholar in both music theory and musicology, Rivera opened a window to one of the most critical episodes in the development of Western musical thought, the explicit recognition of the triad of the late 16th and early 17th century. He published numerous articles dealing with music theory from this period. Professor Rivera is perhaps best known for his translations with commentary of a synopsis of new music by Johann Lupius, and especially [inaudible] musical poetics, one of the most important treatises in the history of music theory, in a central part of history of theory curriculum. Virtually every music theorist and student of music theory had their work enriched in some way by Rivera's thorough and careful scholarship. Professor Rivera earned his PhD in musicology from Rutgers in 1974 and subsequently held teaching appointments that Baruch College, the University of Richmond, and the University of North Texas. In 1985, he joined IU's Jacobs School of Music where he remained until his retirement. His signature course at IU was the graduate history of theory seminar in which he was an expert. His work to erase boundaries between music theory and music history, and he had a deep knowledge of five languages and great skill and counterpart. He was equally beloved by undergraduates who characterized him as a patient and stimulating professor. Given his courses regularly enrolled well over 100 sophomores, Professor Rivera's students were also impressed he made a point to know each of them by name. The faculty of the Jacobs School of Music remember Professor Rivera as wonderfully collegial. He avoided open controversy and was committed to quietly working out compromise, always seeking the input of his colleagues. He brought the same attitude to bear in his service to the scholarly communities at large. He served on the Council, the American Musicology Society, was the National Secretary for the Society of Music Theory. While at the University of North Texas, Professor Rivera was instrumental in the founding of *Teoria*, a journal devoted to the history of music theory. As young man, Rivera had initially aspired to career as pianist, but instead join the Jesuit order. And he earned a BA and MA degrees. In 1964, the seminary sent him to Woodstock College in Maryland to further study in theology. There, the American Jesuits allowed them to roll at the nearby Peabody Conservatory, where he would earn bachelor's and master's degrees in piano. He ultimately obtained relief from his Jesuit vows in order to study music full-time. After his retirement, Professor Rivera returned to intensive study of the piano and applied his usual discipline and honing of his technical skills to fully articulate his interpretation of the score. His family and friends regard him as a quiet observer, self-deprecating humorist, a generous friend, and a loving husband, father, and paw-paw. Benito

Rivera was a monumental figure in music theory and musicology, and his passing will be acutely felt by all who are influenced by him and his work. Thank you.

**SHRIVASTAV:** Thank you, Eliza. If you are able, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. I now invite faculty president Cate Reck to give her remarks.

#### **AGENDA ITEM FOUR:**

**RECK:** Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for being here. This is our last BFC meeting of the semester. So that's definitely something to celebrate. Let's start off today with some exciting news. I'd like to introduce our newest member to the faculty council office. Her name is Heather McDonald. Heather, do you want to? Absolutely. Thank you very much for... Heather comes to us from Ivy Tech, where she was director of accelerated programs. She has a very diverse background. She has a BA from Hanover in history. She has a BS from IUPUI in secondary education and social sciences, a master's from Butler in school counseling. And she's currently working on her PhD in higher education administration from Bellarmine? Biller mine. I've never pronounced that. Bellarmine. Bellarmine University. So welcome. We're very pleased to have you here. So she'll be helping the BFC and UFC functions, as well as serving as the point person for a wide range of committees on both councils. I believe some of you probably have been contacted by her and have been communicating with her recently. So please get used to emailing her and getting to welcome her in and be part of this BFC-UFC family.

Secondly, I'd like to turn the floor over to President of IUSG, Kyle, who would like to educate the BFC on the new IUSG student health care fund. Kyle, where are you sitting. I'm going to bring you the mic. You got it? Perfect.

**SEIBERT:** Hello everyone. And I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak you just a little bit today. I want to say thank you to Cate for all your support this year, and then thank you to all of you all who have reached out in the past couple of months and have been so supportive of all of our initiatives, especially our response to SB1 and the issues that a lot of students are facing in that area. So, for those of you that aren't familiar, IUSG this year is provided free emergency contraceptives to Bloomington students. So all the students have to do is go to the Health Center, flash a crimson card, and you get that product and then some also other informational services and things, as well—excuse me—with that. So that program has been very successful, and we've had a lot of feedback from the very beginning, asking how can others support the program. And so, since August, we've been working to create a fund that would allow us, that would allow other people, to help support this program hopefully, long into the future. We've got a big goal of hopefully endowing this fund. So we can not only focus on this specific initiative, but also expanding our areas into student health and well-being, hopefully far into the future. So I have the link for the fund; it's on the, if you've ever donated, on the Foundation website. It's on there. So it's IU student government health fund or something like that. But I'll be happy to share that link around, and we would appreciate any support that you all or anyone that you might know has, especially at the end of the year; end-of-the-year giving is very big. So again, we appreciate all the support, and we look forward to continuing to work with you all. Thank you.

**RECK:** Thank you so much. The bookstore is looking for a BFC advisory committee person. So this group meets once a semester for less than 2 hours. If you are interested, or if you can suggest someone special who has a place in their heart for the bookstore focus, please send any names my way. So they only meet once a semester for about an hour, hour-and-a-half. And as I've said before, we have a hard time at the end of this semester finding people to participate in committees. So hopefully that might be something of interest. So send me an email.

As I mentioned at the last meeting, I'm still looking for members to fill the roster for the Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee, SAAAC, that will start its work in the spring. So again, my plea goes out to you. If you have members that would work with SAAs and have an interest in that background, in that function, please send them my way.

If you've not heard yet, Kim Geeslin has been named Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, effective December 19th. She's professor in Spanish and Portuguese in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs since 2017. So, she joins us today and will continue with us in the spring. So welcome.

Then finally, and sadly, though probably happy for her, this will be Eliza Pavalko's last meeting with us as Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. While you know her most acutely as the voice of the BFC memorial resolutions, we've all benefited from Eliza's expertise in translating major BFC- and UFC-initiated policy changes, in overseeing dramatic changes in policies and practices, always responding with diplomacy and tact. She's fostered the development and implementation of a large range of policies that make IUB the top among its peers in family-friendly practices and always ensuring that these resources are available to all. So during her eight years in the position, she's expanded support for department chairs, mid-career faculty, developing a broad range of support systems such as things like the scholarly writing program, helped shepherd through the creation of the third rank for teaching professors, led efforts to make the processes of tenure and promotion even more transparent, fair, and clearly understood. So I know she's been a strong support system for me personally, and I suspect she's been a strong mentor for many faculty in this room and throughout the university. So I'm going to ask Marietta to read a resolution for Eliza Pavalko.

