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1. Approval of Minutes
November 29, 2005
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/minutes/11.29.05.htm

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Adam Herbert)
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Professors Bart Ng and Theodore Miller)

4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)  
(President Herbert and Professors Ng and Miller)

5. Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and Guidelines for Campus Admissions Policies  
(ACTION ITEM) (15 minutes)  
(Professors Elizabeth Jones and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs, Educational Policies Committee)  
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U9-2006.htm

6. Search and Screen Procedures for Administrators (DISCUSSION) (30 minutes)  
(Professors Bart Ng and Ted Miller, Co-Secretaries)  
Memo from Board of Trustees: http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U10-2006.htm

7. University Reorganization (DISCUSSION) (90 minutes)  
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U11-2006.htm

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: We’re all over the state of Indiana today. Let me begin by asking if there is a motion to approve the minutes of the November 29th UFC meeting?

COFFIN: So moved.

HERBERT: It’s been moved, is there a second? [Second] Any corrections, comments, if not they will stand approved as written.

In the interest of time and recognizing that there may be a number of questions that you will want to address to Bart, Ted and me, I’m going to give up the 10 minutes allocated to me for presiding officer’s business so that we can respond. There may be some interest particularly in some changes that have been made, adopted, by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on the 14th. So, let me just pass now and turn it over to Bart and Ted to see if either of you have anything.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

NG: Again, I don’t have any report except that I want to point out that we actually have one extra item on the agenda that we want to--as an information item and also as a discussion item; this has to do with the guidelines for graduate programs, that is missing on your agenda. So unless I hear any objects then we shall include that item on the agenda.
HERBERT: Hearing none.

NG: Hearing none. So that item will go on the agenda following number 6. That will be an item on guidelines for graduate programs. That should be included in your packet.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Okay, we’re now at the point for questions and comments and the three of us are available to respond to any that you might have.

MILLER: Could I just say, I think the intent of the agenda is to make item four into what you might think of as a kind of a regular question and comment period and item number seven is meant to be more one focused on the university reorganization issue. So initially in question four, I think we want to hold back on the university reorganization questions for now.

HERBERT: Any questions or comments, anything from any of the campuses? Okay, hearing none, Bart what is the first item that you want to discuss today?

AGENDA ITEM #5: POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

NG: The first item that we have on the agenda is the Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and Guidelines for Campus Admission policies and I will invite Elizabeth Jones and Bill Wheeler to bring us that item.

WHEELER: Thank you. So Betty and I met with members of the UFC-EPC during the meeting of the Agenda Committee. I’d like to begin by…

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can you go to the microphone?

NG: I neglected to actually remind everybody that when you speak to go to that microphone so that all the people on other campuses can hear.

WHEELER: We can do that. Alright. So, Betty and I have met with members of the UFC-EPC who are present here today and we also received suggestions for some friendly amendments from the Agenda Committee that we accept. So first I would like them to indicate for you several very small changes in the document and then say briefly there are a few changes to the copy that you have that was posted on the UFC website yesterday.

So as a friendly amendment from the Agenda Committee on the first page, the second paragraph, the one sentence paragraph, although that would be the first paragraph in the Handbook, the sentence that begins “The faculty of each campus shall set the policies and standards for
admission of students to that campus consistent with Indiana Code”. So where you have the word campus, insert the words “consistent with Indiana Code.”

The next paragraph, the one that says “Beginning with the fall semester” and which concludes with a reference to specific Indiana Code 20.12.17.5 is struck. And the next paragraph begins “In order to establish a minimum level of uniformity” on the third line of that in the copy that was distributed here today following the words “the faculties of the campuses of Indiana University”, replace the word “should” with “are encouraged to”. So, it should then read “The faculties of the campuses of Indiana University are encouraged to follow the template and guidelines” and so forth. Those then are the amendment suggested and proposed by the Agenda Committee which the Committee is pleased to accept.

The one other change in the printed copy that you have before you, Betty proposed this and the Committee accepted it, on page 2 in Section 2, Academic Preparation. The second sentence is modified as follows: in front of the words “Indiana University” and prior to the verb “has adopted”, insert parenthesis, italics, insert campus, close parenthesis. The point here is to indicate that, you know, this is from that point, you know, beginning at the very bottom of the first page where it says Template and Guidelines, what we had is a collection of a template form but people can kind of cut and paste guidelines and perhaps rationales in there and we want to make clear that in adopting this that the sentence that previously said “Indiana University has adopted”, that that was part of what would be customized by each campus rather than suggesting that there was in fact a university-wide policy on these matters. And so again the first sentence in Section 2, Academic Preparation, should appear as “Indiana University (insert campus). So for example, in Bloomington we would end up saying something like Indiana University Bloomington has adopted and at IU East it might say Indiana University Richmond has adopted. At Indianapolis they might say Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis has adopted. The point there being that this portion of the Template and Guidelines are things that we expect each campus to adapt to their own specific needs and so that’s the reason for those changes.

We’ve made a few other changes in this document in comparison to your document as reported to the Council in November appear in italics and if you have a color copy in blue, some things have been struck out, we are trying to address first the Agenda Committee’s concern which states explicitly a policy matter for each campus faculty to adopt, to set the standards of trying to address the concern about what is the guideline rather than saying templates and guidelines rather than just saying a policy or something of that nature. We have attempted to respond to Marty’s concern in that section number 2, he had been concerned about the phrase “or required”. We have clarified that with the sentence that comes thereafter.

We have been following the state code which is worded to Indiana residents, rather than students that attend high school in Indiana. We have inserted on the next page a sentence about completing a high school diploma. We have then separated out the paragraphs called First time undergraduate students in response to the Harold’s concern from the last time about being explicit about what was expected of home schooled students. We have taken that and put in the part about home school and put those in an entirely separate paragraph. Finally at the very end of the document, on page 9 and since Bloomington does no longer have a chancellor as of
tomorrow we replaced the word chancellor with chief academic officer. And we bring this to you for your adoption.

**FISHER:** Just a thought, Mary Fisher in Indianapolis with a question, do you need the start date beginning with fall semester of 2011/12, at the beginning of that one sentence. Do we need that indicating when it begins?

**WHEELER:** No because of course the faculty could begin setting policies that would apply the year before this begins. So the reason for that 2011/12, that was the date at which the portion of Senate Bill 200, that is Indiana Code 20-12-17.5 begins to apply and affect universities. And so the Agenda Committee’s suggestion that we just say “consistent with the Indiana Code”, since that date is in the Code, we don’t have to say the date.

**FISHER:** Great.

**WHEELER:** It is—campuses should be aware that it’s customary to provide a four-year lead time on changes to admission standards because freshmen need to know at the time, high school freshmen, need to know what they need to do in high school in order to come to campus. So, normally it’s a five-year lead time; four-years is standard but in the Code it says five years.

**HERBERT:** Are there other questions or comments?

**BALDWIN:** Jim Baldwin for Giles Hoyt. I’m confused at how much of this is actually template. I assume everything after page 2 is optional.

**WHEELER:** Everything after the word Template and Guideline.

**BALDWIN:** Okay, and the question I was going to ask is on page 4, Inter-campus—Section 6 Inter-Campus Transfer Students. This is just a template so any campus of IU can set up different standards of transfer within IU?

**WHEELER:** Transferring to their campus.

**BALDWIN:** Yes, I’m not sure I like that.

**WHEELER:** Well, if the policy statement is that the faculty at each campus would set the policy for that campus and there are, on the Bloomington campus there is data to indicate that the current standards are insufficient for students—they have only a 50 percent chance of success for students who transfer to the Bloomington campus. And so each campus will need to look at the data for students transferring into their campus and set this at an appropriate level that will ensure additional chances of student success.

**BALDWIN:** I can see the logic of that. What bothers is that it threatens Indiana University as a single university.
WHEELER: What has happened over the past several years is that if you look at a distant point in the past it was the case that students could transfer but courses didn’t. And what we are now moving to is a situation where courses automatically transfer but the student may not.

