

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**February 6, 2007**  
**Ballantine Hall 008**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Alter, Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Julie Bobay, James Capshew, John Carini, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Robert Eno, Alyce Fly, Betsy Henke, Kevin Hunt, Elizabeth Johnson, Owen V. Johnson, Christina Kuzmych, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Grant McFann, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Lisa Pratt, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Elyce Rotella, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** David Daleke for James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Katy Borner, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Richard Carr, Les Coyne, Aurelian Craiutu, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Barbara Hawkins, Amy Holtzworth- Munroe, Laura M. Jezewksi, Andrew Lauck, Terrence Mason, Sara Pryor, Jerrold Stern, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill, Cara Wellman

**GUESTS:** Brian Spegele (IDS), Jeff Palmer (Biology), Maynard Thompson (President's Office)

**Agenda**

1. IU Bloomington and the Life Sciences Initiative [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)  
(Professor Jeffrey Palmer, chair, IU Bloomington Task Force on Life Sciences)  
Strategic Plan: [http://lifesciences.iu.edu/doc/strategic\\_plan.pdf](http://lifesciences.iu.edu/doc/strategic_plan.pdf)
2. Agenda Committee Business  
(Professor Theodore Miller)
3. Presiding Officer's Business  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)
4. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)
5. Bloomington Faculty Composition Report [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)  
(Professors Kevin Hunt and Theodore Miller, co-chairs, Faculty Affairs Committee)

Campus: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B18-2007.xls>  
School/RC: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B18-2007b.xls>  
College: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B18-2007c.doc>

6. Faculty Governance Representation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)

(Professors Kevin Hunt and Theodore Miller, co-chairs, Faculty Affairs Committee)

7. Review of IU's Core Campus and System School Operations [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller)

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U7-2007.pdf>

8. Standing Committee Reports

9. Old Business

10. New Business

### **AGENDA ITEM #1: IU Bloomington and the Life Sciences Initiative**

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you all for being so brave as to brave the weather and be here. I was just saying to Ted that I watched the Wolfgang Petersen movie “Stalingrad” recently and walking over here gave me some sense of what it was like as well. So our goal is to see if we can through this reasonably quickly so that those of you who are worried about this getting even worse can get away and get home. The first item, let me just ask Ted to make some comments about the first item before Jeff Palmer speaks.

**MILLER:** One of the things of course that’s happening in the university as you all know is that there is proposal in front of the legislature for a substantial amount of money focused on life sciences and I thought it would be useful for the Bloomington Faculty Council members to become familiar—to the extent that we are not now. I think that many of us probably don’t know a whole lot about this. I think it would be useful for us to become familiar with what this is all about and where we stand and so forth. Professor Jeff Palmer is with us today. He is the chair, as you see, of the IU Bloomington Task Force on Life Sciences. Now of course this life sciences initiative is not only a Bloomington initiative only. A substantial part of it is going on in Indianapolis as well. So there may be—the way I look at this particular session here, we have a brief period of time with Jeff, he has other commitments, but it is kind of a preliminary discussion and we may want to have some more focus on this as we go forward through the year. One of the things I would ask Jeff perhaps to say a few words about as he is into his presentation is who should we ask if we want to hear more about this, who would be other people that could be asked to come and provide some useful insight for the faculty?

**PALMER:** Thank you, Ted. It’s a pleasure to speak to you today. Can everybody hear me? I was just asked to come here and talk to you on Sunday and I have to leave town early tomorrow morning, at least I hope to, weather permitting. I have obligations I have to run to right after this. That is why I said I could only come if I could be here by the way. I have to leave without

staying around to answer any questions formally after your meeting break. So I apologize for that.

The Life Science Initiative has been gathering steam over a number of years, really starting around 2000 with the INGEN Initiative. It started to really take shape and ramp up, at least in terms of its ambitious vision, in President Herbert's State of the University talk in fall of 2005. At the same time a strategic plan was being drafted. That's the plan that its URL is given as part of the agenda for this meeting. I have a hard copy right here and this is what it looks like. This strategic plan if you do choose to look at it, a word of caution is that it is really intended to external audiences. It is intended for the trustees, a semi-external audience, but certainly not a faculty audience, as well as people in the state, particularly in Indianapolis in the Statehouse, the legislator's administrative staffers, to get an idea of what IU means to the more general public about its bold plan for the Life Sciences.

The plan has two major goals which it is trying to marry as successfully as possible which is to build the life sciences in size and in quality and stature at Indiana University, and at the same time to marry that growth with helping to build the life sciences, a stronger and stronger life sciences economy for the State of Indiana. We honestly think that we have both the foundation in terms of excellence in the life sciences, both academically at Indiana University as well as other research universities in the state such as Purdue and Notre Dame, as well the economic base in terms of life science companies, pharmaceuticals, Cook and so on, that with major investment from the state and from the university and other sources that we think we can be an even greater players nationally in terms of building a strong life sciences economy. Now, lots of other states have similar plans while our ultimate success remains to be seen.

This is a balancing act because we want to balance growth at the university with fostering growth of the life sciences economy. But without that, having the economic aspect of that drive growth of the university in ways that would be dangerous to our academic mission; and that's a concern that is especially cogent here on this campus with our emphasis in the sciences on basic fundamental scientific research. That's an issue that we've had to come to grips with on several occasions in terms of the discussions, in terms of how to grow the life sciences and discussions in particular that have been partnered with the Medical School where they have their own operating model and it's been a very educational process for them to learn what kind of operating model we have on this campus and the ways in which it's different, and where it is intrinsically different, and is going to stay different. I won't go into those details although I'm happy to take questions on that.

There's another important aspect of value to the Life Sciences Initiative, which is the way in which we grow on this campus, we want that growth to be growth in size but not at the expense of quality. So I'll come to that when I talk specifically about our projections for how we would spend new life sciences dollars. We want that growth to come at a sustainable pace. If the state gives us as much money; the full amount of money that we're asking for, that would involve hiring on the order of 100 new tenure-track faculty over a ten-year period. That's in addition to all the normal level of replacement hiring in the life sciences. That's actually a pretty substantial growth in a very competitive market and we don't want to in any sense feel compelled to rush to hire in ways that would come at the expense of the quality of hiring. If anything we want to

elevate the quality of our science faculty and we certainly don't want to do anything to diminish the quality.