**SIMPSON:** Thank you, Cate, and I feel particularly honored to read this resolution because Eliza has certainly been a huge support for me during the time that I was president of this body. She was that phone call at the odd hour when I was really ready to pull my hair out. So, and you know, I prize my hair. So I really appreciate all of her support and the role model that she is for so many of us. A resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Whereas Eliza Pavalko, the Allen D. and Polly S. Grimshaw Professor of Sociology, has served as Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs since 2015, and whereas in her time as VPFAA, Eliza developed initiatives to mentor faculty and support them throughout all stages of their careers, including the creation of the Scholarly Writing Program, which has served as a powerful accountability tool for faculty and which plays an important role in retention, and whereas her leadership has strengthened IU Bloomington's partnerships with the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity and the Big Ten Academic Alliance, which provide programming to support mid-career faculty through career and leadership training, and whereas she fostered the development and implementation for a range of policies that make IU Bloomington the top among its peers in

family-friendly practices, and whereas Eliza demonstrates unparalleled expertise in translating critical faculty policy changes into efficient and effective procedure and is engaged in efforts to make the processes of tenure and promotion ever more transparent, fair, and clearly understood, and whereas she has not only served as the voice of BFC memorial resolutions, but played a critical role in the discussions of this body, providing an expert opinion and perspective which we rely on when making decisions, and whereas she models the values of Indiana University and an unwavering commitment to shared governance, responding to tough situations with diplomacy, kindness, compassion, and tact, and whereas she announced that she will return to the Department of Sociology faculty in spring 2023 semester, be it resolved that this body, the Indiana University Bloomington Faculty Council, a body conceived in and dedicated to the ideals of shared governance, collectively expresses its sincerest gratitude for Eliza Pavalko's service to Indiana University Bloomington, and the outstanding model she has set for future holders of the title of Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, given this day, Tuesday, December 6, 2022. Thank you, Eliza.

**RECK:** So go ahead and pull it out.

**DESAWAL:** So we wanted to make sure that you had a little something for your office from the faculty to remember the BFC. So an IU owl, for all the knowledge you bestowed upon us. And a thank you from the BFC.

**RECK:** Thank you, Marietta, for that beautiful reading of the resolution. Beautiful. Alright, I'm going to end my comments with wishing you all a successful end to the semester, and we're all looking forward to winter break, I'm sure. So.

#### **AGENDA ITEM FIVE:**

**SHRIVASTAV:** Thank you, Cate. Thank you, Marietta. I will now proceed with my report. Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back. I hope the final weeks of the semester are feeling manageable and positive despite the cloudy, slightly cold weather outside. But I'm sure you are looking forward to ending the semester on a high note. First of all, a quick update on the IUB 2030. I remain excited about the progress we're making on the IU 2030 plan. I continue to hear great things from Cate and Carrie Daugherty, who are doing just an amazing job of leading this effort. And I greatly appreciate all the effort and the pace at which this work is progressing. As Cate has shared before with this group, we have 25 working groups. They are soon to wrap up their initial meetings and we'll submit their final reports and associated goals in a few weeks' time. The planning committees and the executive committees will then take these reports and began work to synthesize these recommendations, to develop an initial draft to share with the larger group. We will be opening up multiple opportunities to seek additional feedback, including from various academic and administrative units and the community through a number of ways. To that, I hope you already have marked on your calendar our two planned town halls. Once again, I'm reminding them, Cate. February 15th, 3:30 to 5:00 P.M. at the IU Auditorium. and February 16th, from 2:30-4:00 P.M. at the Whittenberger Auditorium. I believe we will have Zoom for both of those. So those of you who can't make it in person should be able to listen in or provide your comments that way. We expect to have a completed plan by March. And that, again, as I've mentioned this before, the idea is to have that wrapped up, or nearly wrapped up, as

we get into our budget discussions which begin March and go all the way into April for the budget development for the next fiscal year. Thank you, again, everybody. I know several of you are participating both formally and informally, and I greatly appreciate your engagement with this process so far.

The second big update is around Faculty 100. We are actively moving forward with the first phase of the Faculty 100 hiring plan. I know there was a question submitted on this regard, but I'll address that here, so I won't have to repeat that later. As you may recall, we had asked for initial proposals. We received about 75 different proposals based on certain priorities. These were reviewed and prioritized by the deans and submitted to us. I have a faculty committee that has reviewed and helped us prioritize those further. The committee members include Justin Garcia, Patty Ingham, Caroline Chick Jarrold, Pete Kollbaum, Hui-Chen Lu, and Kosali Simon. I don't know if any of them are here, but once again, my thanks to all of these people for doing just an unbelievable job. They've done the review with a lot of depth and integrity. I have those recommendations. We will now be reviewing those in our office, trying to match them with funding space, and other issues that we need to address while making faculty hiring decisions. I will be working with both the Office of Research, Fred Cate's team, as well as capital planning and facilities, led by Vice President Tom Morrison to consider viability and needed support, so we can approve these proposals with full backing to make sure these new faculty come in and hit the ground running and are successful at IU. We expect to approve funding and notify those selected for these awards, hopefully before the semester ends. It's just a matter of scheduling all the meetings with all the people, but I'm fairly optimistic we'll have the first rounds approved and the individual units and deans notified before we break for the semester.

The remaining hires, the next phase for Faculty 100, will launch in the spring. The idea there is to align those priorities with whatever strategic priorities emerge through the IUB 2030 strategic planning process. I am again excited for the potential that all these new colleagues will bring to IU and appreciate your strong interest in finding the right people and help build some truly exceptional programs at IU.

Another point I want to highlight today is the Staff Merit Awards. I'm pleased to recognize our outstanding staff. As we approach these annual Staff Merit Award ceremony—it's scheduled for tomorrow—it's important that we acknowledge not only the contributions of all the nominees, but all the dedicated staff that make it possible for us to do research, advanced learning, and all the outreach work that we do throughout our campus. It is always a challenge to read through all the wonderful nominations and the letters and find the winners, because there are truly several well-deserving individuals. And this year is nominations were no different. They reveal the depth of care, the knowledge, and resiliency present amongst our inspiring staff. This year's winners, I can share with you, are Annie Willis from the Students Advocates Office, Allen Hall from the carpentry and lock shop, Timothy Womock from the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center, John Taylor from the sheet metal department, David Sparks from Building Services, and Shirley Richardson from Psychological and Brain Sciences.

Finally, I want to give you a quick update on all our searches since the last time I met with you. First of all, Kim's hiding back there. One last time. Next time, she'll be up on the table. I'm thrilled to have Kim join us as the new Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. Her

appointment as effective December 19th. As Cate just mentioned, she's been here since 1999, has helped shepherd the office in a very productive way for a long time. She has built strong relationships across campus, championed inclusive hiring practices, worked on policies to promote professional growth, and I know she will continue to do amazing things in that role in supporting all our faculty and faculty and leadership development over the years.

Hamilton Lugar: the work continuous. We are nearing a final decision. I met with the search committee again early this morning, and I'm hoping I can announce next steps there in the near future.

For the Kelley School of Business, we expect full recruitment of candidates to launch next week. First round interviews are tentatively targeted for February 2023, so in a couple of months and I'm hoping we can have a finalists identified and hired around spring break or so, give or take a few weeks.

The School of Media: we are launching the recruitment stage for the dean of the Media School. The airport interviews—I say that in air quotes, because they are really Zoom calls these days—they are targeted for the month of March 2023.

And pretty soon, we're hoping to launch a search for a new dean for Optometry, hopefully before the end of the semester. More information on this. I'm hoping to send it out over email. If not, I will share with this group at our next meeting early in the spring.

