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10. Executive Session: Honorary Degrees (15 minutes)

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Thank you very much for your patience, we’re just trying to get everything organized. We have a couple of presenters that aren’t here yet so we’re trying to figure how to juggle some of these things around.

Let me call the meeting to order and the first order of business is approval of the minutes of January 31st. Are there any comments, corrections related to those minutes? Hearing none they’ll stand approved as printed.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me turn to Bart with regard to the Agenda Committee’s business.

NG: I just want to update you on a couple of things that we talked about at the Agenda
Committee, the first one of which if you recall at the end of last year we passed the so called Chancellor Review Policy and it’s my understanding that the presidents rather that review is front of me and they are in the process of getting something back from the Chancellors. There’s a couple of Trustees who were not on board last June who would like to have a chat with the Chancellors before they go ahead and put it on the agenda. Our understanding is that that should go forward without further changes.

Now some of you may have actually logged on to the web actually looking for the IU register on which the faculty’s degrees and backgrounds are listed and some of you if you have done so in the past I would say month, you realized that that has disappeared. But the good news as I understand is that it’s going to reappear and I would actually ask Kelly to actually give a kind of an update on that. She has the latest information. This is just information to note what we have—what will be done to the IU registrar.

KISH: The register will appear probably by the end of the semester in the IUIE with the same attributes that it had in the old public domain. They are testing some prototypes right now to make sure that they can get degree information and other things in there accurately and it was an intentional decision to take it down because the information hadn’t been updated since the fall of 2002. It was inaccurate needless to say and there had been some complaints about it. So they made the decision to take it down, they’re in prototype now. We should have something by the end of the semester in IUIE and they will send things around to people to clear how to navigate to it. Right now of course that will be an internally accessible format and if there is any—if the need arises to put one back in the public domain then they’ll do that. But right now it’s in prototypes and we will keep you posted as we hear more and they may ask some of you to test it out before it goes live.

NG: So the good news is that we are in fact—we will get access to that information back. We also had a very interesting discussion at the Agenda Committee meeting. Ted Miller brought forth what we call the IU Color Curriculum Policy and we actually had a very interesting discussion and most of the people think that that is a very positive step moving in the direction of crafting a color policy for general education and the Agenda Committee has agreed that this document, even if it’s in draft form, should be shared as quickly as possible with the Educational Policies Committee on each campus and also that Ted is going to come up with a second draft of such a document. I’m not so sure that we wanted to say anything that’s not on the agenda. So just to let you know, we’re working on that and we perhaps we will in fact get it somewhere.

And also, my Associate Vice President have given the Agenda Committee a briefing on the latest review on the intercampus research fund which she pointed out is somewhat because of the way the money was spent in the past few years. And she in fact gave the report on how the funds are going to be spent and she’ll work very hard with the vice chancellor for academic affairs on several campuses and come up with, I think—the use of money will make more people on various campuses very happy. At least some of them—well I gather from the reaction from the various faculty presidents who were in the Agenda Committee meeting. So for those of you who were raising questions about whether they will get continuing support of research money at the smaller campuses. I think that question has been answered to everybody’s
satisfaction and I think your own faculty president, if you want more detail, they can actually brief you on that. So that’s all I have today for my report.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

HERBERT: I might also note by the way that during the Agenda Committee meeting I agreed to provide to each campus the schedules for Chancellors’ reviews in 2006-07. so we’ll go through that process shortly and I’d like to just thank Ted for the excellent job he did in advancing our discussions on a topic that as you know is especially important from perspective and that is general education. And this is something that the Board of Trustees also is very interested in. So I think that our discussion today was particularly helpful in the formulation that he put on the table clearly does more and further conversations and advances that very effectively. Ted.

MILLER: Thank you very much, President Herbert. With regard to this document we discussed in the Agenda Committee today, there are a couple of changes that have to be made before this is actually made a public document. But it will be distributed to the various campuses within a few days I would say and we can get it into the right hands and see what happens to it.