The other important aspect of balancing growth on this campus, and I'll belabor this in a few minutes, is to do so in a way that doesn't in any way drain resources unintentionally or otherwise from other parts of the campus which is, I'm sure, a fear from many quarters, and I'll address that. What the Life Science Initiative involves in terms of what we call the "ask", that is, what we're asking of the state is enough funds to hire upwards of 500 new faculty, life sciences faculty, across Indiana University. Most of those faculty would be hired in the Medical School, on the order of a 100 of them would be hired on this campus. Now, the greater portion of the funds would actually come to this campus, on the order of approaching about one-third of those funds would come to this campus because of our different budgetary models for funding those faculty positions and allied expenses that I will elaborate on. The other aspect of the ask is not only the money to hire the faculty and associated base expenses, but also of course the one-time funds for the start-up and the buildings that would be necessary to house much of this new growth.

These new funds are being asked a completely separate budget item from the normal biennial request for the Indiana University budget. That is for two pragmatic reasons. One is so we can do the best job of selling this initiative to the state by making it clear that from their stand point we're selling it largely on the basis of economic development. So we're separating that from the purely academic mission of the state. And secondly, something I've already spoken to, we want to protect the budget of the rest of the university and so by completely distinguishing the funds of the Life Science Initiative from the regular university budget, we think the state is less likely to say yes we'll give you new money for the state, for the Life Sciences Initiative and yet at the same time cutting back or giving minimal growth for the rest of the university budget so that life sciences growth would come at the expense for the rest of the university. We certainly don't want that to happen.

Michael McRobbie formed a task force for the Bloomington component of the Life Sciences Initiative about a year ago. I chair that task force. It's a large task force comprising members of four different schools on this campus and multiple units from within the College of Arts and Sciences: biology, chemistry, psychology and physics. Ted asked about other people who can come and make presentations about Life Sciences Initiative. There are, I can give you, I don't want to give the whole list of names but I'll make it available to you. It consists of science leaders from, as I said, a number of units, some of them are department chairs such as the chair of Chemistry, Psychology, Biology, and members of other units. It includes Sarita Soni as head of the Research Office. She can also give her own perspective on this.

In our activities so far the task force has concentrated primarily on the issue of planning for, on the financial side, what we would do with the dollars in terms of making projections, costing projections for how we would spend new monies over a ten-year period. There are four basic kinds of expenditures that we envision. Two of them are base expenditures and two are one-time expenditures. The base expenditure that you would really think of are for set salaries and benefits for the new faculty. Again, if we get all the money that we are asking for, then we would be hiring about a 100 new tenure-track faculty on this campus over a ten-year period. We project—

we built in to our salary models, about 40 percent of the new faculty being hired at senior level, with seniors defined as anything from faculty who just achieved tenure status but are clearly on the fast track to great success, to truly senior faculty of vintage, of many of us gray-haired members of the audience.

In addition we plan as much as possible to front load senior hiring to do even a greater portion of that in the initial years, the rationale being that that will both help jumpstart the initiative by bringing a lot of prominent senior faculty and as well we'll be in a better position to hire those kinds of faculties by bringing them in at the beginning where they can have the most input on future directions including using the lure of future hiring and growth as part of the package to attract them here.

I'll then turn to the two one-time expenditures; one of them is for new buildings and a substantial renovation of some existing sites. We estimate that if we get, again, the full ask, that we are able to hire a 100 new tenured faculty, 40 percent of them being senior faculty. In addition to Simon Hall and MSB2, which we can now also call LS2 or Life Sciences 2, that in addition to those two new buildings, we will need about three additional new buildings of the size of Simon Hall. It is hard you to appreciate the size of Simon Hall because it has a disproportionably large basement. So let me give it to you in the currency of this building, Jordan Hall and Chemistry, which are all roughly the same size in square footage although their shapes are obviously different. But they are all about 300,000 square feet in gross square footage. Simon Hall is about half the size of Ballantine, Jordan and Chemistry. So we would need about one and a half new buildings in addition to Simon and MSB2 of the size of this building and of the size of Jordan or Chemistry, to give you an idea.

In terms of what is a sustainable practical rate of getting the funding and planning and figuring out the siting for those buildings, we envision building perhaps three or even four buildings of more or less likely at this point four buildings roughly a size a little smaller than Simon Hall. We envision those buildings being located in the sites corresponding or as close as possible to the sites corresponding to the two current loci of life science activity of campus. That is, this area of campus where Simon Hall is being built and Jordan Hall, Chemistry and all the other science buildings are located. The other locus being up on 10<sup>th</sup> street and beyond where Psychology, SPEA or Geology are located.

The second kind of one-time expenditure is start-up funds for new faculty hires. Another kind of expenditure is one that may not be so obvious to you but is very very important and that is something where the task force has spent a lot of its efforts on trying to get a realistic counting of what are the other basic expenditures that go along with hiring and bringing on board new science faculty. There was a lot of discussion and dissatisfaction with aspects of the Commitment to Excellence hiring plan and budget plan because most of that money is for new science faculty was for faculty salaries. There was not enough money budgeted for ancillary expenses and that's what we've tried to do here for a couple of reasons so that we can have very attractive hiring packages and so that we can grow the sciences sustainably and do so in a way that doesn't drain resources from other parts of campus as could otherwise happen. So we've built in substantial monies into our budget constructions for graduate support and graduate fellowships to accompany new faculty, for staff support, for new administrative as well as

technical and scientific staff, and for things as mundane as assessment which cost money. Each new faculty, staff, graduate student and new square foot of space has a per capita or square foot dollar of assessment attached to it and we want to make sure all those costs are built into our budget projections. So substantial funds, a surprising large fraction of the base budget funds for the initiative are actually going to those kinds of activities in addition to faculty salaries and benefits.

A second activity we've been involved in is helping Vice President for Life Sciences Craig Brater in his assistants and J. T. Forbes in the State Relations Office in preparing documents for lobbying the state legislature and to some extent being engaged in those lobbying activities ourselves. I won't say anything more about that. You may have seen some of us the background of the commercials that are now airing statewide for the Life Sciences Initiative.

The third activity which is our principle activity now is this planning for the growth in terms of how it is going to happen. So we're planning in terms of space. This fall Provost McRobbie formed a task force to plan for the next new Life Sciences building which is termed Life Science 3, hence, we are now rethinking the names of Simon and functions of Simon and MSB2 as Life Sciences 1 and 2 if there is going to be a Life Science 3. That task force is moving along. We'll have its report prepared shortly. The report is to make recommendations about both the recommended location siting for the new building as well as the program for that building; what sort of scientific activities, groups of faculty, would be part of that new building.

The second task force that's not entirely within this Life Science Initiative is going to be a very important part of it, is a task force on developing a plan for developing incubator space for fostering economic development for science-related activities that would have a university component of them. I'm not involved in that task force so I can't really speak directly to that at all. But I believe their report will go shortly to provost McRobbie as well.