JONES: I’d like to make one, perhaps, amendment to what we talked about here. In the Template and Guidelines, Academic Preparation section, that first sentence that Bill talked about, it seems to me that applies to all the numbers that follow it, not just to Academic Preparation but that it applies to abilities, and first-time undergraduates, is that the way you read it Bill?

WHEELER: Well, it is certainly the case that it expected each campus will adapt the entire template although we strongly recommend that Section 1, the Introduction, be left unchanged. That portion has been vetted by Vice President Nelms’ office and the Affirmative Action Office and if one were to—it also has language in there to protect the university from lawsuits and so it’s strongly recommended that each campus include the Introduction Section One and not to adapt the words Indiana University in that paragraph. But beginning with Section 2, Academic Preparation, then it is expected that each campus would be adapting what follows thereafter to the circumstances of their particular campus. This was the only place I think where we actually mentioned Indiana University and that was, or at least that’s the only one that’s been called to my attention. The reason for making modification in the first sentence in Section 2 is that’s where Indiana University is mentioned where it would be appropriate for Indiana University with a campus and if there are any occurrences of Indiana University thereafter, then where there’s campuses of Indiana University, certainly those do not have to be modified.

JONES: I just want to make sure that campuses understand that everything that follows is an example of a template, it’s not the gospel that they have to follow, this is an example of something.

HERBERT: Ted?

MILLER: Could I just make a comment about this please? It seems to me that one of the friendly amendments that you accepted in the final paragraph of the policy, it says that “faculties of the campuses of Indiana University are encouraged to follow the template and guidelines” that are set out in this particular document. So I really am not quite sure I understand why we need to put that parenthetical thing in there for example because what is in this template and guidelines are really just the things that the faculty should be thinking about. I mean, there’s nothing in here that says that the faculty has to adopt what is in the template and guidelines and our expectation is that each campus will have a different version of the Academic Preparation, a different version of the transfer student section. I mean, to me that’s why we have—why we’re calling it Template and Guidelines. So I’m a little confused about why we need to have these parenthetical clauses and…

WHEELER: If at one particular point if one were to just take this template and drop it in and not identify the campus, different campuses asserting that Indiana University had adopted the following standards, and we would all have different standards. So that’s there simply check, you
know, one campus should not be asserting what Indiana University has adopted. This is the university policy.

**HERBERT**: So is this the motion that you are offering now or is this coming from the committee?

**WHEELER**: This is coming from the committee.

**HERBERT**: Are there other—please?

**MOORE**: I guess I’m a little bit puzzled. I’m hearing that these are only suggestions—a suggested template but we have one, two, three, four very dense pages of details of what is just a suggestion.

**WHEELER**: Yes.

**MOORE**: This seems to me to be severe overkill in the worst sense. It could be nothing more that just ideas, why all of this excruciating detail, some of which I find confusing and perhaps even conflicting.

**WHEELER**: There are a number of bases that have to be touched.

**MOORE**: Why?

**WHEELER**: Why?

**MOORE**: Why?

**WHEELER**: Well you’ve got to deal with the issue of Inter-campus Transfer, you’ve got to deal with the issue of External Transfers, you’ve got to deal with the issue of what coursework you are expecting of it. The coursework previously had only appeared in the section first-time undergraduate students but it needs also to be referenced in the other sections and so it was logically appropriate to put it as a separate thing so that one could reference it but everyone needs to have a paragraph that talks about first-time undergraduate students, that talks about external transfer students, that talks about inter-campus transfer students, that talks about non-admitted applicants. Now, several of the sections are guidelines rather than templates.

For example the paragraph which talks about academic abilities, achievements, motivation, and maturity. The committee at one point in time was concerned with recommendations on how to set SAT guidelines, GPA guidelines and things of that nature due to the fact that we now have an office of Institutional Research and therefore there is (unclear) to have something about how you go about setting the standards with research data in order to show the appropriate standards. In fact, we backed off from doing that but we still felt that there was a need to inform people about the types of things that should be considered. Item number 8 again is addressing those same concerns about trying to, it talks about the things that campuses should bear in mind. There is a strong feeling that (unclear) for enforcing admissions policies and standards. So the answer there
is, you know, each part which is here was, in the sense of the committee, a part that we needed to put out there. Some of them are called Template and Guidelines. The template portions are concerning item 1 in the Introduction, 2 Academic Preparation, 4 First-Time Undergraduate Students, 5 External Transfer Students, 6 Inter-transfer Students, 7 Non-admitted applicants, and 9 the Responsibility and Accountability.

HERBERT: Ok, I think that we have just exceeded that 15 minutes allocated for discussion on this item and so I think I must call the question. All those—the motion is the adoption of the proposed Policy and Template and Guidelines for Campus Admissions Policies. All those who are in favor…

VERMETTE: Can I make an alternate motion before you move to the vote?

HERBERT: I’m sorry…

VERMETTE: That question doesn’t have to be seconded because it’s a committee report. Could we just shorten this and I’d like to move that we keep all the headings but delete the content under each of the headings. The campuses should be intelligent enough to apply, to understand what’s underneath.

HERBERT: Ok, the motion is to keep the headings but to delete the content included under each of those. Is there a second to that motion? If you have a comment and you’re not here in Indianapolis, could you identify yourself? Is there a second?

BALDWIN: I’ll second it.

HERBERT: Okay, it’s been seconded. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, all those who are in favor of the motion please say aye [aye], opposed no [no]. It is the chair’s determination that the no’s are in the majority and therefore the motion is not adopted. We then come back to the motion that is before us and that is to adopt the proposed Indiana University Policy and Template and Guidelines for Campus Admissions Policies. All those who are in favor of the motion please say aye [aye], opposed no [no]. The chair here’s the majority of voting in the affirmative and so this Policy and Template and Guidelines are adopted.

AGENDA ITEM #6: SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTRATORS

HERBERT: The next item on the agenda is Search and Screen Procedures for Administrators.

NG: What you have in your packet is a document that was addressed to President Herbert, Michael McRobbie and Ted Miller and I. This is a document that was prepared by the Trustees, the intention of which is to revise what is now currently found in the Academic Handbook regarding the search of academic administrators. But I want to point out to you right away that this policy covers executive academic administrators as well as executive administrative
positions. And I will tell you that the Agenda Committee have actually looked at this document, had a discussion on it, and instead of telling you what is in this document, let me just tell you briefly about what we’re going to do with it.

The Agenda Committee is going to try to have a group working on this document and try to look at this document in the context of the existing policy especially as it has to do with the faculty representation and the composition of the committee and try to rewrite thoroughly that section of the Academic Handbook which are currently that we are using when we are doing searches on academic administrators. So, with that if you have any questions, the floor is open to questions and comments on this proposed so-called search policy.

HERBERT: Are there questions in any of the campuses?

MILLER: Could I just make a few comments about this? The document that has been distributed here, Circular U-10, is a statement by the Trustees about issues that they perceive in our search and screen processes and they have some suggestions about how this kind of thing should be done. There’s going to be a discussion of this item at the Trustees meeting Thursday or Friday, I forget which day the discussion actually takes place. But the reason that this is on our agenda here today is because we, Bart and I, will be attending that meeting, at least Bart and I will be attending and we want to be in a position to say something about what the reaction of the faculty to this. So really our primary purpose here today is not so much to talk about what kind of revision we should be doing, and that’s something for the future, but really more of a reaction to the document. My own sense is that many of the ideas in this document are quite compatible with what we are now doing. Our policy as printed in the Academic Handbook is a fairly general policy and many of these ideas are quite compatible with what we are now doing. There are some things in here that I think will be welcomed by many members of the faculty. For example, under the issue of confidentiality, this is Item 6 in the document. If you go over to the next page, the final sentence of this section indicates that individuals wishing to become one of the final candidates must allow their names to be known in the final phase. As many of you know, the chancellor’s search in Bloomington, there are many people who felt that this is the kind of thing that should have been done in the chancellor’s search in Bloomington. So I think that item is going to be a welcome one to the faculty. So, again, I think what we’re looking for here is reaction, whether it’s positive, negative, we want to be able to reflect the faculty view in this meeting—the Trustees’ meeting in Friday.