Finally, you may know, we have officially launched the search for the vice president for research. As you may recall, Vice President Fred Cate will be returning to the faculty. You may or may not know that search is co-chaired by myself and Robin Newhouse from IUPUI. There is a small group of faculty, some staff, that form the search committee. It is a mix of people from IU Bloomington, IUPUI, and School of Medicine. We are using a national firm, Storbeck and Associates. They are one of the top firms out there. And our hope is to have the long list interviews, the first-round interviews again late March or so, and have some finalists on campus for their visit before the end of the semester. This search is fairly early in its process. The position description is still being finalized. So the timeline is still tentative as best and it is open to some change, but our hope is to get somebody identified and on-the-ground as quickly as possible.

I want to close with just saying thank you for a great year. This is the end of my first calendar year. I'm not quite 12 months into the role yet, but it has been an honor and privilege to work with all of you in making sure we keep moving forward as a university. And I am excited about what the next semester will bring. I hope the upcoming winter break and include some rest, some fun, and honestly some time you can dedicate to yourself, your families, and things that are near and dear to you all. Thank you very much. And one last thing before I hand it over to the next item, for those of you who watch the World Cup football, the other kind, Portugal just went up to zero. So it's almost half time there.

**AGENDA ITEM SIX:**



I will now open it up for some questions if you have any from this group. Yes, Israel.

**HERRERA:** Just, just having one thing. Portugal is winning. But IU is in the college cup for the NCAA championship so we can for the ninth time. So this is the time.

**AGENDA ITEM SEVEN:**

**SHRIVASTAV:** Thank you. We will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a proposed change to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty. Rachel.

**COHEN:** Thank you. So, we had first reading last meeting, which I was not here for. I have read the transcript of that meeting. I think CARC has integrated all of the changes requested. So, as a reminder, this is an amendment to the Constitution. So, while we are voting to send this to the whole faculty here today, if we do any wordsmithing here, it means it goes back to committee, and then it won't get back on the agenda until March. Just warning you all. I'm not discouraging anything. Just want you to know how this works. So, basically we're just redescribing the composition of the delegation of GPSG. For anybody who doesn't know this, the wording came from—mostly came back from the wording we had in our previous Constitution. If that gives you any idea when GPSG had four members instead of three, they've lost a member with the NTT increase. So currently it says three graduate students selected in accordance with the procedures of the Graduate and Professional Student Government. We wish to change it to three graduate students selected and in accordance with the procedures of the Graduate and Professional Student Government, of whom two shall be the president and vice president of the Graduate and Professional Student Government and the third shall be a student academic appointee. And that was important to us because the president and vice president represent the whole body of the graduate school, of the graduate body. And then the third person would represent the interests of the student academic appointees.

**AGENDA ITEM EIGHT:**

**COHEN:** So I will open it to questions, but that is what we're voting on. One more slide just in case anybody is interested on the process. Once we vote to go to a ballot, the information goes out to the university faculty, who get to know what we're voting on and why. After 15 days, the ballot will go out, which I think is January 17th, if I remember correctly. And then we need a majority vote of the entire faculty to pass this. I will open it to questions. We'll pass the mic around. I'm not seeing any questions. Can we?

**SHRIVASTAV:** Seeing no questions, I'll call upon a vote. All in favor of voting in favor of this proposed change to the Constitution of BFC, please raise your hands, so I guess we need to vote, it looks like. All opposed? No. The motion passes. Thank you very much.

**AGENDA ITEM NINE:**

**SHRIVASTAV:** The next item on the agenda is the Task Force on the Future of General Education. They will be presenting the report. I call upon John Arthos, Clark Barwick, J Duncan, and Micol Seigel.

**DUNCAN:** Thanks, everyone. So I'm going to ask that people please hold their questions until the end of the presentation. I understand it may be a little longer than the presentation that just preceded us, but we would appreciate that, so that we can make sure that everyone will stay on time today. So we are here as the steering committee for the task force that was just described. I'm J. Duncan. I'm joined by John Arthos and Micol Seigel. Clark cannot make it today. He is unfortunately not well, and in the interests of general health, he is staying home. He wishes that he could be here. We were charged in 2019 with making recommendations for evolutionary change in regards to general education on the Bloomington campus of IUB. It's this, rather than specific policies, that we bring you today. We bring you an outline for change, rationale for it, and some descriptions of things that we found along the way. We will, at the end of this call upon the next step of the process.

The overall theme of the reforms that we bring you today is learning together; bringing students together through several different pieces, such as a first-year experience courses that cross unit boundaries; a capstone experience for those that don't already have it; bringing faculty together; replacing administrative assessment with peer review across GenEd topics; having an Annual Colloquium for those who teach in gen ed areas to get together and discuss these topics; and encouraging interdisciplinarity in research and teaching. Because it's the most common question we receive, I just want to off the bat, let people know that what we are proposing is not an increase in the credit hours required of any of your students and is not a specific course in any specific area. Although units could choose to impose these requirements if they want to, as they always can, we will be proposing a framework that lives within what we already have and does not require these increases.

Over the process of the last several years, we have solicited input from a lot of different places, lots of different people, and a lot of different ways. This includes reviewing the archives, going to best practices reports, interviewing people at other universities, researching what other institutions were doing, holding several town halls, having faculty and student interviews and surveys, extensive discussion with members of the administration in places, and also receiving feedback through our liaison task force from the individual units that teach these courses.

Output has been varied, as well. We've had several subcommittees working on this in different areas. We presented an interim report in December of 2021, and currently we are presenting, as well. But I would like to note that this is not the final time that you will hear from us, nor is it the final version of this report. We're actually here today in major part to request your modifications, feedback, input, discussion, etc. on the report that we have presented so that we can take that in and assimilate it with our current report and present then a final report in March of next year. So if you are burning with something you would really like to contribute to this process, we welcome that. And this meeting will not be your only opportunity to do that. You're also welcome to provide us with comments through e-mail, personal discussion, Zoom meetings, anything you would like, so that we can hear from you.

In our analysis of the current Gen Ed program, we identified a great number of places where we could do better. And here, as in many other places, I will remind people that there is an

exhaustive report behind us, and I cannot capture that in 6 min. So please forgive me if I'm hitting the highlights and encouraging you to go and read the full report.

RCM, in its purest form, which thankfully is not what we practice in every piece of the university, does encourage a certain mentality of competition for Gen Ed credits that we need to be careful not to get stuck into. We found numerous places where students express confusion. They did not understand the distribution requirements, and they rejected the overall coherence of the program. They did not feel that it meaningfully contributed to their experience as undergraduates. Faculty had a variety of confusions around our program. Including, what is our General Education program? Where do I fit into it? Why are my students required to take these courses? How can I ensure that my department has a seat at the table? There were so many questions and very few people who had a full grasp on the Gen Ed program. In fact, I don't think any of us did until we were well into this process and able to take the full view on it that most people don't have the ability to do by not being in the middle of it.