And then we were also talking about how this growth will be managed in terms of organizational aspects. Bringing on this many new faculty has implications for how current life science units are structured and organized in their relations to other units, it has implications for units such as my own department Biology, which is a very large department, of approaching 60 tenure-track faculty. If we grow portion to our current size a fraction of life science enterprise on this campus, proportionally to this new growth, we would become perhaps unsustainably large in size and may have to reorganize in certain ways that raise questions. Other units may face similar issues and then there are issues about how, if we're going to grow, if sciences develop rapidly as we move into new frontiers, what are the best ways of bringing together faculty of common interest irrespective of current departmental and school boundaries. We have already faced some of those issues through Commitment to Excellence hires, as well as other hires that transcend different schools such as environmental science and bioinformatics.

This year the College and the Medical School are embarking on a new partnership in hiring. It's very experimental in developing a program in basic cancer biology on this campus, which involves partnering for new faculty hires between the College and the Medical Sciences Program on this campus. So there are a lot of implications here for how we structure and operate across and within schools and colleges on this campus.

Finally, what are the chances of success in inaugurating significant new funds from the state for this initiative? Well, I don't have a crystal ball. Perhaps Provost McRobbie has one. I can say a couple of things which is that none of us would be putting as much energy and time into this if we weren't at least cautiously optimistic that we would get some significant fraction of the funds we are seeking. But of course there is no guarantee of that. From the limited contacts that I've had first hand, directly with people of influence in the state, they seem to accept the idea. From the second hand comments I hear from people like Provost McRobbie, Craig Brater who is VP for Life Sciences, I get the same message that we should be cautiously optimistic that this will happen to some degree. Whether the state gives us all the money that we are asking for the next budget biennium as well as future biennia remains to be seen, but again we wouldn't be here and putting as much time into this if we didn't think something was going to happen of course.

So that's what I have to say. I don't know how much time I took but I'll be happy to take a few questions.

**MCROBBIE:** Questions for Jeff?

**CARINI:** So how do we see the distribution of undergraduate majors on campus changing? Do you expect dozens more, hundreds more, thousands more?

**PALMER:** That's, we expect graduate population to increase dramatically in life sciences in proportion to the faculty role. We don't of course see the Life Sciences Initiative having a direct impact on undergraduate education in terms of numbers. Just in the general reason that you know that the Bloomington campus is really saturated for majors and I think there is some desire to reduce that a little bit given current pressures on space and like resources. On the other hand the initiatives should have very salutary effects for the quality of undergraduate education in life sciences in particularly in terms of affording a much bigger percentage of our undergraduates the chance to engage directly in research as undergraduates. And now there is a real limitation because of the limited number of faculty and departments like biology and psychology each having in order 1000 or more undergraduate majors we simple can't accommodate nearly a fraction of those majors. We would like to have them work in labs or in the field doing research first hand. We can serve a lot more of them. We can also offer a greater number of courses in a lot of areas we are really hard pressed to fill basic courses and we can't offer as many specialty courses. In Biology at least, perhaps in the other units, we have actually reduced our reliance to some extent on lecturers which cover some of the teaching that we do. So there certainly be afforded benefits.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions. Yeah, Bob?

**ENO:** Just to follow-up, I think there are probably going to be very dramatic changes that may not be entirely anticipated in terms of things like undergraduate majors and the way that research patterns in other units begin to become sort of bio-tropic or life science-tropic. We see that up on the IUPUI campus where the medical school is so dominant. If the Life Science established a national reputation on this campus, I expect more of our out of state applicants are going to be applicants who are interested in participating in the life sciences. I think there are a lot of great

things that can happen as a result of the life sciences growth. On the other hand, I think other units will face a lot of unanticipated consequences which may be positive in terms of ways of relating to life sciences, but may also be negative because their enrollments may naturally fall even though their own quality may be very high. This is a tremendous thematic change in the way that the campus is going to be represented within the state and externally as well. And I think as we move along, it is going to be very important to monitor for these changes and realize that we are a healthy campus with a diverse sorts of units. It is going to have to be sustained in other types of ways. This is a great development. I think that this is a great idea. The scale you are talking about is a scale where lots and lots of unanticipated consequences can be anticipated and we have to mobilized to observe them and committed to responding to them.

**MCROBBIE:** Herb?

**TERRY:** As co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, I am glad that you pulled assessments into your plan. Those get lost in the typical budget requests. My question would be sort of related to that. Are you planning, for lack of any other term, adding into your planning the broader impact on the physical plant of this place of these expansions? For example, additional parking, expansion of cold water, hot water heating system, telecommunication systems perhaps? If you are going to offer more classes, more classrooms, that sort of thing?

**PALMER:** Well, a lot of those very basic, but often overlooked, infrastructure issues are already built into requests that are at the Statehouse right now in terms of the capitol priorities requests. There are obviously in terms of the Cyber Infrastructure Building that will have a major sustaining, or pair of buildings, that will have a major sustaining goal for the life science initiatives as well as all other aspects of life on this campus. But another major item of the capitol priorities requests is for basic things like electrical upgrades, new chilling plants for this campus, things that are fundamentally necessary. We have pretty much maxed out on AC capacity on this campus and we cannot continue to bring on new science buildings and so forth without increasing that so that is part of that. We just hope that the state doesn't just go for the glorious new science buildings and forget the part that underlies that.

**MCROBBIE:** Maybe one more question.

**THIBOS:** I have a question. By tying this new academic initiative so closely with the economic development of the state, I can imagine that there must be a lot of pressure for developing some formal mechanisms to prove the success of this initiative. Are there mechanisms being envisioned by which we will be able to measure the outcome of this initiative on state growth?

**PALMER:** Well we have benchmarks literally in terms of job creation but I think and we're working with people very closely on that in terms of what I think are very conservative benchmarks. In terms of direct job creation, we make the argument to people in the Statehouse that each new scientist brought on board is equivalent to bringing in a new small business. These scientists develop, bring in external funding, and create a lab group of people that represents new jobs. We project that across the university on the order of 3000 new jobs directly from upwards of 500 new scientists and members of their research groups and those are pretty conservative assumptions in terms of the average group size. Then there are multiplier effects in terms of

indirect jobs that are created for the initiative and then what we hope. And this is much more ballpark crystal ball aspect of how all this new research activity in terms of creating a larger and more vibrant life sciences academic unit in the state of Indiana how will that pay off in terms fostering the growth of new companies and bigger companies. And there projections have been made which are much more open to question about but I think they are fairly conservative reports. Whether we will hit any big winners within our lifetimes will be the INGEN much less the Lilly's in terms of size and of jobs created. There is an element of tying it into economic growth and in terms of our projections for our budgetary models for the Bloomington campus we've tried to do that in a way that we will continue to hire basic scientists and at the same time we wouldn't discourage them from doing transitional or even applied research. Our emphasis is still going to be on the basic research and we are not going to sacrifice that at any kind of alter of economic growth.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks very much, Jeff.