This is the kind of thing I think that we will probably be doing a little bit of in each of our meetings as we go forward here. One of the things that you probably have heard the Trustees say is that they do not see us as doing business as usual in Indiana University as we forward. They seem to be referencing there a sped up pace of action and so one of the things we want to make sure, I think Bart and I want to make sure is that we have an opportunity to get faculty reaction to various things the Trustees are talking about. And as you may know, the UFC meetings this year I think as we go forward it will continue to be this way. The UFC meetings are scheduled immediately prior to the Trustees’ meetings and so to the extent that things come up out of the Trustees and get on of their agenda, we have an opportunity to bring those things to this meeting and it really I think is going to serve as a principle forum for faculty to discuss issues that are going to the Trustees. So this is kind of a first incidence of something I think we’ll see more of.
HERBERT: Are there questions or comments about this?

BALDWIN: Jim Baldwin again. There’s nothing on here about the faculty’s role in the these searches, the faculty on the committee.

MILLER: Well, the…

BALDWIN: Will faculty be members of these committees?

MILLER: The existing policy deals with the faculty role. My sense is that the Trustees, they were concerned about whether the faculty had too big a role or too little a role, I mean, they would have said something about this. I’m not sure that this is an issue actually. But it clearly is something to be concerned about and it certainly is a question that I think should be asked.

HERBERT: I can tell you that at least what I’ve heard the Trustees discuss, that has never been an issue, that is, about active faculty involvement and that there is something in the Handbook that speaks to a majority of the appointments must be faculty for any academic leadership positions. I think that continues to be operative and it is in the Handbook and they did not speak to changes of that particular approach.

MILLER: Kelly reminds me that in your packet please note that you have a document, there’s a handwritten, up in the upper corner, from the Academic Handbook. This is a statement of the current Search and Screen Policy that we’ve been operating under. This document from the Trustees is not I don’t think meant to be a proposed new policy. It’s really kind of—they’re kind of raising some issues that they see and I think what Bart was saying earlier was that we’re going to try to form some kind of a group to consider what the Trustees views are and see if modifications to our search and screen policy are appropriate.

HERBERT: Are there others, please?

COFFIN: Don Coffin from IU Northwest. In Number 4, job description and criteria, I understand that we hired (unclear) more process by which job descriptions are written. But I think it’s essential that however it’s done to include consultations with the faculty. You know, having positions or positions which are academic administrators but I think it is highly inappropriate not to include faculty input even if the final writing of the position description is delegated elsewhere.

HERBERT: Ken?

GROS LOUIS: Two comments for the committee that’s going to be—can you hear me okay?

HERBERT: Yes, we hear you loud and clear.

GROS LOUIS: One is that there’s no indication here about how the committee members are selected, in the Trustees document that is. And the second observation is to keep in mind
students and staff. So I’m thinking particularly under waiver, if the position that’s being waived is dean of students, then the students need to be involved and not just the appropriate faculty group. Did those things come through?

HERBERT: Yes, notes are being taken, thank you Ken. Are there others? Other comments on any of the other campuses? Okay, hearing none we will proceed consistent with what Bart has indicated and the Agenda Committee will have a group working on that and we’ll also have someone from the President’s Office taking part in those conversations as well.

AGENDA ITEM #7: GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: The next item is guidelines for graduate programs. Bart.

NG: Once again, in your packet you should find, it’s printed on a white sheet, guidelines for developing new graduate programs at Indiana University. This is again one of the—these guidelines are created in response to one of the recommendations in the Mission Differentiation Project. And as Ted said, this is again one of those items that are going to come up in front of the Trustees for discussion for approval. Let me give you a little bit of background on this document. This document is actually drafted by Sherry Queener and I think Gene Kintgen and it outlines the, you know, gives you the background and the consideration that will go into requesting new graduate programs—graduate programs on any of the campuses. So this is going to come up in front of the Trustees I believe for discussion, is it this time?

HERBERT: Yes. In fact, I think Ken is prepared to make a comment on this and he’ll be making a presentation to the Board. Ken do you want to say something about this now?

GROS LOUIS: Yes, this is something that the Academic Leadership Council was given this at the December meeting, early December. So each campus has had an opportunity to send comments back to Gene and to Sherry and a couple of campuses did that and Sherry and Gene have adjusted the document to respond to those concerns. Probably the most interesting one is the third line from the bottom. The one that says that when partnering within Indiana University is impractical options to partner with other public institutions may be explored. And this is put in at the request of the several campuses and I think it’s really a policy question for the president and the board about whether there should be graduate degrees given on our campuses at the commencement that are degrees from other institutions. Now, as you all know, many of our campuses give Purdue degrees but I don’t know of any other degree besides Purdue and IU that are given at IU commencement. So it’s a policy question of whether we want to have a Ball State degree for example given at an IU commencement ceremony, plus some other institutions.

HERBERT: Are there questions with regard to this policy? Mary.

FISHER: Yes, and this is for Ken possibly, this is Mary Fisher. On the certificates in the second paragraph, I know current practice on our campus is 12, to the number range, it may not be 24, and I know that we have existing certificates that are 12 credits and I know Nursing is sending
forward a certificate that is 12 to 17 credits. So I’m wondering if that 15 to 24 could be changed to 12 to 24?

**HERBERT**: Ken did you hear the question?

**GROS LOUIS**: I did. I don’t know if, since Sherry was the primary drafter here whether she put in the word normally, the third word in that line because she must know that some of those certificates at IUPUI are 12 but its fine with me to change it from 12 to 24 Mary.

**FISHER**: Thank you.

**HERBERT**: Are there others, Ted.

**MILLER**: I’ll just make a comment about this. Many of you last year were present when the Mission Differentiation Report was presented to the University Faculty Council and there was considerable faculty discontent, I would say, over some of the ideas that were in the document regarding the development of new graduate programs. This document to my way of thinking, is a very positive development because, I call your attention please to the final paragraph on the page. The first phrase in that paragraph makes it clear that new graduate programs, that the criteria for new graduate programs, may be met by resources on a single campus. This document does not require cooperation, collaboration, partnerships and so forth and so on. Of course it goes on to say that that is still possible but this document now opens the way for campuses to develop their own stand alone graduate programs within the framework of a set of criteria. My own view is that that is a very positive development for Indiana University.

**HERBERT**: Thank you, are there other observations, questions or comments. Mary

**FISHER**: Here I am again, sorry. The other thing that occurred to me that this document does not list a remonstrance process and I know there has been some instances where a graduate program has been brought on that is in direct competition and might impact other existing programs and I think there needs to be some mechanism for that to be looked at.

**GROS LOUIS**: That’s a good point Mary.

**HERBERT**: Is that a comma Ken or a period, at the end of that?

**GROS LOUIS**: May be a semi-colon [laughter]

**HERBERT**: So we’ll hear what follows that at the board meeting?

**GROS LOUIS**: That’s right.

**HERBERT**: Okay, I think the point is well taken and we’ve got to focus on that.

**NG**: Is the board going to actually—this is the first reading in front of the board?
HERBERT: That’s correct.

NG: And so they’re not going to vote on this yet of course?

HERBERT: It’s going to be in committee, Ken, what’s your understanding in talking with Trustee Talbot about that?

GROS LOUIS: I don’t have a definitive answer but I’d be very surprised if they would vote it at this meeting since it’s the first time they’ve seen the document and I’m sure that nobody will have time to think about it.

HERBERT: Normally what happens is they have two readings on all policies and actually the board may have some suggestions that it would like to make for a final document. So what we know for sure is that this is before the committee. I don’t recall that it was on the formal board agenda.

GROS LOUIS: It’s not.