Our task force elaborated four criteria for reform to guide us. The first one is that the program we recommended should be comprehensible to students. This is not something that's going to happen through a buzzword or through the proper selection of a single ideal. This is going to be something that requires long-term determined communication from all of us as faculty and from the entire university to the student body. Because this is something that students will often come into the university already having an opinion on. And we need to get them before that, as well as continue the message while they're here.

The program should be meaningful and legitimate to our students. They should be able to understand why we are tasking them with these requirements, how it fits into their goals as learners and as future citizens, and have a comprehensive nature to it that says: Yes, I can articulate to anyone else why I am here and doing this thing.

Next, the faculty should believe in and be invested in these proposals. Anything that's simply imposed on people externally is not going to work. This is something that requires collaboration at all levels of the university. That will include the faculty in all of the units coming together and saying, yes, we believe in this, and we want to make it happen. When we interviewed people at other universities, this was a consistent theme that buy-in at all levels was required.

And finally, the program should align value and feasibility, which is to say that it should stay within the requirements that are imposed externally on us, as well as the things that we internally require inner individual units. This is, in part, why we come to you today saying that it does not require additional credits, because that simply isn't feasible for a number of our programs.

The overall highlights of the specific reforms that we're going to recommend start with a full four-year framework for General Education. This includes a first-year experience to tie things together for students and to make them feel part of a cohort, to give them an identity as Indiana University Bloomington students that they may not currently have. It includes reforming the distribution approach around an actual coherent theme and to make sure that faculty in those areas are allowed and encouraged to collaborate together. It includes the recommendation for a senior capstone for units that don't already require those.

Our concrete plan to reconfigure the distribution requirements and the common ground are around a single theme, urgent and enduring questions that Clark will be talking to you more about—that John will be talking more about. We'll recommend strengthening and existing themed requirement, and Micol will talk about the difference between Diversity in the U.S. and a social justice requirement.

Finally, we have a set of minimal concrete steps at the end of the proposal that are things that can be done completely independently from the rest of the proposal and that would increase the general utility and viability any Gen Ed program that we implement here. So we encourage people to look at those as things that can be done immediately without having to wait for the others.

So how can we propose these things and say that it does not increase credits? Well, as part of our examination of what's required by both the state and by our policies, we discovered that if we're going to stay within the 30 credits for a general Gen Ed program, we do have the ability to re-allocate credits across some of these categories in the distribution requirement. We can decrease the number of classes that we require in these three specific categories and use those credits to implement some, several, or all of the recommendations that we're giving. Additionally, we could choose to make those more flexible. In other words, if we retain some of the credits there by implementing some but not all of the recommendations, we can allow students to take classes across these categories rather than mandating specific ones. This will make sure that we stay within these credits and don't increase them for students. I'm going to pass this over now.

**ARTHOS:** Hi folks. So this framework that J just described took us a while to get to. Oh, in the interests of time, what I'm going to do is I'm going to say we found really strong empirical evidence of what J's talking about with the student attitude to the current Gen Ed. And I can go over these slides with you. We had two surveys with healthy samples, both with advisors and with students, and it confirms exactly our fears about the fact that students do very much believe in the idea of a General Education. The vast majority of students do. Yet, the current system they neither feel to be doing that or understand it really. So we do have a problem. All of these materials, the reports, the qualitative and quantitative data is all available to you. It's public now. We're not meeting the first two for sure. Okay, So here it is. It's a more unified structure with a beginning, a middle, and an end. It conceives of a Liberal Education, which is both the Gen Ed and their majors as a single developing experience that students understand as such. All the parts speak to one another. Students have an anchor in a first-year experience that serves as a memorable touchstone to refer back to along the way, and a capstone that asks students themselves to reflect back on, gather up, and point what they've learned to their futures. The real linchpin is what we're calling “enduring and urgent questions”, which is a way to revise the common ground courses. We didn't invent the great questions approach. It comes highly recommended from many directions. This motto caught our ear: Learning outcomes don't motivate students, questions do. And that comes from someone who's doing this now. And it's in a wonderful Gen Ed reform handbook by the Chronicle of Higher Education, which again is available to you in the materials. Now, what I want to do now is give you a snippet of the interviews that we conducted with a bunch of folks, both faculty and administrators, who have successfully implemented this type of reform. Lana, do I do that, or do you do that?

**VIDEO:** The makeup of these courses is intended to be the foundation of their undergraduate experience. And so we're very intentional about that. And a lot of them want to get done with the course, that they can move on to their majors. What we want them to do is to step back and say, hold on. The core curriculum is providing you with an interdisciplinary way in which to understand the world and to understand yourself. So the complex problems and enduring questions courses really came out of an understanding among faculty and deans in the university who realized that the core has become something that students were no longer very excited about.

Part of what we're trying to do here is also ourselves understand the core in a different way as something other than distribution requirements. So both we and the students can explain in a few sentences why you're taking this course.

The primary thing that's really important is what's the personal meaning that you are able to draw out of this? And what are your other colleagues in the class pulling out of this and how are you different in your approach to that? So it really is about developing personal meaning.

So that's one of the goals is just self-awareness and also coherence. So it's not just a checklist. So when we started living out that education, it really created a lot of good conversation between faculty which they were there for anyway. And then what we found is that often what was coming up in the classes where these questions, and it really helped shape what the class was about. And we saw the students thinking about the classes in those ways too. So we decided that we would re-frame the whole GE in terms of these big questions. We have students that really want to take these classes. And a lot of it has to do with the marketing and that goes behind it. Yeah. How that we've taught them for what are we going on into our sixth year starting in the fall. Other students are now talking about these as being exciting, interesting courses. So at the beginning, it was really trying to promote them without any knowledge of whether they would even succeed. But now they're promoting themselves so much easier than it used to be.

**ARTHOS:** Okay. Come back to me now. Okay. So the EUQ, the enduring and urgent questions, does not change the existing distribution structure. Add or subtract or rearrange courses. It's simply asks that we refresh our common ground courses as we typically already do. That when we do that, we committed collectively to use this approach, which is to turn the lens we're using to look at our courses a few degrees by asking the essential questions of the course. So just, I'm not going to go through these examples carefully, but both social, both informatics and English have questions, have courses the learning goals and outcomes lead to or could be grouped under the question, are we are technology? These are questions that our subcommittee developed as a draft, right? There's a SPEA course that would come under the question, how should humans interact with the Earth? A question of a course called narrative in any kind of fictional narrative course that could regrouped under the question, what did the stories we tell, tell us about ourselves? And I found a geology course that did the same sort of thing. That the SPEA course comes under that same type of question. So we found that this is very doable. The idea would be that the first year in capstone projects would help students put these questions in conversation with each other. And then if that happens, students with themselves be appearing over disciplines, boundaries and creating an interdisciplinary experience themselves. The thing that

separated this approach from all the others we explored is that it could realistically meet all four of the reform criteria we set.

Note that the first-year experience isn't necessarily a new three-credit course or even a new course. It could be a new configuration of two existing courses or a one-credit course or something else. It could integrate an academic structure like semester with an extra curricular component, like the digital gardens initiative that's going on right now, very exciting. The key thing is that it should be a common project that the entering cohort of students can become invested in and can look back on as a meaningful reference point. The capstone likewise does absolutely not have to be a new course. There are elegant ways to provide a summative act of reflection and application.