I would like to just—as a part of the Agenda Committee business, just remind you that the next meeting of the University Faculty Council is scheduled for March 28th and that meeting will be held on the Northwest campus. And as is usually the case, we will be soliciting your travel arrangement information and so forth. Kelly will be sending something out shortly regarding that. So please make note that this is the meeting of the year that where we’re kind of going places where we don’t ordinarily go and it’s going to take some special effort and planning and I hope that will have a good turn out at the Northwest Campus.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Ok, I think now we’re ready for question and comment period. Bill.

WHEELER: Thank you. Well, I ____ ____to Ted ____ discussed in Bloomington this morning at the Bloomington Faculty Council’s Educational Policy Committee and the University Faculty Council also ____ committee in parallel time with the Agenda Committee discussing it. We appreciate his effort because we have made advances. There are reservations about it and I’m wondering if ____ and we have some group discussion as well and other items that will not ____ building upon that will bring much concern the issue of certification and also I think the issue of certificate in general education as a way of taking of care—of handling this matter. We discussed some of ____ to IU and then ____ promises ____ IUPUI ___. The ____ to discussion the details of that _____ but the committee did express that departments hope, I should say, that this will be referred to UFC EPC for discussion and to have the opportunity of presenting along the campuses the additional ideas on this matter. So that’s—is that ____? So, that is what the committee is asking you to say.
HERBERT: Bart?

NG: Can you say the last thing that you said—that you asked us to present it to the UFC?

WHEELER: Referred to the UFC-EPC gives an opportunity to also put ___ some alternative ideas before it goes up to the campuses ___. We feel that there _____ there are strong feelings about ___. There are some people on the committee _____ some the committee thought that there were significant shortcomings that _____ at the opportunity to those in ___ as well before we move on to the campuses.

NG: You seem to suggest that you object to the campus EPCs considering this empowerment.

WHEELER: Well we think they should have before them an array of ideas before they start down the path of _____. That those feelings _____, One of the president’s calls is to _____ to IU. That we have something that is built on IUPUI’s world _____ evaluation and something then and the discussion with the Bloomington registrar there was a sense that the ___ concerns certification ___ and it needs to be clarified ______ at this point in time.

NG: Ted, you want to comment on that?

WHEELER: Unfortunately _____

MILLER: Well no I don’t have anything to say about it but I would like to have a face off with the person who called it a travesty outside after the meeting. We’ll duke it out.

NG: Mary go ahead.

FISHER: Well I think the Agenda Committee made as to the ___ of it. So that decision was made by the Agenda Committee, which is within their purview. That would not preclude—it goes to campuses for them to consider, what concludes you getting the UFC put together and also looking at it. And you can proper your information to all the other campus committees as well and it could all be done simultaneously. The idea is to take some action and to support—I think this document to us is much more preferable than a prescriptive document which is what your committee sent and that is not ____ to the majority of the people. So you’re going to have to come up with something that is going to allow flexibility on the campuses but yet have some kind of ___ and I think that Ted’s step moves that forward much better than the other document.

WHEELER: Well we weren’t saying that ____ document too, I was referring to your campus representatives, ___ for discussion and ____ find it very productive ___. Unfortunately this is not on the agenda so we won’t have time to discuss it.

HERBERT: Are there other question or comments?
BODMER: In the January meeting of this body, a list of questions were presented to you, that you ___ later to university reorganization and you were going to provide written answers to those. I’d like some kind of, may be, reassurance that they’re still working their through.

HERBERT: Yes. What happened was that last week I got a modified version; condensed version of all those questions and my intension is to get those out by next week. We have a board meeting and I’ve been dealing with all my phone calls to the Trustees and that sought of thing in the past few days and we’ll have a response to all of them next week.

Are there other questions or comments? Okay, seeing or hearing none, let’s then go on. Tom Healy and J. T. Forbes were in the state house this morning when I was over there so they’re on their way.