HERBERT: It’s up for the first reading. Any other comments here in Indianapolis or on any of the campuses?

COFFIN: Is this available online anywhere or can we post it on the UFC website?

HERBERT: Ken is there a problem with putting this online?

GROS LOUIS: I don’t think so.

HERBERT: It will be online by tomorrow. Okay. Other questions or comments?

NG: It will be on the UFC Website.

HERBERT: UFC website.

AGENDA ITEM #8: UNIVERSITY REORGANIZATION

NG: Before we go on to the next item I almost forgot to actually bring everybody’s attention to this brochure that is available on the little table as walk out. This is a sign up form for the Hoosiers for Higher Education State House visit. That will take place on February 21st. So make sure that you pick up a copy and fill out the form if you want to participate.

HERBERT: We have a number of legislatures there and what we are trying to do is let legislatures from around the state know that their constituents are very interested in their support of IU and all of our campuses.
Okay, the next item is university reorganization discussion. Let me start off if I might with a couple of overarching comments and then I’m available to respond to any questions that you might have and we have colleagues also in Bloomington that can also take part in that conversation.

Let me begin by saying this, as all of you are aware and many of—the last time Indiana University took a comprehensive look at its organizational structure was in the 1970s when John Ryan made several recommendations that were adopted by the board to transform the institution. I think it’s clear that everything has a half-life and it is important periodically to come back through and take a look at what we’re doing and to determine if there are more effective ways of organizing the institution, of handling our processes so that there are more responsive to the shifting realities or environment in which we find ourselves. As a result of several issues that emerged in Bloomington there was a clear opportunity for us to take a very hard look at, not just the Bloomington organizational structure, but indeed that throughout the university. On the 14th of this month, the board as all of you know met for the purpose of discussing several things including a set of recommendations that I made to them. In addition, the board released a statement that was very comprehensive, identifying a number of matters about which they feel very strongly about issues and challenges to faculty and the administration and it culminated with the statement that Ted referenced a few moments ago and that is that we are no longer conducting business as usual.

From my perspective, let me just tell you that the path now on which are proceeding is built around several basic issues. First, what we tried to do is, in recognition of the fact that there are in Bloomington first starting there, the recognition that there is great deal of faculty interest in enhancing significantly the quality and reputation of the university as well as a desire to in particular focus the campus on the academic mission and needs of Bloomington to make that one of the campus’ highest priorities. In addition, it was clear as we took a very comprehensive look at the campus and the organizational structure that the Bloomington was very different from each of the others in the university as it relates to the leadership of the campus. That is to say that it had both the president there and chancellor. The chancellor was responsible for day to day operations on the campus and yet the chancellor did not have the same authority and set of responsibilities over the campus that the other chancellors have. That is to say that there are several aspects [End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost] … campuses where the chancellors have responsibility for physical facilities and all aspects of campus operations. In the case of Bloomington that has not been the case so the chancellor has been in a position of having to negotiate with the university-level vice presidents on a number of issues and its clear that in the long-run that systems simply does not work well and it has implications with regard to budget as well as services that are provided. And so what we’ve done is to modify the organizational structure of the Bloomington campus with a clear intent to enhance academic focus and quality and also to bring all of the university operations under the leadership of the chief executive officer for the campus.

And so the position for chancellor has been abolished effective February 1st and the president of the university will assume the chief executive officer function and we will have a provost on the campus who will be the chief academic officer and the second in command on the university, on the campus. I would note that this is very consistent with the operations of several of the Big Ten
universities including Purdue and Penn State and Ohio State. Again, different kinds of campuses in some instances but nevertheless that model is one that has served all of them well where the president simultaneously wears both of those hats.

The second thing that we have tried to do is to reinforce the role of IUPUI, first to make clear that it is one of the two research campuses of the university and second to place greater responsibility at the vice presidential level in leaders on this campus. So we have gone from one vice president to two university-level vice presidents on the campus. In addition the chancellor at IUPUI will serve as the executive vice president for the university. And then we also have the vice president for life sciences who in addition serves as the dean of the Medical School and I’ll come back to that in just a moment.

The third thing that we have tried to reaffirm is a commitment to support our regional campuses. We are doing that both by reaffirming the fact that the president serves not only on the Bloomington campus but that he needs to have responsibility for the regional campuses. The chancellors will continue to report to the president. Simultaneously, the executive vice president will have greater responsibility for working with the regional campuses and particularly with the vice chancellors for academic affairs to ensure that our overall commitment to higher academic quality is sustained so that they will continue to be two senior levels officers of the university that are working closely with the regional campuses while acknowledging the fact that they continue to grow and that as they mature, and they have matured over time and will continue to, that has the implications for the nature of these relationships. The focus in particular throughout the university on undergraduate education is a priority and that the executive vice president will have responsibility for assuring that we do not forget that fundamental commitment to undergraduate education, which is a hallmark of the university and it is a particular strength on our regional campuses as well as here at IUPUI and Bloomington as well but I think we’ve received a number of national statements of recognition in terms of quality of what we’re doing there, we wanted to sustain that.

I think that the core thing that we have tried to do here is to strengthen our capacity for collaboration among units and campuses stated quite in a different way, it must be a major priority of Indiana University that we continue to break down these silos that divide us kind of cross-campuses as well as among our academic units. When you take a look at this university what stands out is the depth of intellectual capital which is particularly impressive in a number of areas and what we need to is to achieve greater synergy and to facilitate the kind of interaction both in the context of research and other creative activities that will enable us to develop an even stronger reputation nationally and internationally. We’ve already done that in the information technology area. One of the things that we are doing ties back to this initiative and this is one of the challenges that we’ve given to the vice president for the responsibility of life sciences Craig Brater is we’re going to utilize the life sciences as another, in this case, academic program area and research area to facilitate collaboration and to and break down more of those silos and the cancer area is just one example where our goal is to become one of the top five cancer research and diagnosis and treatment centers in America to compete with M.D. Anderson, Sloan-Kettering, Harvard and the like. And to do that, we simply must draw not only upon the strengths that we have in the clinical arena and the some of the basic research is being done here in Indianapolis but also on the bench scientists that are working everyday in these areas in
Bloomington and on our other campuses. So the challenge here is to get us to the point where we stop focusing solely on campuses alone and to begin thinking about ways that we can collaborate, we could partner across and then taking advantage of that rich reservoir of intellectual capital that we have and I think the life sciences provides a very good example of what we can do in that area and we’re going to come back also in the international arena. There are a number of possibilities there. I attended a session at the State Department a few weeks ago where the President announced that there were some major issues in that arena. We have incredible opportunities for collaborations there with things happening on many of our campuses and we simply must do more. So part of this is also about strengthening that capacity for collaboration and we’ll be undertaking a number of initiatives to assure that that occurs.

We also want to assure the maintenance of effective processes for academic program review and evaluations, accreditation and the like. And so what we’re trying to do is to assure that we don’t lose momentum with regard to those activities and have assigned responsibilities appropriate to accomplish that. And I think may be the last thing I would just highlight because there are several other points, but in terms of major themes, we’re also trying to realign reporting relationships as appropriate to foster greater effectiveness and efficiency in the organization. I should tell you that we are also in the process of this is part of that last point, we’re taking a look at what are called system schools, university schools or systems schools and core schools to determine whether or not those models continue to work and whether or not we are at a point where we need to look at different modalities for administration and program delivery. Again this goes back to the 1970s, I think that either we need to reaffirm on a program by program basis that this continues to be the optimal way for us to proceed or maybe it’s time for us to look at something different. So we will over the course of the next several months take a very hard look at that and we’ll be forming a working group that will have faculty. We will also have outside consultants to work with us as we try to sort all this out. But the bottom line is that there are periods of time in the life of any institution where you simply must go through this kind of process. My belief is that what we’re doing is positioning the university for decades of additional accomplishment.