**SEIGEL:** Alright? Alright, so before I begin talking about the substantive things I wanted to address, we just what we would like to ask you in the Q&A period, to try to go broad, if you can, to engage with us on the on the question of principles and framework. And that if you have specifics and in particular corrections, please email those to us. Don't take up collective time with specific things that are better dealt with an e-mail. We're very much looking forward to having lots of email feedback. But we would like today to really be a discussion. I want to talk briefly about the social justice education proposal, which is a reframing of the "Diversity in the US" requirements. It is guided by a process of student activism that took place in 2016 and which was implemented but incompletely in 2019. We are recommending that the campus return to the recommendations made by the students and endorsed unanimously by the BFC in 2016, that the diversity requirement to focus instead on social justice, that it not be restricted to a single category of power, but that it engages several of them in an intersectional or otherwise multiplicative way. It does not involve the proposal of a singular new class. It draws on existing expertise and perhaps also existing classes in the curriculum. The teachers of it would self-select across the campus.

There is a new administrative position proposed within the OVPUE, a Director of Social Justice Education. This comes directly from the student recommendations in 2016. It would come into conversation with itself. The teaching faculty would, through an Annual Colloquium; it would be supported. We are very conscious of the ways that such a requirement can overburden already overburdened faculty and units. We are asking that the RCM consequences of such a requirement be mitigated there and we've received initial positive feedback in relation to that request. The reason for this distinction and this move between diversity and social justice is that the DUS requirement is atomized. It gives us a patchwork of courses that can risk occasionally shallow engagement which provokes student resentment. The advantages of social justice education instead, is a greater support if this measure comes with support which it must. For both scholarship on social justice and scholars who engage in that kind of research and teaching. It can support innovative teaching and scholarly collaborations through communication that we would encourage across this innovation. We hope that in support for work on racial justice within social justice, that there would be additional impetus towards a kind of critical mass of scholars who teach on race and racism on campus, which supports graduate students and undergraduates interested in these topics as well. Moving towards the kind of representation on campus that we've been attempting to achieve for many years. It would also save administrative labor by moving the process of administering this over from the existing subcommittee within OVPUE to this director of Social Justice Education and the faculty themselves.

In order to ensure that this particular recommendation and the rest of our recommendations are successful and do not further entrench the campus in competition we are strongly recommending the institutional adjustment of a modification of RCM, which is the campus bogeyman, that's the campus bogeyman. We recognize that this is not entirely up to us. Faculty do not have responsibility over administration. We have legislative authority over curriculum and only consultative authority over other matters. And so we turn to the administration responsible to structure the institution to support the curriculum that we design and request that RCM continue to shift to support gen ed and other teaching and research goals. So we have not made specific recommendations about this, although we have offered a couple of ideas in the report.

So, before I move to the de minimis stuff, these are already okay because the action items for now, I just want to say that the one other very important reform that we do not have a slide for involves math. And in particular 118, the requirement for finite (Sorry, it's not limited to math 118). And there are several versions of 118, but we have identified this as one of the main areas of student complaint. You'll see that documented in the full report. And we have requested that this be addressed explicitly. We've come up with a couple of ideas that we're already getting corrections and feedback about, and so we encourage those of you with expertise or opinions in that regard to look at that in the report and send us your feedback.

So now we've made a, just a number of suggestions regarding immediate possibilities, things that can be implemented right away and that are independent of the larger framework that we are proposing. These have to do with also problems that are identified through the consultations and the surveys that we performed. One involves assessment. We are very concerned that assessment right now doesn't feel meaningful. We propose a peer review structure to replace the existing assessment procedure. We hope to clarify and simplify explanations of the current gen ed program to make things easier to understand. And we propose the enlisting of the IU Office of Communication and hopefully a little bit of a bang. So that it becomes not only comprehensible, but actually attractive and compelling. We hope to get the advisors can achieve additional expertise through training. Although frankly, the advisors are often the most educated people about gen ed across campus and our consultations with them have been some of the most useful to us. We hope to communicate to the faculty, the structure of gen ed and how their courses fit within it. Which is something that faculty are often without a good grasp of. We want to improve the transparency of the approval process.

We ask you the BFC to revisit the structure of the gen ed related committees so that they are aligned with the intent of the faculty so that their processes are suitable and efficient. This is the University Communications Office, a major sustained campaign to help form student understanding and appreciation, encourage OVPUE and faculty directors of required multi-session Gen Ed courses to work together to figure out how we're going to supply instructors for those courses and allow upper-level courses to count towards Gen Ed requirements when the instructor deems it appropriate. And we have a couple of tweaks that would make that less administratively burdensome. Then finally, we ask you the BFC to carry the work that we have performed over the last three years forward by taking the final report when we submit it to you in March, directing the EPC to constitute a follow-up task force in consultation with CARC, hopefully aiming to have specific policy language before this body in one year. Thank you so much.

**DUNCAN:** I realized that was a lot and fairly quickly. We will of course make this report available to everyone in both the slide format and the format you already have. As we receive corrections, you can expect that we will have that edited version with additional input for you for March. But for right now we'd like to open it to general questions or comments.

#### **AGENDA ITEM TEN:**

**GROTH:** Hi. I just wanted to thank the committee for their work. We met seems like years ago because it really was years ago. And there's a lot of good ideas in the report. And like all reports that are generated over; met with many people touching them. I'm sure that you'll get a lot of feedback, and my office will provide substantive feedback to you to help as the process moves ahead. But I just wanted to thank you for at least doing this, and also maybe now in reflection as if you could go back to the first meetings. Why was I was not evasive but I really needed to develop the vision. It couldn't come from me as the administrator of the, of the current program. So thanks.

**DUNCAN:** Likewise, we really appreciate the input you gave us. Those early meetings were extremely helpful in getting started, and also in referring us to some other people to talk to.

**SMITH:** Hi, I have a question. I think I might run the risk of going into specifics a bit, but I wanted to know that I believe several recommendations you make regard to shifting of the responsibility for teaching around basically, I'm talking mostly about like the math modeling courses and finite, which I think you didn't have a slide for. My question really is about how would you expect these shifting around of Gen Ed requirements or classes effect the graduate work in teaching (the graduate work teaching load)? Because I think especially for math modeling, most of these classes are talking almost exclusively by SAAs. And I suspect that across university that might hold true for these classes which are such requirements. And would how would this affect funding for those SAAs or would that be more question about changing the RCM model for funding? If you could comment on that, I'd be grateful.

**DUNCAN:** So there were certainly a lot of different recommendations that we made in the report. Possibilities for addressing the issues that we received feedback on. For math, modeling is an area. For classes like finite, what we recommended is that those go to more sections that were smaller individually, that met more frequently, and that had more full-time faculty involved in the teaching. But my own experience is that anytime you're going to have courses like that, you will of course need assistance, SAAs for the full-time faculty. So, I can imagine that just as many SAA positions would exist, but there would be also more full-time faculty in the courses. And that will increase the ability for you to have lower student to teacher ratios in general and would give the SAAs more of a mentorship structure. I think it could be beneficial for everybody.