AGENDA ITEM #6: POLICY FOR DEVELOPING NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: Let’s just skip back for just a moment and go to item number 6. Bart let me ask you if you would introduce that.

NG: Sure. This is, I believe that you have in front of a document called Guidelines for Developing New Graduate Programs at Indiana University. This document is drafted in response of one of the Mission Differentiation proposal that we have such guidelines to guide the development of new graduate programs at all campuses of Indiana University and this document has been drarter by Dr. Queener and Dr. Kintgen who are the co-directors of, I hope I get the title properly, of the Graduate School currently. So what you have in front of you is this document we tried to set out in broad—giving broad guidelines as to how we go about what are the considerations that will be taken up for any proposals for new graduate programs on any of the IU campuses. And as I understand it this is a policy statement. It does not go into great details about its implementation and this will come after the UFC approves this as a policy document then further procedural consideration will be taken up by Dr. Queener and Dr. Kintgen. Dr. Queener, would you like to comment on this?

QUEENER: I might just say, reiterate the point as said that this is a document that’s intended to give an overview. We started out with fourteen page document that was drafted by Dean Slattery as he was leaving town and then when Gene Kintgen and I took over the Graduate School operation, we modified the document and condensed it to a four page version and Ken Gros Louis wrote back and said we needed to further condense it. So you see the one page condensation of the original four pages.

The primary forces behind this policy are recognition that there is a reasonable cause to have graduate programs at various campuses and to place that on some sought of firm grounding that would be recognized nationally. So applying these policies toward national guidelines for the council graduate school and the on element that I think is especially important and think about is the idea of incorporating ____ to make sure that facilities are well improved and the faculty are well involved in our graduate programs as _____ appropriate. So it is a overview, you will see a
statement that remonstrance process for example, which was a comment on the ___ I believe, but you wont see the details _____ something that _____.

NG: Okay, yeah go ahead.

MILLER: Yes, I have a question about the remonstrance process. Now, the question or the reference to this here is kind of a prospective reference. A remonstrance process should be created it says. The implication of this is that we do not now currently necessarily have the process that you’re envisioning?

QUEENER: We have a remonstrance process for individual courses. The Graduate Council functions as a remonstrance—a ___ for a remonstrance at the university wide level. When this was written, the Graduate Council was not regularly meeting. It has been reconstituted and will come back into play and we at that point, the faculty will ____ but it will also be distributed in a proposal redistributed to the campus. So, there will be an opportunity to carry ____.

MILLER: Thank you.

NG: I should also point out that when this document was presented to you at the last UFC meeting there were two questions that were raised; number one is the minimal number of credit hours for a certificate and somebody pointed out that there are in fact certificate programs that require only twelve hours, twelve credits, versus I believe was eighteen at that time. The second was the question about there should be a statement about the availability of a remonstrance process to deal with any questions and conflicts. So both of these have been added to this new document and that is the only two points that have—the only two changes that remained.

HERBERT: Please

GABLE: I would like to ask Dr. Queener if these guidelines are also intended to address graduate professional programs.

QUEENER: These guidelines try to prescribe for professional programs especially at the external campuses other than IUPUI and IU Bloomington and that’s why some of the language says things such as— it mentions accreditation, agencies and external organizations.

HERBERT: There’s a question over here please.

COFFIN: I apparently missed this the last time I read this but in the concluding paragraph it says options to partner with other public institutions in Indiana may be explored. And I was curious about two restrictions that are listed there; one is that it’s partnerships with public institutions rather than perhaps private institutions where some parts of the state that might make some steps and the other restriction to within Indiana and in particular those campuses that are in border regions of the state might find partners who are across their state lines with whom partnerships would be valuable and productive. I was curious about the rationales for both of those. I realized there may be some credit issues across state line programs but I was just curious about that.
QUEENER: We looked at for example national partnerships might exist from ____ and campus at that site. The decision was made to limit state wide to public institutions, not to limit the possibilities later on. We don’t know what kinds of arrangements might be reasonable but rather than open it to all institutions, in discussions with various ____ of the Trustees, we have limited it to public institutions in the document but once this is out and discussed, it might be possible to go out. I don’t see this as necessarily ____.