There are going to be—I would just note that we must continue to fine tune this, everything is not currently locked in concrete. So there’ll be some fine tuning that simply must occur as we sort through all these matters and I’ll be working very closely with our leadership team and with the leadership of the UFC on university-wide matters; those that relate to individual campuses we’ll be talking with you as appropriate but I do think that this is an exciting time for the university. It’s an opportunity as I indicated, for us to take a very hard look at all aspects of what we’re doing and whether or not we can do them more effectively. The board of trustees as you have heard feels very strongly that now is the time for action and you only have these opportunities under unique circumstances in the context of the life of an institution.

I would just note finally and on a personal level that as all of you are aware, I did indicate to the board that consistent with the contract that I signed with them, it is not my intension to serve beyond the current contract that I have. And I think the fact that that is the case reinforces the importance of the university addressing as many of these issues as possible prior to the beginning, or as we begin, depending how the timing works out, begin the search for a new president. I am convinced that there are a number of issues and I think that we have begun to
address them in Bloomington that have created a scenario with which the last four presidents in the university have been subject to several kinds of things that we have read about in the Chronicle and experienced and that is unacceptable for a university such as this. We cannot maintain a set of policies or practices and structures in which every president goes through that. It would be a kiss of death ultimately for the university in terms of sustaining the quality of leadership that we simply must have to achieve the very high aspirations that we do. And so my hope is that by making clear my intentions, what we know is we have a time frame set within which to do some of these important things that must be accomplished for the university and at least on my part there is no vested interest. What I want to do is assure that every step we take without question is at the best interest of the institution.

Finally, let me just say this, that there are some very unfortunate comments that have been made in the Chronicle and elsewhere. This is not about diminishing any campus. The missions that are articulated by the board, approved by the board continue to be in place. We have very strong campuses where we are going to continue to do all we can to enhance the capacity of each of our campuses to fulfill those missions. We must not get bogged down in what folks say, particularly if it’s not coming from the board or the president who ultimately are going to be the ones who are presenting these matters and I think that we can do this in a spirit of collaboration. That was very clear in terms of my comments to the board. There are going to be some tough issues that have to be addressed and we are going to take a very hard look at a number of things including centers and institutes, where they are located, whether or not they’re fulfilling the missions that have been articulated.

You may have heard in my comments that I feel very strongly about it and the board has supported a proposition that we must focus attention on general education as a matter of institutional priority and you’re going to be hearing more about that and the board has established some deadlines by which it expects that we’re going to take action. We’re going to focus increasingly on accountability for performance. This is a direct response to the assertion that quality is dropping throughout the university, particularly in Bloomington. We don’t really know whether or not that’s the case. All of the indicators that several of us looked at are quite to the contrary but if faculty perceive that then we need to come in and take a hard look at exactly where we are where the problems are so that we can go about fixing them.

So, this is going to be an exciting opportunity. I don’t think it’s necessarily a roller coaster ride but I think it is one in which we have a chance to work together as colleagues to make this a stronger place, to make it one that is very consistent with all of the aspirations about which we speak on an ongoing basis. Let me stop there and if there are any questions that you have I’d be happy to respond. One of the things that we talked about in the Agenda Committee is that there have been several questions posed, in the interest of time what I indicated was that—and I guess that there’s a need for some amalgamation because there are others that have come in and so what I’ve indicated is that I will respond to all of those in writing so that they’ll be available on the UFC website. But today I’d be very happy to respond to any questions or listen to any comments that you might have.

MILLER: Could I just say before we get into it, there are lots of questions; it’s clear that there are lots of questions. I would also encourage you though that in addition to asking questions, if
you have comments about the direction you’d like to see this go, for your campus or whatever, please take this opportunity to make those kinds of statements as well.

HERBERT: Bill?

WHEELER: Bill Wheeler, Bloomington. In trying to get a handle on the nature of the organization, I was wondering if you anticipate that at some point in time that your position might have the dual titles of president of Indiana University, chancellor of the Bloomington campus so that this then would be the two primary officers, the president and the chancellor of the university and chancellor of Bloomington and then the executive vice president of Indiana University chancellor of Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. And whether that, I’m trying to say that the two positions will then be the chief executive officer of the Bloomington campus, is that kind of where we might be headed towards saying the president of the university and the chancellor of the Bloomington campus?

HERBERT: At least right now what we’re operating under is the assumption that the president as of the 1st will wear both of those hats. As you take a look at the Big Ten, that differentiation is not made. That is, the president of Purdue is president of Purdue; he is the chief executive officer of the West Lafayette campus with no additional title. And the same thing is true at Ohio State and also Penn State. I think ultimately we can do it but the key thing is that it will be clear that the president is the chief executive officer on that campus as well as the entire university. One of the benefits of this by the way is that, as I indicated earlier, is that there are several vice presidents that have portfolios in Bloomington and now all of them, all those vice presidents, report to me. And so now I will have control over all aspects of the budget for the IU Bloomington campus. That I think is a very important step as we try to consolidate all these things and I can tell you that with me it’s not a matter of negotiating on these matters. We need to focus on what’s in the best interests of the entire university; the chancellor did not have that flexibility. I do and will exercise.

COFFIN: Donald Coffin, IU Northwest. There seems to be a lot of really major kinds of interests about all the phrases and I just want to comment. I think two things are essential; one is that the appropriate faculty governance structures are involved in all of these and at all levels of discussions, system-wide and on the individual campuses. And second I think it’s essential that it not take a long time to come to a resolution about these decisions. If we get into a long-term strategic planning process that takes two or three or four years to complete than I think we will have failed.

HERBERT: With regard to the latter point first, I cannot agree with you more and I can assure you that this board does not intend to allow all these discussions to drag on nor is it my intention. And I try to give some sense about this in the context of urging the board to initiate the search for a president. I think the key thing is that we need to have most of these issues resolved prior to bringing a new chief executive in. So whether that will be in a year or two, I think what we have to operate under is a timeline that is geared to year to a year and a half. Frankly I think most of these decisions will be addressed, most of the issues will be addressed, decisions made well before the end of that time period. So we clearly need to deal with that.
With regard to the governance process, there are a number of these matters as we go forward that clearly do fall within that framework and we will definitely respect those processes. Are there other questions or comments, in fact we’ll start out here at IUPUI and then we’ll go around each of the other campuses.

ROSS: John Ross from the Kokomo campus. Do you envision interim assistant provost for Bloomington also?

HERBERT: The only interim right now that we have is the provost position in Bloomington. In some cases what we’re looking at is whether or not we need to keep roles. We have another case, for example we have in the area of information technology, we’re holding the position of vice president vacant. We will have an acting or interim chief information officer that will not be at the vice presidential level. But we’re talking right now about the research function. Some aspects of the current position of vice president for research will naturally shift over to the provost. There are two or three other areas in that portfolio that we just got to sort out. We are working on that right now but I don’t envision the creation of any additional—right now any additional interim appointments.

ROSS: Thank you.

HERBERT: Others?

BALDWIN: I think you know we had a general faculty meeting here at IUPUI yesterday.

HERBERT: I heard that, that was the case.

BALDWIN: One of the principles that we came up with that we think is very basic, we don’t want to see this campus cut in half. So I hope everybody realizes what that would mean for the future of research and teaching on this campus. And the connections, the synergy that’s already established in the non-health and health parts of this campus.

HERBERT: The thing I can tell you is that what we’re trying to do is to build bridges and what we want to do is to facilitate even greater collaborations not only among units on this campus but throughout the university. That’s part of what is behind the idea of having a vice president for life sciences and having that person also serve as dean of the medical school reaching out across campuses—across this campus and across the university. So, it is the case that we have dealt with some realignment that just makes sense. The budget for the school of optometry is in Bloomington and yet the dean reports here and all of the other health sciences programs are here. And so we’re shifting that budget to the medical sciences budget to assure that all of those units and all those units are operating under the same budgetary framework. We have, we are recommending, that the budget for the medical school be pulled out of the medical sciences budget so that there’ll be three that will show in IUPUI. One is medicine, the second is health sciences, the third is IUPUI general. And frankly the reason—there are several reasons for it but one of them is that we want to have the medical school standing alone in the context of the total budget so that the state can begin putting resources directly into the medical school and I think you’ll see something similar to that as we talk about the life sciences in Bloomington. We’re
going to make the next decade one focusing, not exclusively because obviously there are other critical components of what we do as a university, but the life sciences will be a very significant component of our strategy for the next decade and we want to position the institution so resources can be allocated.