## **AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** Let's move on with Agenda Item 2 which is Agenda Committee Business. Ted?

**MILLER:** Yes, well, I guess I have a couple things that I would like to mention to you here today. One has to do with the presidential search. The Search Committee, as many of you know, met maybe two weeks ago, I am not sure exactly, somewhere within the last couple of weeks, and essentially terminated its operation by forwarding to the Trustees a list of candidates that the committee felt would be acceptable candidates. My understanding is that the Trustees at their meeting last week discussed the candidates that were forwarded to them. And I was not privy to this discussion but my understanding is that there was such a discussion. Currently the chair of the Search Committee, Sue Talbot who is a Trustee, is calling around talking to the members of the Search Committee, to the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee about the conclusions that the Trustees have come to regarding the candidates that were forwarded to them. So they are gathering information from, they are kind of testing what their initial thoughts are about that with the Faculty Advisory Committee, with the Search Committee. That is my understanding of where the process stands. My sense is that this search is moving forward quite rapidly. I am not sure exactly when we are going to hear anything about it, but its moving. So that would be my report on the search.

Second item, Kelly sent you a couple things that I asked her to forward. One of them is a letter from the IUPUI faculty to the—it was addressed, I believe, to the new President of Indiana University and to the Trustees of Indiana University. The IUPUI faculty has some points that they want to make that revolve around the reorganization that the Trustees undertook about a year ago now. It is quite clear that they are not happy with the reorganization and then the letter also has a good bit to say about – at least the way that I interpreted it – about the mission of the IUPUI campus within the overall scheme of Indiana University. This is something that may turn out to be consequential. I am not really sure exactly what is going to happen. I wanted you all to be aware of the fact that the IUPUI faculty is making certain presentations to the Trustees. I have a chance at the Trustees meetings to make comments about whatever it is I want to make

comments about. And I chose to talk at this last meeting about this letter basically. And I tried to make a couple of points. The most important one I think, at least from some points of view, the most important one had to do with the idea—I am not sure that everybody shares this with me—but I tried to reinforce with the Trustees how important I thought the reorganization was for the Bloomington campus. That in principle anyway, although I don't think that we have necessarily kind of gotten all the way through what might be done within the scope of the re-organization. But in principle the reorganization was viewed as very beneficial to the Bloomington campus. The idea that it would be abandoned in favor of the old model, I tried to suggest to them would be very problematic. I also had a few words to say about the mission of the IUPUI campus which I don't think, I am not sure that I am a very popular figure at IUPUI actually right now. But nonetheless we might come back to this mission idea a little later on.

We have this item about the core campus and the system schools and I have come to think that there is some sort of fundamental relationship between that item and these mission ideas. From some points of view the mission, the IUPUI mission appeared to be settled. We went through the mission differentiation. Bloomington created a new mission statement that was approved by the Trustees. IUPUI created a new mission statement which was approved by the Trustees. From some points of view, it appeared that that was settled but it really now appears that both from the point of view of this letter and also I think one of the other things that I sent you was the draft of the framework from the Commission for Higher Education. I am not sure if you got into that, but the framework is really the document that sets out from the states' point of view what the mission of the various campuses is. And it seems to me that the mission at least envisioned in this draft framework for IUPUI and the mission as envisioned by the faculty of IUPUI are not necessarily together. So I have a feeling that we are going to hear more about this and that is really why I am talking about it hear today. We are going to hear more about IUPUI, what its mission is, what role does it play in the overall scheme of things. I think that this is a general topic that the Bloomington faculty should give a little bit of thought to.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** Let's move on to Agenda Item #3. I really don't have any major items to report on. We moved closer to finalizing a number of the searches. It was only a week ago when I reported to you on that so they are not quite finalized.

**MILLER:** I'm sorry. I have one additional item that I should mention. One of the things that happens on the campus, one of the things that we do is we review academic deans under policies of the Bloomington Faculty Council. I just wanted to announce to you that this year the dean that was scheduled for review, actually I believe he was scheduled for review last year and it was deferred to this year for reasons that I am not sure that I quite understand. But the dean that was scheduled for review is the Dean for the School of Music. I am pleased to announce, although it has taken quite a bit of time to get reorganized—administrative transitions have a way of sort of slowing down the works—but the review for the Dean of the School of Music is underway in a sense. It is not actually underway but the committee is about to be appointed and it will get underway. We have names. We are going to submit names to the committee members, the Provost, the Provost will appoint the committee and it will be underway.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

**MCROBBIE:** Let me move on to questions. There are a number of questions that were sent to me. One about the President's fund from Jim Capshew asking about this. The President's fund came out of the review of RCM last year, the first half of 2006. It was one of the recommendations that a President's fund be established that was similar in kind to the Provost's fund on this campus and the fund that the IUPUI Chancellor has to use for university priorities. You asked how was the new money defined and how is it to be obtained. It is to be financed by a 12.5 percent tax that's leveled annually on the growth of budgeted income. Budget income is defined as the sum of the general fund budgeted income and the sum of other areas including medical practice funds and unrestricted budget income from auxiliary enterprises and so on. Internal service centers are excluded from this. You ask are there any exceptions? The only exceptions announced to date is the special state appropriation that is being requested for the life sciences. I could ask if Neil would like to add, Neil has been involved in some of the follow-up RCM committees, whether Neil might like to add to those comments as response.

**THEOBALD:** Well I'd say the most important thing is that the 12.5 percent on new income is simply how the tax comes to us. Based on our new income last year the tax would be about \$4.5 million dollars for the Bloomington Campus. Within the campus, we will develop our own process for raising that \$4.5 million dollars. Consultation with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the Dean's Advisory Committee, are the normal players in this kind of conversation. So once we know what the amount is, we begin discussions of different ways to allocate that among units. But it is, we do not use some kind of mechanistic budgeting process where we simply take the tax that's given to us and pass them along to the units. I can assure you that won't be the process. There are expenditures on this campus that we would not tax. We would not want to do that. And there are things that we might want to tax that wouldn't be covered by this. So that's the key point I think, that there's a significant amount of money that we have to assess out like any other assessment. You think \$4.5 million sounds like a lot of money. We assessed \$213 million this year. We are going to give physical plants \$55 million. It's not a small amount of money but when you put it in the context of bigger amounts that we are already dealing with, it's a large chunk of change. It won't be tremendously disruptive as part of the operation. Are there any questions, is that clear? We're hoping that we're going to get all of it and more back.