FISHER: Were you trying to be not controversial?

QUEENER: No, not necessarily but the actual example that’s being addressed here is one where Ball State was trying to partner with the campus in Fort Wayne. So that specific example was ____.

MALIK: Do the schools that are primarily Purdue mission schools have the opportunity to apply for graduate ______ to Indiana University? I mean, is it now standing as I say, primarily because school of science offers degrees from both IU and Purdue.

QUEENER: Right, right.

MALIK: So in principle could a Purdue school apply for a graduate program through IU as opposed to in Purdue?

QUEENER: Yes, yes. But again ____.

BALDWIN: As long as its two systems the law has established IUPUI.

QUEENER:

BALDWIN: Because it’s written in the law.

HERBERT: Are there other questions?

MALE SPEAKER: Just one to Bart, ____ Purdue program ____ Purdue degree?

MALE SPEAKER: No.

MALE SPEAKER: We argued that ______.

HERBERT: Are there other questions or comments? Ted.

MILLER: Well I’d just like to make a comment. My own view is that this is a very important document for the future of Indiana University and in particular down at the bottom—the paragraph at the bottom of the page makes it clear that any campus of Indiana University can develop a new graduate program under the guidelines presented here and my own view is that allowing all of our campuses the ability to do this is a very very good thing for the future of
Indiana University. We have for many years, I think, tried to control these developments in an unproductive way, that’s my own view and I very much appreciate the way this document is phrased.

**HERBERT**: I might make one observation and that is this, that when the board has essentially given the administration the directive that when we do submit programs for approval, they are concerned about whether or not money is being taken from undergraduate education to support the creation of new graduate programs. This is something about which they feel particularly strongly because of the Commitment to Excellence Funds. So what they want to make sure is that having bitten that bullet stepped up and provided the additional resources to enhance undergraduate education. What they don’t want to do is to come back and then erode the programs that they are taxing students additional resources to support. So when the programs do come forward, it’s just important that everyone understands that one of the questions that I’m obligated to ask and to respond to in making presentations for new programs is whether or not this is indeed taking funds from any undergraduate initiatives on the campus. Is it taking money particularly from CTE funds that have been approved for other purposes. Are there other questions or comments?

**FISHER**: Just one question; on mission alignment, the very first bullet, talks about post-program having fit within the mission and also complementing existing programs. I wonder if when you’re writing more detailed information for people wanting to put new programs in place, if they would also at that point have to be information about the impact on other existing programs and whether they were impact on being competition with existing programs and that sort of thing. Is that implied by that first bullet or are going to deal with that more administratively?

**QUEENER**: It is implied by that first bullet. The original language was phrased somewhat negatively in saying that it not be ___ programs some applying _____ colleagues have changed to language to be more positive so that says what it does. But yes, that’s the implicit ____.

**HERBERT**: Other questions or comments? Hearing none, this is an action item and so all those who are in favor of the adoption of the policy for developing new graduate programs at Indiana University please say aye, opposed, no. It’s adopted anonymously and thank you for the great job that you guys have done.

**AGENDA ITEM #7: SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

**HERBERT**: The next item, item 7 is search and screen procedures for senior administrators. Ted do you want to take us up on this.

**MILLER**: Yes, thank you. Well, as you can see, the document that you have before you; circular U13-2006, have been developed by a sub-committee of the Agenda Committee; an ad hoc sub-committee of the Agenda Committee of the UFC; Miller, Fisher, Finkbine, are the culprits lying behind this particular document.
Note please that this is a first reading and the fact of the matter is that this document has not really had much scrutiny. There was a bit of a discussion at a BFC meeting last week but not really much and so we’re not absolutely positive that we have the right approach to this and we are open to comments as you might see fit to make them. Bill this one might actually be a travesty [laughing].