I must tell you that there’s one other very significant reason for doing that and that is that during the last legislative session the budget for the medical school was cut. There are a number of folks in the Statehouse who could not understand how that could have happened and we are being blamed for it. And so the suggestion has been, well, you should take money from other IUPUI programs and shift those over to the medical school to make it whole. So what we’ve got to do is to assure that we aren’t putting the balance of the campus at risk in that kind of scenario and one of the ways that you do it is to pull that budget out so that they can put money into it and if they cut they understand exactly what they’re doing. So, some of these matters are strategic in nature as well. I think that the basic thrust then is that we simply must build more bridges across campuses, achieving greater synergy, work together and the Feds as it turns out in terms of many of their grant programs are telling us exactly that. That they are focusing on research teams as opposed to individual labs. They want to see greater collaboration and I think we’re going to be very well positioned as the Feds begin moving more and more in that direction. And ultimately I think the entire university is going to benefit. So I guess what I’m urging is not to think only by campus, although I think that obviously is important, but also to begin thinking about opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration and ways that will also be transformed into the nature for the entire university.

Others, here? Are there any questions or comments from Bloomington? Kokomo? Richmond? South Bend? Gary? Fort Wayne?

MERZ: No comment.

HERBERT: Okay, did I say Southeast?

FINKBINE: I do have a question. I think in our discussions on the campus, the biggest concern that came up was a lack of visibility of university level people and not just one person. I got an email last week from an assistant vice president I didn’t know existed. So I guess the question would be how do we not just cross campus, get our sciences to work together, but some of the administrative lines that seem to be weak?

HERBERT: Actually, I think that we’ve begun to address that in several ways; first is through the creation of the leadership councils and I think that that has worked pretty well. Some of you may want to contradict that but I think that the Academic Leadership Council—we have them in every major functional area of the institution and what we’ve tried to do is to utilize that as a vehicle to foster greater communication. They’re all chaired by a vice president. We’ve recently created one related to development because there are fundraising needs on all the campuses and so we wanted to assure that there’s greater communication there that’s chaired by the president of the Foundation. We’ve also just most recently created one related to Advancing Indiana to deal with economic development issues. Each of the vice presidents has been asked to visit all the campuses a couple times a year at least and we also have meetings with the chancellors.
What we’re trying to do is to assure that—for the Trustees we’re trying to get them out in the context of the board meetings and what I try to do is to visit each of the campuses at least once a year. I talk with the chancellors seven or eight times at a minimum, plus individual conversations. But this is something I think we have to continue to work on. I think what may be happening is that there’s less communication at the faculty level and more in some of these administrative units. But ultimately the challenge for us, given the nature of our structure, is to figure out ways that we can continue to foster the sense of community that is necessary in a large, complex organization like this, we’re the fourth or fifth largest employer in the state, so it makes it even more challenging to do that but I think we simply must and I’m definitely open to ideas that go beyond what we’re currently doing to attempt to accomplish exactly that.

Cathy?

**LUDLUM FOOS:** We talked a little bit some of the realignment in terms of the medical school and health sciences. The question I have has to do with the realignment and reorganization of the other professional schools including Kelley and education and so on and it strikes me that we’re focusing more on research in Bloomington and regional economic development on IUPUI and regional campuses, it seems counterintuitive to put the professional programs in Bloomington rather than over at IUPUI and the regional campuses. Could you explain what the rationale is for that?

**HERBERT:** Well, there’s only been one shift and that was the Kelley School. The balance we’ve made no determinations on and I think …

**LUDLUM FOOS:** I had heard differently so I’m confused.

**HERBERT:** Well, I can definitely tell you that that has not been done. What we are doing is taking a look at all of them. It is not so much a reporting relationship issue right. The question is, does that model work. That is, how effective is the current delivery system and structure in the context of SPEA, in the context of social work, nursing. Each one is slightly different in terms of how they’re playing out and so what I’m just doing is saying, let’s take a look at all these just to determine whether or not we’re doing it the way we ought to be doing it thirty years after the system was put in place and it may be that all that is working fine. But I can definitely tell you that the only unit—well, there are two unit changes in a sense; one is the Kelley School is going to report as of the 1st to the provost and second the dean and vice president—let me put it in a different way, the dean of the medical school and vice president who is responsible for life sciences is reporting, in terms of the organizational chart, to the president; with regard to day to day operations he continues to report to the chancellor here, our chancellor/ executive vice president. So nothing else has been decided with regard to those other campuses and we haven’t talked about, up to this point, the changes in reporting relationships.

**LUDLUM FOOS:** Are the faculty members in those different schools on the regional campuses going to be involved those discussions?

**HERBERT:** As a matter of fact, one of the things we’re trying to figure out now is how best to go about conducting that study. There will be representation and what we’re trying to figure out
is whether or not it makes sense to have a consolidated task force that takes a look at all of them with the extensive participation in each of the schools and on the campuses, or do we have a separate task force taking a look at each school and there are pros and cons of both of those and we just haven’t reached closure on that. Michael and I want to have a chance to talk with Bart and Ted about that so we can sort out the strategies. But one way or another we will make a decision on that within the next couple of weeks. Michael there’s been a number of other things that we’ve been trying to grapple with before that but what I want to do is to get that under way so that we can illicit—we want to make sure that there’s an opportunity for faculty participation in the conversations as we deal with each of those individual programmatic areas.

LUDLUM FOOS: Rumors are flying in terms of communication.

HERBERT: Well, I’m glad you asked the question so that I can tell you that at no point in our conversations have we talked about reporting relationships for any other unit. I saw something a few days ago that said that there was a conversation about having all the health science units report to the dean of the medical school or vice president. We’ve never talked about that and the practical reality is it wouldn’t work. There’s no way that Craig can be dean of the medical school and simultaneously and lead all of our life sciences’ strategic planning initiatives and handle all of those academic units. It’s totally absurd and there’s no way one person can do it and so we’ve never given any thought to it but all of a sudden it’s out there. So I can tell you that that’s not something that we’ve looked at nor have we looked at changing reporting relationships for SPEA and Education and other units. That doesn’t mean that something may not come up at some future points. It will occur in the context of the study that we’ll be initiating.

One other thing by the way and I’m not sure how this will impact or whether it will impact individual campuses beyond maybe two, but we are taking a very hard look at RCM. There’s a task force that is underway now, we have outside consultants who have extensive experience in the area taking a look at how that’s being implemented and whether or not there is a need for some changes in the way that that is being implemented. It’s a policy level study. It’s not getting down into a lot of the nitty-gritty although some of that may emerge during the course of that study.

I don’t want to bore you with all this so …

DE TIENNE: One of the concerns that was shared by the IUPUI faculty was this fear that being the president of the university and also being CEO of the Bloomington campus, your conflict of interest will prevent the president from being the spokesperson of the entire university. How do you view the possibility of that being a conflict of interest?

HERBERT: I see no problem with regard to conflict of interest and I think that the national pattern with all the universities where this occurs is the case, ultimately the Board of Trustees and the faculty of the university are going to judge me on how we deal with both of those issues and so as we deal with budget presentations, with legislative representation, with addressing academic program needs and the like, one of the things I’ve got to do and I understand it, is to be sensitive to needs of all of our campuses and I think that whether it is me or the next president coming in, we all understand that that is a fundamental part of the job. And the sense that I have
is that Martin Jischke understands that at Purdue, Karen Holbrook understands that at Ohio State and the same thing is true cutting through across many other campuses. So that’s a fundamental observation that goes along with the position and I understand that and we’re going to assure that we’re sensitive to the needs of all of our campuses in every aspect of what happens. And in a sense the president’s office has been in Bloomington but I focus on all of the campuses and clearly this does require more time with regard to a presence in Bloomington in dealing with some of those issues. But this is not a job that is 40 hours a week and anyone that is in this role is going to understand those fundamental responsibilities and I think you’ll feel good about how we handle it.