**FUREY:** I wanted to thank you also for the work. It seems really exciting. This idea of enduring and urgent questions. I wondered about the slide that talked about how you had. I think John was speaking when this slide came up. What about the flexibility you have in terms of rearranging where the credits come from. I think it was that there's sort of an A and H and an S and H, and then there was a new nine credits as I'm remembering correctly. So I just was wondering,



following Micol's suggestion that we think in big picture terms. I just would like to understand how that the need for that flexibility relates to this broad reorganization in terms of thinking about first-year experience and capstone experience; is why you need to build in that flexibility in that way to fulfill what you are understanding as the overarching goals of the structure.

**SEIGEL:** Yeah, Thanks, Connie. I mean, it seems that the first of all, greater flexibility is a goal in general because students often struggle to find courses that will fit their schedules. And so that in part is a recommendation across the board. When you have specific courses that will be designated a first-year experience or urgent and enduring questions or capstone, there's also the question of how to fit them in. And so by expanding the flexibility of how courses are able to be counted, it opens the space for the possibility of developing this, this overarching framework. Some units already have this diminished requirement in place. And so it is not that complete of an innovation, it's not a, it's not a break with existing practice. But shifting over to this much more flexible possibility allows us to schedule a much larger number of different courses as either first-year experience, emerging and urgent questions or capstone.

**DUNCAN:** You'll also find that sometimes students take courses that are cross-listed and double count. So there are a variety of ways that you can reconfigure these so that you have the credit hours available to do innovative things. But that's going to come down to the recommendations made by the follow-up task force. What we wanted to give them was maximum flexibility for approaches they can take that would be consistent within the framework we currently have established the university.

**FUREY:** Could I have a quick follow up? And just, again, this wasn't on the slide, but I do think this does relate, or I'm curious how you all are posing the ways that it's related to graduate funding. For example in A and H is not at all true necessarily that a grad students are the ones teaching the gen ed courses. But it is true that graduate funding, obviously graduate students, the College is the primary place for graduate, the largest number of graduate students and among all the units. And so the gen ed has quite significance potentially, unless there's significant changes in the funding model, quite significant implications for graduate funding. And so I just wanted to understand how that's being framed as the key to it all.

**DUNCAN:** The last bit you said there's the most important one, the specific changes to the funding model. It turns out that RCM is a lot more flexible than a lot of us understand it to be especially within the college, that you might talk to some of the upper-level administration for how that currently functions. We were quite surprised to learn that it's not a direct correlation, especially in the College, between students in a seat and funding for graduate students and teaching lines. And there's a lot more flexibility that can be had there to support the educational goals. The educational goals really need to come first. The implementation of the backend for supporting that financially will come from that.

**BRIDGES:** Thanks for your report and presentation today. I have a very small question. What is the email that you would like our minutiae comments sent to?

**DUNCAN:** Well, unfortunately, we don't have a single e-mail. So probably the best thing to do would be to e-mail the four of us that are the Steering Committee on the task force directly or any one of the four of us, That's true.

**SEIGEL:** Yeah, If you send to any one of us it will go into the same folder.

**DUNCAN** But but yes, at the moment, just please email us directly.

**COHEN:** So funny enough, my undergrad had basically this program. Though it was a small religious school, so it also had a religious slant. But the one thing I was noticing or waiting for is the more integration of research skills and information literacy. A lot of students are coming in with and skipping W131 and all of those skills where a lot of those skills are built. So we're getting juniors and seniors showing up who don't have any idea how to do research suddenly. I was wondering if you guys had thought more about trying to integrate information literacy and research skills into some of these first-year classes. That was a big component of my undergrad where we also did a Capstone. Some of it was a paper, some of it was a project depending on the class and how that could be more integrated into these classes.

**DUNCAN:** Thank you for your feedback about having gone through a program like this. We found a number of other universities that had switched to this model reported extremely good results. In terms of what you're speaking to that's part of a broader problem that we're seeing right now. Because of the increasing push of general education credits into high schools and other programs like that, students can enter our university with basically a full year under their belts, not ever having taken an IU class at this campus. So one of the things that we considered when we were looking at problems, what kind of experience can we give people that's singular and unique, that cannot be replicated elsewhere? And the first-year experience is the place to do that. If the follow-up taskforce agrees, if everyone else agrees with this idea, then that's the place to push information literacy also, whatever the first-year experience will be, it needs to have a component of information literacy. I strongly agree with you. That will give the students that unified background and then everybody in all of the programs can draw on that.

**SEIGEL:** I just want to say that I think research is distinct from information literacy and thank you so much for raising it in relation to it. I'll discuss with my colleagues the possibility of adding it because I think that's really crucial. Thank you.

**LION:** Hi. I just wanted to thank you for your report. I'm amazed and humbled at all the work that you've done. I bow to you, thank you. I want to throw out technology skills. Okay, granted it is what I teach, but I also know that students come to this campus and no, they really don't know how to use their computers. They really don't. And they don't really know the difference between Google Docs and Word, and they don't really know how to find the cloud. They think they do. They don't. What if maybe we could have just throw that out as a possibility to also have something thrown into classes or have it a possibility of teaching them in some way. And that's just they go (shrug) and I'll throw also e-mail you about that, but thanks.

**DUNCAN:** I think that would dovetail with the idea of information literacy. They need to have the skills to be able to get the information. So that would be part of the same process. They don't always get it wrong. No.

**JOHNSON:** I'm just wondering if you could talk a little bit about what you've discovered in your research and interviews with colleagues at other institutions about what I think is a really crucial component of this, which is the requirement you pointed out that faculty have to be genuinely invested in these reforms and they actually have to see, they themselves have to have an investment in whatever kind of general education program ultimately develops for it not either to be stagnant or to devolve into a kind of unintended weather beaten shack who is just sort of what I feel like tends to happen with curricular structures that people that are developed and that are received with a sense of dismiss liveness and cynicism.

And the reason I ask that, I mean, maybe it's self-evident, but I do think that in my own observation, institutions that have genuinely rich general education programs that are regarded by their students as being genuinely meaningful, that are regarded by faculty as being generally rewarding to teach have cultures of conversation and discussion that transcend disciplinary interests and that bind us together, not as experts in our disciplines, but as intellectuals. As like thoughtful intellectual. And I'm constantly amazed when I have discussions with people about general education, particularly people who are very accomplished in their fields, their disciplinary fields, that many of them seem to have forgotten a skill set that they themselves possessed when they were undergraduates, right? Many of them went through general education programs. And there's something about the way we train people in disciplines that convinces us, I think, that we can no longer do as teachers or model as intellectuals what we imagine our own 18-year-old first-year students capable of doing.

What did you learn about that issue? About how you get buy-in and about how you create a culture on campus where people don't think talking about general education or about education generally is a sort of ancillary concern relative to whatever is going on in the context of their discipline.