**HENKE:** I just have a question. For the money that is assessed upon all these auxiliary services and other areas across campus, does that not ensure that that \$4.5 million is then allocated to areas to improve on this campus? Can it be used university-wide?

**THEOBALD:** It's university-wide. We're \$4.5 million, IUPUI will be a little less than \$4 million, university administration will be about \$500,000, and then the rest will be between all the regionals. So that will be about \$9.5 million. All of that will go to the president. He could spend it all in Bloomington, which I think will be a very good use of the funds, or he might choose to spend it elsewhere. But no, it's all at the university-level and allocated by the president. But we will, when the process for putting together the President's Fund Proposal are announced, we will have a robust proposal to get out money back.

**HENKE:** I would think so because a lot of those campuses don't have auxiliary services, they don't have those different types of areas that are going to be generating income. So I would think that if we are trying to operate most efficiently and channel our ways into operating like that, I would think that that kind of deviates away from that; it's just sending money all over.

**MILLER:** If I could just add a comment to this. We did, at the UFC Agenda Committee, last time have a pretty focused discussion with the president over faculty consultation regarding expenditures of the President's Fund money. We know that in Bloomington we have a Budgetary Affairs Committee that advises the Provost in several matters and we encouraged very strongly the president to work on developing similar mechanisms for his fund. That I'm sure is a recommendation that will be carried forward to a new administration, to a new president's administration. I think most of the faculty feel that this will be a very very useful thing.

**ENO:** If you're talking about a new mechanism of faculty involvement with the President's Fund comparable to what we have with the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Provost's Fund, I think it is important that any mechanism distinguish between a UFC-level involvement and campus-specific involvement and include both because I think the UFC would not be an adequate vehicle to try to determine the types of priority reallocations among different campuses that the President's Fund will involve. But I agree with you that you need a mechanism like that, it would have to have campus-specific involvement as well and university-level.

**MILLER:** Well I think that's a very good point, actually. One of the things we know I think from our historical record is that programs that are developed at a university-level and dropped down on the campuses—some of them may be perfectly wonderful but it's not clear that they really do contribute optimally within the campus environment to achieving the goals of the campus. I think that's an excellent point you make.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** At the Trustees meeting last week President Herbert announced that every campus has to find a way to go smoke free...[End Tape 1, Side A]

**MCROBBIE:** I had a couple more to deal with me. Let me deal with these. There is nothing more on the Presidents Fund from anybody? The second thing was that my office was trying to follow-up with Dan Rives this week to get a response on the question that Murray asked last time. We weren't able to reach him. However, in the process of doing that, we discovered that Dan had a meeting with the BFC Fringe Benefits Committee. It may be the case that Professor Johnson, I think was at that meeting and may want to comment on what Dan had to say, if not or if you prefer to leave it, I hope to get something from Dan that we can send out electronically this week as an update. Any comments on that?

**JOHNSON:** Really all we know for sure is that, and this is on their website, that a proposal was sent to the Bloomington Hospital by Anthem on January 30 and so far there has not been a response to that. I am hoping that Dan will answer you maybe in writing and you can send it out.

**MCROBBIE:** That is what I want to do. And finally Bill, I got your note having been in meetings most of the day. I got your note. I asked Roger Thompson to respond to this but I think Roger is on the road at the moment. We will get you a response in writing on the questions that you raise as well. Herb?

**TERRY:** Ok, thank you. As I said, at the Trustees meeting the President announced that every campus must by October submit a plan for how it is going to become smoke-free. And it looks to me that is consistent with action 7.2 in the Life Sciences Initiative to reduce the prevalence of smoking. I am just wondering how, given the summer break and everything else how you plan to organize that task and meet the October deadline?

**MCROBBIE:** I think at the moment, as the CEO of the campus, I think the President himself is going to be handling that. And I literally haven't had a chance to discuss it with him. But I think he may want to handle this himself. I believe there is a committee that I think Dick McKaig has been involved in that he may want to use. That Dick was either chairing or setting it up that he may want to use for this purpose. I can take that one onto him and try to get you a response on that.

**ROHWER:** The smoke-free committee meets February 14.

**MCROBBIE:** Right and I think it has to be charged with putting this policy in place but I am not absolutely certain.

**ROHWER:** It is.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay that answers your question, Herb. We are probably timed out for questions.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COMPOSITION REPORT**

**MCROBBIE:** Let me move to Agenda Item #5 on the Faculty Composition Report that Kevin and Ted are going to talk about.

**MILLER:** Well before I do that, the items that were on my Agenda Committee report are slowly coming to mind as I go through the meeting here. I did want to just mention that the general education report was giving to the Trustees. The President made a statement about general education activities and the Trustees seem comfortable with the situation as it was described for them. So I think that is a good thing for the faculty of the university. I did want to say however that our action last time where we basically asked our Provost to undertake an assessment of the implementation of the gen ed program and to think through the various complications of the timing of this, this action by the Faculty Council was very much appreciated by the Trustees. I think that they appreciated not only because they thought it was a reasonable thing to do. But they also appreciated it because they felt that it was a very slick move on the part of the faculty to stick Michael with this task. I was sitting at that meeting in the committee where this discussion was ongoing and all year long we have been having these discussions about general education and the eyes of the Trustees have always been on me. When this proposal was explained to them, all of their eyes shifted to Michael. And I just thought it was a great moment.

I just loved it.

**MCROBBIE:** What I said was that the complexities of gen ed were that Ted decided that they were beneath him and he was moving on to world peace for his next project.

**MILLER:** Well, ok. We now have in front of you the campus report on faculty composition. The first page is the page that we were looking at last week. It's kind of the campus summary. Then we have a segment of the report. Please note that it didn't quite get printed exactly the way I think that we were intended to print it. So we will make some additional copies of this. On the webpage it appears in a reasonable way, I think. But anyway we have it broken down please note by RC. It turns out that some of the academic appointments on the Bloomington campus are not made within the context of academic units. They are made within the context of other units on the campus. There aren't a tremendous number of such appointments but that kind of accounts for the structure of this report. Jeanne can perhaps explain to us generally what this is about. And then we have finally at the end, we have the report for the College of Arts and Sciences broken down by department and you will note that the format of that report is not the same. This is just the College information is just the 2006 information. We don't have sort of the timeline 2003-2006 as we do in other parts of the report.