MALIK: David Malik, IUPUI. A hundred years ago the University of California decided they would create separate autonomous campuses with the central administration not being on any one campus. I think after those years since they were founded we’ve seen a remarkable system that far exceeds what any of the example campuses you gave have achieved. So, if there’s so much success in giving a lot of local autonomy, direction and focus to the faculty on those campuses, doesn’t the long-term prospect hold out better than the examples where you have single large institutions with really many small campuses like Purdue; one huge campus, lots of little ones? So what’s the argument for really going to that model?

HERBERT: Well, I think that—first let me tell you that I headed up the system that had 250,000 students with a five billion dollar budget, campuses of all sizes and so I understand some of those dynamics. Now keep this in mind, that this state has 6 million people. There are more people living in southern California alone than live in this entire state. It had, as those decisions were made, a resource base that far exceeds what we have in this state. The practical reality is that I think we have to deal with the reality that we’re now adding a community college system and that changes the dynamics. I think that many of our campuses are vulnerable. As we enter into this period, there are resource issues that are very significant and from the economy of scale perspective we’re able to do so much more for our campuses in the context of the current structure. If all of our regional campuses had to hire their own general counsels, their own architects and you go right down the line of things that we are able to provide at a university level, we’d have major problems and I think that you would see some significant difficulties in terms of Foundation support, just buying land. We’re able to do that in a fashion that is possible because we are operating as we are.

The study that was conducted, that was led by Tom Reilly of efficiency of institutions made the observation that at IU and Purdue we’re very efficient. In fact at one point one of the questions was you guys do such a good job in these matters, maybe you ought to be running some of the other campuses within the state. Well, obviously I didn’t want to get into that, but just think about what our smaller campuses would have to deal with if you had to go out and negotiate your own health insurance and go right down the line. So there are some very significant benefits associated with this kind of structure for campuses of the sizes that we have. And I think that the regional campuses in particular would get lost. I think that you would see a growing effort for the community colleges to take them over and to create another layer of campuses within the state and all that becomes part of the political dynamic.
So it seems to me that given the population realities of the state, the economy of the state, the current situation of each of our campuses as they deal with the unique realities of their region and in the context of a community college system that is growing, that has a pretty substantial amount of influence in state government, this would be exactly the wrong time to move toward the California model assuming that the state would allow us to do it and I don’t think that there’s a great deal of interest in that happening. That’s just my political and general, education, administration strategic analysis.

BLACKWELL: Hi, Jacqueline Blackwell, I have a question. You talked about the community college system and it’s growing very very fast particularly with discussions over articulation agreements. How do we position ourselves to have the best foot forward because it is expected that we will do the 2+2 agreements? I’m assuming you are thinking about that so what is the plan?

HERBERT: First of all I think that we must be active partners with community college system and they are here and they’re going to continue to be here, they’re going to grow over time and the—let me just give you an example.

When I came here I remember going to some of the legislative committees and I was beaten up over the fact that IU was not collaborating with the community college system and in particular Bloomington was singled out as being the culprit. It was pointed out that IUPUI had done a very good job with the Passport Program and was trying to make this work. Two or three of our regional campuses, they made reference to but one member after another zeroed in on Bloomington and said that there was an elitist attitude, there was a total unwillingness to collaborate. I had a meeting with president of the community college a few days ago and he said that Bloomington is now a role model for the balance of the state, in part because of a number of the efforts that Ken Gros Louis has undertaken there. But we have several programs including one in which students are living on campus in Bloomington while studying at the Ivy Tech campus.

Strategically, we simply must reflect a commitment to collaboration. It is a matter of state policy so we have to do that and we need to do it in a spirit of collaboration recognizing that every student that comes into the community college cannot come to our institutions in any event. And as we deal with higher standards for admission, as we begin to move away from the practice of offering remedial courses, those students will naturally gravitate to the community college system. That ultimately I think enhances the quality of our student bodies. If you view it from a self-interest perspective, one of the things that ultimately will happen is that we’ll have students transferring in at the sophomore or certainly the junior level and so those will be net new students coming in, better prepared hopefully, as a consequence of going through the community college system than they would have been coming in to us as freshmen as we continue to bring on our own freshmen classes. I think that there are some challenges here, one of them is that we are going to have to move [End of Tape 1, Side B, some comments lost] … the influx of additional students at the sophomore and junior level may become even more important over time. So the official university posture is that we want to continue to collaborate. We’re going to be identifying several areas in the life sciences where we want to have some special partnerships on each of our campuses. This ties back in to that theme of whether it’s nursing or other areas.
We want to identify those; we want to start packaging them together so that students know that there truly is \(2 + 2\) opportunity for enrollment. And that also then gives us an opportunity to take part in conversations with the community college about the quality of what they are doing because it’s a true \(2 + 2\) program. So we’ve got to do a number of those kinds of things and I think that over the course of the next year or two we’ll continue to increase the level of conversation with the community college. I’ve already asked that Charles Bantz initiate some conversations right away with a designee from the community college so we can begin to talk about some of these strategic areas for collaboration because they are going to come increasingly more important over time.

This is part of the reality of our state and we need to embrace that reality and figure out how we can assure that we are getting high quality students who are coming through that process and also I think that we’ve got to—when you take a look at the number of students to whom we have to offer remedial education that’s a problem and we have got to address that and this is one other way in which we can do that in a very coordinated and systematic fashion.

**BLACKWELL:** If you will be patient, I have a follow-up question. Ivy Tech is interested in state-wide articulation agreements. Our Indiana University campuses, all our different schools are quite different. So, in the school of education right now at the IUPUI campus, we’re in conversations with them right now about our early childhood program. But that’s just one program. But what does it mean to us when Ivy Tech is talking about state-wide agreements and when you look at all the different campuses how different the programs are?

**HERBERT:** Well, I don’t see that as a problem. Again, I came from a state where you have multiple universities within the state system and we all had articulation agreements and some of the programs differed and the actions that you took today speak to the fact that there are going to be some difference among campuses. And that’s fine. What it just means is that each of the campuses must work with the community colleges as we try to accomplish that. I might also note that one of the problems we have is because we don’t have a general education curriculum and there’s some other challenges associated with this and so I definitely align myself with Bill and a few others who feel that we simply must address that issue because we’re all part of that total mosaic.

When you’re operating in a complex environment with multiple campuses and where we’re accepting a proposition that there are going to be some differences among campuses, it just becomes an obligation of the faculties on each of the campuses to work with their counterparts to get that done and it’s the same thing as having to deal with Purdue and with Ball State. I mean, it just so happens that we may have seven campuses or eight that are slightly different. But we’re all committed to the same thing and that is we’re going to work together. As long as that’s clear, we can get it done.

**BLACKWELL:** I found it to be quite—I believe in the work of Ivy Tech and collaboration and coming to the table but that was just a question as we look at different campuses.
HERBERT: Yes, in fact the same question can be applied cutting across our campuses. So it’s not just an Ivy Tech issue and that’s why some of these policies become so important and that’s why I think how we handle some of the general education issues becomes so important as well.

BLACKWELL: Thank you.

HERBERT: Sure. Again, I hope that this gives you a little clearer sense as to what we’re trying to do. I will respond to the questions, I will respond to the questions that are given to me and we’ll do that in writing and if any of you have others that you would like for me to address, send me an email message and we’ll respond to that.

Did you have a …?