**ARTHOS:** So I'll say a couple of points that that occurs to me and then I'll pass it on. So. There's a couple of places where it enters into for me, which is with assessment. So assessment typically now is organized based upon metrics of learning outcomes and all of that sort of after the fact work. But the reason we suggested peer review, it's more of a bottom-up from the beginning of the process. Because if you can consider your own work as a teacher, what happens? The reason you become a better teacher is when you talk to other teachers about your work and get their feedback. Now, that's not measured. But if you, if you consult yourself, that's what moves you to teach a better course and revise and so forth, getting that kind of feedback. So an actual conversation is where we're talking about, which is why J. talked about a colloquium.

Then the second point I think that might enter into is this whole notion of how we create the EUQ the enduring and urgent questions that's not clear to us what the best way to do that is. So we had a subcommittee actually develop EUQ questions that they thought could fit right for the whole common grounds courses. But that's sort of a top-down approach where, where those could become very easily empty universes, right? What about going at it from the other direction? Where either individual, faculty or units develop the questions themselves, which is that's where you get the investment. If you're asking yourself, what's the essential question that this course is asking students to consider? Then you become invested in it. Or there could be a

sort of an intermediate place/way that you would do that. So I think that's going to be a really crucial question for getting out what you're talking about.

**DUNCAN:** So, following up on what John was saying, I want you to imagine that when you are involved in a general education course, instead of at the end of the semester submitting some forms and getting feedback or not getting feedback and it not being clear to you what happens to that? That what you get to do is be involved in a yearly colloquia where you get together with other faculty who are also teaching GenEd classes. And you have an honest, unmediated conversation about teaching and about teaching in these subjects. Where you get together with other faculty who are teaching a course that applies the same urgent and enduring question. And you get to have that kind of in the hallway discussion that you sometimes have with your peers that can be transformative in the moment. And it's not because you're mandated to do that. It's because you genuinely want to, because you're deeply invested in that. And you get to meet faculty from all across who are also deeply invested in that. If we don't create structures where faculty continue to get invested, this structure will not endure. And that was a fundamental thing that we came across when we suggested this. How do we continue indefinitely? Excitement and motion about these questions, how do they refresh themselves?

**SEIGEL:** I think we also cannot do that without administrative support. We really have to have administrative buy-in across the campus. And that can take the form of investment in the program through the Office of Communication to make it really visible to everybody across campus. Perks for teaching, support for the teaching, RCM incentives. There are a range of ways in which administrative support will be absolutely essential to making this the bright and shiny thing that will attract faculty. That will reverse the way gen ed is valorized on campus at the moment. It's sort of the least interesting thing that if at all possible, you want to get out of teaching. Then also just in our attempts to make this process right now involve as many people as possible bringing it to you, not once but twice, involving the liaison committee, and the town halls, trying to make the process visible so that people can get a little bit hooked into it.

**OSSI:** I've just been told I'm the end of the road. So I have, first of all, thank you. This is a really amazing report. There is an enormous amount of work and an enormous amount of commitment that's gone into it. And it's generated a lot of conversation. I am from the School of Music so I've had conversations with my colleagues. There is a certain amount of perplex about this and about some of the proposals. So the thing that struck me personally is the research you've done outside of you. And I look at the list of schools beginning with Harvard, Virginia Tech, Ursinus College, Boston College and so on. And what strikes me is that these places which have all had successful experiences with this kind of, with this kind of program, are small. And small is good. But small is not us, right? And it's not just a question of how many people are involved, but it's really a question of how many moving parts are involved. So for example, some of the things that are proposed could work well if we weren't in limiting ourselves to the College for example as the place where the first three years, the first year experience must reside.

There are courses offered in other units of the university that could very easily fit that model. I can think of several in my own department. I'm a musicologist, so my own allegiance is to the humanities, interdisciplinarity, and I feel much more, in some ways, much closer to the Renaissance Studies Program, for example, than I do sometimes to the School of Music. So I feel that that's something I could contribute to. And I have colleagues who could also social justice

being another area in which my colleagues are working at length, in depth. And so I wonder if you've thought about this and why it is that there is a difference between us and the institutions you've looked at.

**ARTHOS:** Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for that question. So there are large public institutions that are using parts of this in different ways. University of Florida, Ohio State University just started a new reform, Purdue. These happen, the great questions happen in different places in their curriculum in different ways. So we address that. So for example, with the smaller institutions you can get right, very ambitious with the structure of it. A good example of this is I think it's Ursinus where the way that they did the urgent questions and to create the interdisciplinarity was they actually paired courses next to each other in the schedule so that a student would go from one class to another. That's impossible for us. We couldn't possibly do that. Um, other, other, so the University of Florida has their Great Questions and they have a single great question as the first-year experience. By the way, in the first-year experience, I think that's where we're thinking definitely there could be much, much broader participation across the university.

With one of the models that we rejected, which was very attractive, was the clusters or thematic approach. Precisely because it's prohibitive to reorganize the curriculum that we have along those lines. So what we did was we extracted this idea. By the way, clusters can actually use the Great Questions model in its own way. So what we did was we extracted that specific element of the Enduring and Urgent Questions because that does work for us. It does put the onus on the instructor's right to sort of re-imagine their courses. But it doesn't change any structure. It's the structure itself. So that's the, that's the unique and the original thing that we've done with this that will make it work for us. That will make it work for us. Yeah. Yeah.

**DUNCAN:** I definitely think that interdisciplinarity needs to be part first-year experience. And when we talk to people about that, when we talk to them about things like linked courses, specifically, over and over again, what we heard was well, RCM would, RCM this, RCM that. But then when we talk to administration, what we heard is RCM will support whatever model the faculty feel is appropriate here and it can be made to work. So just because people might be in different units from an RCM perspective, doesn't mean they can't collaborate on a first-year experience. I think we should draw on the expertise on the exciting work that is being done all over the university. Because our students are going to go all over the university.

**SEIGEL:** We leave the final implementation of all of this to another body. A task force that we asked you to constitute. The devil is in the details. Maybe most of those, maybe it looks like the host institutions are smaller. But what are the actual problems of translating a model that works best in a small institution to a large one. That is something that the next group of people will wrestle with.

**SHRIVASTAV:** Okay. Thank you, John, J., and Micol, and thank you all for a robust discussion. It's very important topic. And I appreciate all your effort into it in the interest of time, I will move on to the next topic, but their emails? I'm sure they are they are on the report. The report was circulated to the BFC membership. I suspect if it's not already, it will be on the website. I hope you continue having these conversations and send your input to them as soon as possible.

I will now move on to the next topic, which is a report on the from the International Affairs Committee updates. The co-chairs are Jose Luis and now Rojas and Israel Herrera was taken away. Thank you.

#### **AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN:**

**ANTINAO-ROJAS:** Thank you. Provost Shrivastav and President Reck. Thank you for having us. This is the first report that the International Affairs Committee gives the full BFC since 2018. In that moment Vice President Buxbaum addresses the BFC with the idea of showing the BFC how the structure was. And there's a few of the questions that were presented at that time. And since then the pandemic happened and we haven't reported back. So this is very, I'm very happy to show some of the progress that we have made in the last few years in the committee.