Now one of things that is interesting in this report, it seems to me, if you kind of take the first two parts of it together, there was a discussion last time about the fact that there were 87 new tenure-track faculty members on the Bloomington campus over this period 2003 to 2006, 87 new tenure-track faculty members. Seems like a nice number. If you look at the details of this within the RC report you will find that the majority of those are within the School of Informatics. Fully 51 of the 87 are in the School of Informatics. That's not true, John?

**CARINI:** 20 of those were from Computer Science.

**MILLER:** I suppose that is maybe right, 20 of them are computer scientists. The other unit that has some significant growth is the College of Arts and Sciences. The total is 29 different over the 3-year period. If you take the 51 and the 29, you are pretty close to the total of 80 that we have in the report. So the implication of that is clearly that most of the rest of the units on the campus are pretty stable from this point of view. And if you look at each one of them in turn, you will see that a couple of them go up a couple, a couple of them go down a couple. There really is not much going on outside of the College and outside of Informatics. And I will just say that when Michael gave a speech a couple weeks ago now to the Rotary Club in Bloomington where he had a seven-item list of issues that were important in his frame of thinking about the university. One of them had to do with the idea that the faculty of the campus is in a major transition. Lots of people are retiring. I am not sure exactly how these data are generated, but a fairly substantial proportion will be returning over the next 5 years or 10 years or whatever it is. And given the stability of the campus in many of its units I think this just reemphasizes how crucial it is that we do this faculty transition in the best possible way with a clear objective of improving the quality of the faculty in everyway that we possibly can. It is a fabulous opportunity for the campus and its one I think that, in a way, the importance of it is really highlighted in a way by this report.

**MCROBBIE:** The figure is almost half the tenured faculty members on this campus will turn over in less than ten years. That's the figure.

**MILLER:** Is that right, half?

**MCROBBIE:** Just under half.

**MILLER:** Well, that is what I wanted to say about this. Most people in the room are going to be in that group.

**BOBAY:** What's going to happen to the Faculty Council?

**MCROBBIE:** The wind is blowing through this room.

**MILLER:** There is one other thing; we had a discussion last time about the clinical category and the report shows us that there are now 94 clinical appointments on the Bloomington campus. Arts and Sciences has 22 of these although 15 of those are in Speech and Hearing Sciences, which is one of the units where we would, I think, expect to see such appointments. Business has 22, Optometry has 13—another unit where we would expect to see clinical appointments—HPER has 12, SPEA has 7, Education has 8, Law has 3 and Music has 1. If you look at the Arts and Science and the Business numbers—Jeanne, I wonder if this could really be right. Do you think the Arts and Science Dean and the Business Dean have a meeting every year to decide how many, because if you look at the numbers in Arts and Science and the numbers in Business, over these four years, they are identical. It's like there's some pact.

**SEPT:** It's all in the stars.

**MILLER:** I don't know if that's a real coincidence of whether there's something, I'm not sure. I just noticed that earlier this afternoon and I was struck by the similarity.

**MCROBBIE:** Anything else Ted or that or Kevin do you want to add anything?

**HUNT:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok, any questions on Agenda Item 5 on this matter?

**MILLER:** I will just say one other thing, we talked last time about the possibility of going ahead and meeting with the deans and talking generally about these non-tenure track categories.

**MCROBBIE:** I'm trying to get that organized.

**MILLER:** I have come to believe that it would be very useful as kind of a preliminary set of information to that meeting, if we actually could find out what it is that the faculty with instructional responsibilities on the Bloomington campus, what those faculty are actually doing with regard to instruction. In other words, who actually is doing the teaching on this campus and what kind of teaching are they doing? Before the age of PeopleSoft, we actually had decent data

about this but we have not, since the PeopleSoft started off, we have really not been able to get good information about any information. Not even bad information I don't think, although I don't know. Steve Keucher produces a report every year that is somewhat related to this. But I really think it would be useful for us to know across the academic units, what kinds of courses are being taught by what kinds of academic appointees. I presume that each dean could generate such a report themselves if they needed to, even if we can't have a campus-level query.

**MCROBBIE:** Let's see if we can do this; let's see if we can get the campus-level information.

**MILLER:** I just think it would be—that's such fundamental information. I just think it would be extremely useful.

**MCROBBIE:** If Kelly could put that on the list of things she will remind me about. Let's see if we can generate that information. I'll be amazed if we can't get it out of PeopleSoft. Maybe it'll take some work or something but it should be possible. Yes, Bill?

**WHEELER:** I wonder if it is possible to get an explanation from those variations in the College of Arts and Sciences. I assume that one of the things there was the shift of the members of the Computer Science department to Informatics. I'm wondering if that is what accounts to the difference between fall of 2004 and fall of 2005. Then I'm wondering whether if in fact the Computer Science faculty had not been moved out, I assume that we would have been increasing every year rather than going off some 74 update or some and up and down, which would say that there would have been an increasing trend over the entire four-year period and I'm wondering what accounts for that increasing trend. Is that perhaps the Commitment to Excellence funding?

**MCROBBIE:** I would speculate that is CTE funding. I speculate that it's two things, I defer to Neil on this but two things; one is CTE and the other is that as indirect income rises, then the dean makes a certain base commitment against that indirect income in terms of hiring new faculty and external funding in the College has continued to rise and I think from memory around 8% a year or something like that. So that probably accounts for some of them. Do you want to comment Neil?

**THEOBALD:** 48 tenure faculty members have been hired from the CTE. So a large share of those went in the College. That would be my information to add.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6: FACULTY GOVERNANCE REPRESENTATION FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

**MCROBBIE:** Ok, Agenda Item 6 on representation and faculty governance for non-tenure track faculty. This is Kevin and Ted, in that order or the reverse order?

**MILLER:** Well, I'm looking at the clock. I'm thinking really that is we could defer this item until our next meeting, I think there would be no particular loss to that.

**MCROBBIE:** Does anybody want to put that to a vote or just take that as agreed? Agenda item 6 will be deferred to the next meeting then.

## **AGENDA ITEM #7: REVIEW OF IU'S CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL OPERATIONS**

**MCROBBIE:** So that moves us to agenda item 7, the review of the core campus and system school operation at the university. It's a pretty important report. Ted, do you want to open this?

**MILLER:** I'll just say that this is a report that was completed, this says September 2006, maybe so. But it's a fairly recent origin and my sense is that the president has taken this under consideration and is going to make some kind of recommendation to the Trustees. Whether he does that at this next meeting, I'm not really quite sure, possibly at the next meeting. The report has been discussed within the context of the University Faculty Council where it may be seen as a more core document perhaps at that level. I just thought that it would be of use to just have possibly even a brief discussion here, just to alert the campus faculty that there is something going on with regard to these core and system schools, and possibly some significant changes in the organization of these things.