VERMETTE: I was just going to ask a question about—this is Rosalie Vermette from IUPUI. I was just going to ask about the one university concept, is that still maintained now in this new structuring. With the emphasis that was in the Board of Trustees memorandum to us that IU Bloomington standards of admission should be raised in order to make IU Bloomington a better campus than it has been. And so doesn’t that kind of isolate Bloomington against the rest of us? And what about the transferability which we discussed when we voted earlier on that motion from the committee, and what Professor Wheeler said is that the success rate for people who transfer to Bloomington is very low, what’s this one university concept really mean?

HERBERT: Well first I do think that so long as we offer to all of the undergraduates a degree that says Indiana University, we are one institution. I think in part the Policy and Template that you adopted a few moments ago in part answered that question. That is to say that we’re accepting the proposition, that there are going to be potentially different admission standards and guidelines for each of our campuses and I see that as being a positive because it is recognizing that there are different missions on our campuses, you serve different geographic locations with a wide variety of different demographic considerations and the missions that were adopted are just very clear.

So in the case of Bloomington, the reality is that its peers are CIC, AAU institutions and it is very reasonable and extremely appropriate and I believe that the Bloomington campus should have much higher admission standards than currently it does. And it ought to be judging the context of its peers just as each of you on your various campuses will have peers. And so the question is, what are you doing in the context of those peers taking into account further the realities of the regions that you serve. So, what happens in Bloomington with regard to admission standards should be viewed as a decision that is made in the context of that mission and its peers. And in that context frankly we’re at or near the bottom of the Big Ten and I believe personally that that’s not acceptable. I do believe that we have got to look at more than SAT scores and grade point averages. We need to look at the totality of the student that we’re admitting. But those are among the kinds of criteria that we ought to be looking and in the case of Bloomington my belief is that it should be somewhere near the mean of the Big Ten with regard to our student body, just as the quality of our programs, so many of them are right in the top of the Big Ten, we ought to have a student body that increasingly represents that reality while we’re trying to be as inclusive as possible of Hoosiers from all aspects of life in this state.
So, we can’t have it both ways; if we’re saying that we want to give each campus greater flexibility in shaping its destiny with certain minimum standards, we can’t come back and say, but wait a minute, you can’t have yours too high. Each campus—what we’re saying is that we’re going to give campuses greater flexibility to shape their destiny and the sense I have is that’s something that most of our campuses will embrace certainly as I’ve read all of the materials coming out of the mission differentiation process. So, what I would say is don’t let us get hung up on the fact that any campus is going to have high standards, is going to be more creative with regard to something that it’s doing in terms of specific opportunities for students. That’s all very acceptable and we want to encourage that level of differentiation while recognizing that there still ought to be something that ties us all together. Now, my answer to that is that it should be general education but obviously we’re having a hard time getting there. But to me that is the responsible way that it ought to be done in the academy and recognizing the reality that we have students who are transferring or are shifting from one major to another and just a core belief that there are some fundamental aspects of an educational experience that all students should have. But that’s again just a personal bias; but beyond that I think this is an exciting time to be part of this university because you have exactly that sort of thing occurring in the context of one university.

VERMETTE: I have a follow-up question. In the document that came out from the Board of Trustees and maybe, I’m not sure what you’ve written, but when the Board of Trustees refers to the one university it kind of gets all muddied up with Bloomington because that’s good for Bloomington but it ends up being Indiana University. Is that going to stop fairly soon or is IU Bloomington going to be identified as IU Bloomington when they’re talking about that campus and not using the term Indiana University for Bloomington? Because if we’re one university, we are all separate identities within that one university.

HERBERT: Yes, I think the challenge for us is that we’ve got to avoid being hyper-sensitive about some of those things. But the practical reality is this, if you take a look at the law, what the law says is that Bloomington is Indiana University.

VERMETTE: The state law says that?

HERBERT: Oh yes. The state law says that Indiana University and then it specifies where it’s going to be and then it has created other campuses.

VERMETTE: When it was originally founded.

HERBERT: Yeah, but the law hasn’t changed.

VERMETTE: Yeah but we didn’t exist then.

HERBERT: I understand but the whole point is that when they make reference to that, it is legally the case. I don’t think anyone is purposely trying to demean other campuses and I think sometimes folks are going to say that but we all understand that there are multiple campuses of Indiana University and when you look at what I write, I say Indiana University Bloomington.
But the challenge for us I think is on the one hand to be sensitive to those realities but on the other hand, not to allow what one person says, whether it’s in the Chronicle or an inadvertent conversation become a defining statement that says something about who we really are.

VERMETTE: It’s the Board of Trustees I’m worried about.

HERBERT: I wouldn’t worry about that. I think that the Board understands that there are multiple campuses and what it’s trying to do is to empower all of them and what it’s saying very clearly is that we want each of our campuses to rise to its fullest potential. And that is a very clear message and what they are saying is that we don’t want business as usual to get there. And so what you’re going to see is a growing emphasis on quality and the Bloomington campus in particular is being challenged to rise to the ranks of the very best of the AAU research universities in America and they want to see that campus ranked among the best of those research institutions in the world.

That does not mean that when they say that they don’t care about the other campuses in the university because they do. But they’re looking at the mission statements and they’re going to come back at some point and say to IUPUI, it is unacceptable for you to have graduation rates as low as they are. You’ve got to fix that, now how are you going to do it. So, you’ve got to see that right now the focus in on Bloomington but the focus eventually is going to come to all of the campuses and it’s going to occur in the context, this year we’re going to talk about peers. And the peer groups are going to be different. But the question is how do you stand up in the context of your peers, are you operating in a level that is reflective of the level of excellence that we expect in the context of your mission and with your peer group. So what we’re doing is raising the tide for all of our campuses.

BALDWIN: I think what some of us are concerned about though is the carelessness of the people in the university public relations of defining what is Indiana University Bloomington and what is Indiana University. In many numerable cases where that has happened and it ends up in the public in the media and then people get confused. The point that comes to me then, what happened to that Integrated Image Initiative from last spring, is that dead in the water?

HERBERT: No, we’re still working on that and …

BALDWIN: Because we talked, I was in that committee, we talked about this issue then and I haven’t heard anything about it.

HERBERT: It’s still in place. One of the problems frankly is that there is so much focus on each campus having its separate identity that there’s some push back within the enterprise because—well, I have my logo, I like my logo. I don’t want to change it. And some of this is about RCM and some of it is about—one of the things that we wanted to do was to have a, and we’re going to have one, a presentation at the fair and we want all of our campuses to be represented in that. You’ve got 700,000 people or whatever the number is, attending that, we ought to be there, we ought to be represented at the Black Expo. The challenge in getting folks to cooperate under the umbrella of Indiana University, it’s amazing, the kind of challenges we have to get people to cooperate because they have their own budgets and they say “well, you know, if I can’t get my
name up there, I don’t want to just put up a banner that says Indiana University” and within that we’ll have places where you can have names, but it’s just trying to get people to overcome some of that. But I’m glad you raised that because several board members have asked questions about that and I’m going to make sure that we put that back on the agenda. Thank you for raising it.

As a matter of fact I think now we can begin to deal with it in a way that we couldn’t several months ago. And this still doesn’t mean that campuses can’t do some of their own advertising. I did bring in a consultant to take a look at some of this and one of the things that he told me was that we’ve got to deal with this issue of the silos with regard to how we’re handling some of these incredible opportunities that if we work together from a budgetary perspective, we can enhance everybody within the institution with visibility and we’ve just got to do that. Thanks for raising that. I’m going to draw a little star in there just to make sure [Laughter] I’m going to indicate that you were the one that said that we were lagging behind on that as a member of the committee and you’re appalled.

Well, is there anything to come before the UFC this afternoon, Bart?

NG: No.

HERBERT: Is there anyone across the state that has any other questions or comments? Okay, I don’t hear any. Is some talking? David do you have a question or comments?

VOLLRATH: It is not something for the UFC.

HERBERT: Okay, very good. There’s nothing else to come before the Council today. We stand adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.