Just to highlight here the breadth of the committee composition. We have representatives from different areas in the university. Importantly, we have representation from the Hamilton-Lugar School. We have also student representatives, both from the graduate level and on the undergrad level, which doing even since 2017 when these committee started, was indicated that it was a very important element to have in the committee representation for the student body. And during the last couple of years, we have made a really good advance in establishing a connection with the OVPIA. And this year we have we're good representation from now, an ex-officio member from OVPIA's sidewalk, Seth Walker, he's not listed here, but he was just appointed couple of weeks ago by President Buxbaum to serve in our committee as a liaison, as a member that serves too as the role of communication between the OVPIA and our committee. So that's pretty well. He's director for international partnerships at the OVPIA.

One of the issues that we tackle last year, and I think it's important too, to come back to these is the role of the committee in shared governance and how we function in BFC, how we function and our work relates to OVPIA, which is the entity in the university that is in charge of International Affairs. The mandate that we had and it's like explained in the webpage for example we can see there is the IAC participates in the oversize international affairs. It's very succinct. It follows with the committee recommends policies to governance, to faculty governance or administration, monitors compliance, some personnel issues, budget and planning strategies. So it's a very general statement. But during last year, one of these charges that we have was to actually look at what was the actual role. We had to go back all the way to the initial establishment of this committee in 2016. And I will report from last year. So just it changes to a more--it's a dual role that we have in terms of being an advisory committee to faculty, but also to serve as a communication role between while we do in terms of the faculty and the entity that is in charge of these issues at the university level, which is our OVPIA. We are the BFC this is a campus level committee. So in repeated interaction with Vice President Buxbaum the last few years, we have tried to establish a communication, like a link between OVPIA and us and tried to avoid the oversight part because the level is not the same.

So we're nevertheless, despite that, we are also, we are implementing this dual role this year in the tasks that we're working this year. The committee is still discussing these roles. This is not set and there are still ways to do it, and the implementation is still under discussion. But this is something that we ended up figuring out last year. So an example of the implementation, then we have an advisory role. First, we have continued presentation by the officers of all the OVPIA, for example the gateways, OIS, overseas studies. And we're trying to get these updates every year. We try to get updates from them. We have for example in 2021, the update of the

Director of the Gateways Ally Batten to explain how they function; a very important matter for some of our constituents. And in this year we will have an update by him. So, the idea is to have these continuing communication with OVPIA and they're represented, and the representation that they have. Another important thing that we discussed last year and this year we are starting this is to have ongoing ex-officio representation by OVPIA in the committee so that we can discuss any relevant programs that they have in mind. And then we can comment on them. Remember, we're not like we're not going to do this oversight, but we're going to be more in the comment and advisory role again. And last, last point that we can solicit as problems and issues appear, we can solicit meetings with relevant campus and university officers to talk about specific issues. One example is going to come later for this year.

Another role that was discussed early in the implementation of this committee in 16-17 was that we should have, we should be a dialogue committee. This communication role is implemented this year after the recommendations last year, for example with having representation from Hamilton Lugar, which is the school that is working with global issues, international issues. Another important thing is to have communication, very active communication with the student body regarding international students at the grad and undergrad level and student organizations, student representatives, we have that in the committee as far this year. And any other issue about communication is that we can solicit and we are trying to actively look how to interact better with faculty. Trying to, for example address the faculty instruction in certain ways, either through OVPIA, through the offices to OIS in the case of international students or through direct surveys, we have not made a survey by the committee yet, but it's in the plan for the next few months.

Just a brief summary of the work that we did in the last two years. In 2020-2021 for example we were charged with updating or drafting what could be updated in IU Bloomington Global Learning goals or outcomes. It was sent for comments by the schools in the summer of 2021. We got some comments and this year we have continued discussion on that. We had some renewed impetus by Vice President Buxbaum to implement some sort of global goals. This year she has been working with Hamilton Lugar, she's been trying to advance these from the point of view of setting goals in the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals by the UN. And that's, that's another view of this potential issue of setting global learning goals in the curriculum.

But the main point that we have discussed in the committees that any proposal that we have or any result of our discussion, we'll have to go to the EPC, to the Education Policies Committee too because it's going to be changes in the curriculum that we're going to be going into. Any of these potential proposal for global or international learning goals. In 21 is when we started requesting OVPIA representation in the community, and so far it's worked. This has worked really well. And we got presentations from both the Vice President and the Gateway Executive Director last year. As we were coming back from the pandemic, one of the one of the charges that we had was to study issues related to resuming activities for international students and scholars after COVID. And we had a very interesting discussion with John Wilkerson from OIS, the Office of International Services, how they responded to all the demands that are issues like immigration, students that had to go online and they had problems with immigration status, housing issues and the wonderful response actually their office had to the issues that international scholars and students had in that moment. And also we had a presentation by Vice President Watson regarding diversity and international students and scholars on campus. And she asked us when we started the discussion of the updated roles for the committee that I presented earlier.

**HERRERA:** So I joined the committee this semester. This is my first semester and I can provide the updates about what we have done so far. And also some proposals and work for the next year, for the spring. So the charges given by the EC for this year. We're number one role of the OVPIA under a new president's administration. So we invited Vice President Buxbaum, and she presented to the committee this fall about the reorganization, different changes that we are going to see, and know because she's coming to the BFC in February about the international and global office. All the changes in the organization for this unit. We were charged with exploring ways to improve our service faculty with international expertise or interests beyond Hamilton Lugar School. So that is a survey that the previous committee was working in 2018-19. That is a BFC survey to faculty and also explore better ways to connect with international students, including unique issues faced by those students, concerns. So that is our work right now on a survey that can reach out to international students to see by this time if there are any, any comments or anything that we should give attention.

This is work in progress, as I mentioned, for the spring or maybe next year. But during our meetings, we have shared different proposals. And one of those was the initiative of the proposal for recognizing international faculty projects or research done by IU faculty and also collaboration that faculty can have with international students, collaboration around international faculty or with all the institutions overseas based on the charge from the EC. So there is a work regarding the survey for international student organizations to identify concerns. We are planning to reach out to different presidents from international organizations to identify these potential concerns.

And also the recruitment and admission of international graduate students. Based on our requirement, the three-year bachelor's degree holders, this was brought by one of their members. It seems that in some units, in some world language units, there has been a loss of grad students based on this rule. So we invited staff and the interim director from the international admissions to clarify these requirements. And based on these comparisons for four different units, not just in the College but Hamilton Lugar, it seemed that if students were three-year bachelor's degree, they could be recruited or could be enrolled in the schools with the advice of the international admission. But that is up to the Deans, it is up to the chairs to accept those students. In a way to assess the importance or the reasons why they are recruiting these type of students with less than four years or a bachelor's degree. That's what we have done under Jose Luis tenure and also this semester. So if there is any questions?

**SHRIVASTAV:** Thank you. The report is open for discussion. No questions. You've done a terrific job. Thank you. Thank you. That was the last item on our agenda. Seeing no other items, I will adjourn the meeting and return 15 precious minutes back to you. Thank you very much. Meeting adjourned.