The executive summary of the document is on page 2 and then there are some recommended actions over the next couple of pages. In general, if you look at what this says, at least the way it comes through to me, is that to the extent that we have academic units in Indiana University that are so-called system units, that is to say that they operate on more than two campuses, I think that's generally speaking, the definition of a system school; you have to operate on more than Bloomington and Indianapolis. Once you get beyond the confines of Bloomington and Indianapolis you are a system school. If you are in only Bloomington and Indianapolis you are a core campus school.

With regard to the system schools, this report seems to be saying that perhaps the system schools have lived a useful life and perhaps we ought to reconsider whether we should have such units. Basically this is opening the door, particularly on the regional campuses, for those campuses to decide whether they want to continue to participate in a system school context. Of course my school is one of the system schools. I think SPEA has faculty on 6 or 7 campuses now. Essentially, the campuses are now thinking about whether they want to continue to be part of SPEA as a system school or whether they want to be an independent school. My sense is that in South Bend they are very seriously considering being an independent thing. On the other hand, on the Northwest campus, they seem to be very interested in maintaining a relationship with the school. This is just an example of what seems to be going on and this report seems to be saying that it's time to think about things like that. Just how it's all going to shake out isn't clear I don't think at this moment. But that is something that is really going on.

With regard to the core campus schools, the report is a little harder to read exactly what the intentions of the drafting committee really have in mind here. On the one hand they seem to be saying that, if you look for example on page 2 down at the second paragraph from the bottom, at the end of that paragraph they seem to be saying maybe even in the core campus situation we shouldn't necessarily force schools to remain core campus schools if they don't want to. But at the same time there is a lot of stuff in here that seems very positive about the core campus model, about the utility of that model. You can also see it in that second last paragraph on page 2. The

overall tone of the report seems to be that maintaining the core campus schools is probably, on balance, a good thing. Maintaining the system schools, well, maybe if we don't have those maybe there's not much to be lost. That in general is the way it comes through to me.

I want to connect this backup with what I said earlier today about the IUPUI mission and so forth. If you look at this second last paragraph on the bottom, right in the middle of the bottom of page 2, right in the middle there is a sentence that says "we think there is an opportunity for enhancing Indiana University's mission accomplishment if the professional schools using this model, the core campus model, in Bloomington and Indianapolis explore ways in which they can become better integrated." It isn't clear to me, in the context of this Mission Differentiation idea, this is the point I wanted to make to you today, it isn't clear to me that the Indiana University mission is really—I mean there is an Indiana University mission. You may recall that as we were going through this Mission Differentiation business, at the end of the day, there was a university mission that was structured. There wasn't a whole lot of focus on that I don't think. Most of the effort was in developing the campus missions. It isn't clear to me that the university mission, which is really where this report is kind of hanging its hat, it isn't clear to me that that's where the hat should be hung with regard to this issue. It seems to me that we really ought to be thinking about the campus missions, primarily, and whether the core campus concept facilitates the campus missions or not. That to me I think is a much more important question than whether some general university mission is enhanced. I'm not sure what the general university mission is. This is the thought I wanted to be sure to say to you.

Indianapolis appears to want to be, as they should, the best possible university they can be. I really think that an essential part of Indianapolis being the best possible university that it can be involves having a set of professional schools typically focused on graduate professional education, at least in many ways focused on graduate professional education, having professional schools that are as strong as they can possibly be. I really think that would be in the best interest of the Indianapolis campus. It is not clear to me that that can be accomplished within a framework where most of the deans of these schools are sitting in Bloomington. It is not clear to me that we can accomplish that with the dean sitting in Bloomington. So I'm really not sure that this core campus stuff is actually something that is in the interest of Indiana University anymore. Now, I have to say that this is a fairly recent thought. I've been thinking about this over the weekend and this is kind of where I've come down and I'd be interested in any comments that you would like to make on that or any other aspect of this particular situation.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments on this report in general. Bob?

**ENO:** Mostly commenting on your comments, Ted, because I haven't been able to pile my way through the report past the executive summary. It seems to me that when these schools were founded, when the various campuses were set up initially outside of Bloomington, there were varieties of reasons why they were a good idea. I think they were a good idea. I still think that they may be a very good idea. But part of that model was that this campus was going to be a nurturing center, an anchor for campuses that had to find their missions, find their way to find their confidences over time. Many of us are aware that some campuses have accomplished and gone a long way down that road, the fact that you mention that South Bend may not be interested in participating in a system school anymore is no surprise. South Bend has been for some time

very much aimed at becoming much more of an independent campus and I think that's probably a very good thing for South Bend.

One of the objections to the model over time that Bloomington in particular should be kind of a nurturing vehicle as campuses outgrew this model, we became much more of an impediment in the view of the other campuses. Whether we were in fact or whether we weren't, that was certainly the view and that had a lot to do with the tensions that focused around the chancellor's position on this campus over the last decade or so.

I think that the system that we have right now where we have multiple campuses all around the state with a variety of ties to them is extremely productive of the possibility of having opportunistic possibilities that faculty on all campuses can take advantage of as they come up in unpredictable ways and I think we want to maintain good ties among the campuses and in some cases that has to do with administrative ties. But I do think that, responding to your comment, we have to be able to recognize when campuses are experiencing the joint models that have been set up as impediments. So I think what we should be aiming for is to preserve as much as possible to come up with the possibility of opportunistic occasions where faculty at all campuses are able to find that their work is enhanced because they can connect around the state in ways that it's harder to do if you have multiple different institutions. You might not know about it, or you find that there are administrative obstacles, but we can probably lessen that and at the same time trying to recognize where those administrative ties may have become counterproductive. So I think it's a good point that you raise this issue and I think probably there is no one model that will fit the various schools and this report's basic thrust, the way I read it, was that we ought to reexamine all of the core schools as well as the system schools, and we ought to rationalize them for the time period we're in now and be flexible as we move into the future and that very fuzzy approach seems to me to be the appropriate approach.

**MCROBBIE:** David?

**MACKAY:** One result of IT seems to be the importance of place is diminishing. We certainly see this in some situations. Why is it so important to you?

**MILLER:** Why is what so important to me?

**MACKAY:** The issue of place, in your comments about the deans might be better situated in Indianapolis.

**MILLER:** No I didn't say the deans would be better situated in Indianapolis. What I said was that—I'm thinking about the current structure. We have in these core campus schools, the deans by and large, not all of them. But by and large, they are situated in Bloomington. I've been listening to my IUPUI colleagues kind of rail against their current situation. They really feel like they are being suppressed somehow, may be by the trustees, may be by the president, may be by the Bloomington faculty, may be by the Bloomington administration. But they have a very definite feeling that they are not on a path to be as good as they can be, and they want to be. This is a dimension of it that just comes through to me. The principle idea about having these multiple campuses, certainly one of the ideas about having multi-campus units was that the campuses

were relatively immature when this started in the early 1970s. The campuses were relatively immature and having this leadership in Bloomington was viewed as something that would really be very useful. I'm just not sure that we're—I just think that we're kind of past the point where that is a reasonable argument.

If you're interpretation is—it's not that I think that your interpretation is incorrect. I see the report as pushing a little bit more for this core campus model, maintaining the core campus model. I think that would be the definite preference of this group. I'm just not so sure that we really should. If everybody interprets the report the way you did Bob, that we're going to look at each individual situation before we make general decisions, if we're going to look at each situation and evaluate it, figure out what is best, taking into account what the IUPUI faculty are thinking about in these matters, then I think it will all end up being quite alright.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments from anybody. Yes, Lisa?

**PRATT:** Ted, could you perhaps clarify what your understanding is of the document and the ground rules that were used with regard to this issue in the search for the new president because I was quite taken aback when I opened that letter from the IUPUI faculty this morning and tried to imagine how that letter would be received by somebody considering the position of the presidency and if they've been recruited under the model of IUB as a flagship campus and suddenly they see a very angry letter from the second largest campus. Is this potentially a problem and do you know to what extent the search committee has raised this issue with potential president candidates?

**MILLER:** Well, my sense is, well certainly in the job description, the nature of the job was clearly articulated, that the president is the chief executive officer in Bloomington and also of Indiana University in general. Most of the people who are candidates for this job have been around. They understand institutions of higher education and they knew, most of them knew that this was something that probably did not sit very well in Indianapolis. I think it's something that the candidates were certainly aware of. I'm not sure, the letter emerged rather later on in the scheme of things and I'm not sure actually how many of the candidates really saw that letter.

**PRATT:** And along that same vein, can you reconcile it? Like Bob I just can't get through this on the spur of the moment, but can you reconcile the language of this document with the Mission Differentiation language? Are they saying the same thing or are they saying two different things?

**MILLER:** I think this report was written by group that was blissfully unaware of Mission Differentiation, by and large.

**PRATT:** I notice that Maynard is sitting right now over my shoulder.

**MILLER:** Well, I'm not sure that these two things were done like that.

**PRATT:** Okay.

**MILLER:** I'm really not sure that they were. But I wasn't really involved closely in either of them.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** Being in the College, I don't have any direct experience with the situations in the core schools and I guess I can appreciate hearing some discussion from faculty in those schools. One question that occurs to me, you asked if all the schools on the issue, can Indianapolis become all that it could become, if there are core campus schools. I always look for test cases for those types of issues and it seems to me that it really is relevant to think about the Bloomington Law School and the Indianapolis Law School as the situation where you actually do have different schools. And then perhaps to look at the School of Business where we have a core school that somehow reflecting on those alternatives helps to inform the discussion, it would also be nice to hear from the School of Optometry and from the School of Education, I think. Maybe members of the core schools would like to comment?

**OCHOA:** I can certainly talk about what I have seen and heard as far as the core campus approach or issues in the School of Education, from what I have seen, has not been all that positive. There are difficulties getting the schools to really work together. So we share the same dean but as Ted was indicating earlier, the fact the dean of both campuses sits here, creates some tension with the other faculty who I think for the most part view themselves as the step child.

There are some issues also related to the distribution of benefits. Again, they see themselves getting the short end of the stick. So in the six years I have been here, I have yet to hear anything positive as far as the relationship between the two. That's also not to say however, that there has been extensive discussion about separating. I don't even know if that's an option but there has been some difficulty within the School of Education as far as interacting with each other.

**MILLER:** Of course, the School of Education is mentioned in the draft as kind of a problematic case in effect.

**OCHOA:** A case with challenges.

**MILLER:** With regard to my school Bill, I may have said this to you before but when I came to SPEA in the mid-1970s, it was a system school, a genuine system school, the faculty was a system faculty and we met together routinely. Now, things have changed dramatically over those thirty years particularly with the onset of the RCM. Today SPEA is a set of essentially separate faculties. But there is a single dean sitting in Bloomington. If the idea that seems to be set forth here, if SPEA were to become a core campus school, and if it were going to have this kind of integrated character to it, there would have to be a tremendous effort made to make that happen. Everything that's happened in the last fifteen years has been going in the other direction. To turn that around now, to make something really great out of it, I think it would be extremely difficult, maybe not impossible but extremely difficult. Business may have a different...your idea about looking at each case individually is where we need to be. I hope that's where this ends up. I really hope that that's where this ends up because we have different cases.

**MACKAY:** I may be naïve but I think the Business School is very positive. We have things, for example, the Entrepreneurship Center in Bloomington which a lot of Indy faculty participate in. We have Kelley Direct, which is a way we deliver distributed education, which goes through Indy and a huge number of Bloomington faculty participate in that.

We used to have some difficulty when Indianapolis faculty felt they were being unfairly evaluated for promotion and tenure by Bloomington standards. But that no longer occurs; it's primarily an Indy-based promotion and tenure process. That source of friction I think has largely disappeared. Much of the national and international reputation of the School of Business is based upon Bloomington and the Indianapolis faculty very much enjoy being a part of that. So at least from my perspective, it's a very positive situation. But we should probably talk with those in Indianapolis and see if I'm giving it a more positive twist than perhaps it deserves.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Yes Bill.

**WHEELER:** I speculate that there's probably significant benefit to the students with this system because what it means is that it facilitates their being able to transfer between campuses; that the school exists on various campuses with comparable degree requirements. It certainly has helped students go back and forth between Bloomington and Indianapolis and between Bloomington and other campuses for example for work in summer or if they decide for financial reasons or personal reasons to after a year or tow in Bloomington to go back to another campus to finish their degrees.

**MILLER:** But the degree requirements in SPEA, at the beginning they were all the same everywhere. That's not the case anymore. We have an accreditation process, like every other professional program, we are accredited by certain organization. Each of the campuses is accredited separately. The curriculums are all different these days and really there's not much glue in the system, from my perspective.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other questions? One of our goals was to try and get away a little bit early given the weather. Any other questions or discussion on this matter from anybody?

Okay, there being no further questions, are there any standing committee reports, I don't believe so but are there any? Is that all old business, any new business? We're adjourned. Thank you very much

Meeting adjourned at 5:06pm.