Well, the idea is this; we have now in the academic handbook, a policy on search and screen procedures for administrators. You have a copy of that in your packet. It’s the white thing labeled academic handbook. In addition—now this is a university level policy that is in this particular document. In addition to that, on various campuses, it isn’t clear to me actually how many campuses have a formal search and screen policy but a number of them do. So we have these campus level policies as well. They are attached to that white document, the ones that we have, there may be others. In any event, the purpose of this particular circular U13 is basically to develop a single policy that can be used for all search and screen procedures for senior administrators whether they are university level administrators, whether they are campus level administrators. So the idea here is that to the extent that we can approve this document, it would replace all the existing search and screen policies. So that’s an important context for you to think about as we go into this.

The document that you have has a number of sections. You can see as you look; applicability, we try to describe there which officers of the university would fall under this particular policy. The search committee size and composition is one of the issues that we’ve heard a lot about particularly from the Trustees, as you know, the Trustees have certain ideas about search and screen procedures. In a way one of the motivations for trying to develop this document is because the Trustees think that our current search and screen procedures are not may be what they should be. I’m not sure that there’s a lot of evidence for that but none the less they seem to feel it pretty strongly.

So one of their issues is committee size; we have many instances in the past of search and screen committees that have had 25, 30 people on them and those have tended to be university level committees. If you look at the campus policies that are in your packet, you’ll see that in both Bloomington and Indianapolis the faculties have basically expressed preference for smaller committees, that these big committees are seen as somewhat dysfunctional. And the Trustees of course are also interested in smaller committees. So this document incorporates an idea there that seems to be one that the faculty has supported in various ways. I think one of the problems with this document as it stands right now has to do with the composition of search committees. It not clear to me that we’ve got this necessarily right. I know that there some concerns from our student representatives that student representation on the search and screen committees, be given a particular attention in whatever policy that we act on here and so as I said, this document is not going to be the final draft by any stretch of imagination so if there important issues like this that need to be raised, there’s time for us to consider that sought of thing.

The next section has a number of components to it but the thing that has struck many, I think, as being the most significant is at the end of that paragraph, around line 52, 53, 54, or may be a couple of lines earlier. The notion that when the search and screen committee produces a
recommendation for the group of finalists, the names of those finalists will be public and when the people come to campus, these visits will be open visits that people will know about and there’ll be efforts to bring larger groups of people into contact with these people. That is something that is meant to be very clearly stated here and one of the things that I’m most pleased about with regard to the Trustees’ ideas about search and screen is that this is something that they seem to feel very strongly about as well. So this is not something that we having to press them to consider. They seem to think that this would be a desirable part of any search and screen process.

Search committee procedures—now the other part of this document that I think is a concerning part is this last section; hiring of a senior administrative level search. I think that’s a part where I think we need to be careful in terms of what we’re saying, how we say. It isn’t clear to me that we’ve got this right here at all. Just from a very superficial point of view, this occupies quite a large part of the policy and one point to conclude that that there are going to be lots of administrative searches, administrative hires without searches and hopefully that is not what we’re saying here. Hopefully that’s not what happens. We certainly want that to be a very exceptional sought of situation but we’re trying to recognize that there are times when may be something like that will have to happen; just how that should be phrased, there’s room to discuss that.

And then the final section is guidelines for implementation. Some of the parts of this document were put together by reviewing search and screen policies that are in place at institutions; University of Minnesota I think is one of them that we were working off of and several others as well we were looking at giving us some ideas about how this policy might be put together. So, that’s kind of an overview of the situation.

HERBERT: Are there questions?

COFFIN: In the section of hires without a search, section on emergency hires, I have two questions. One is, what do you think would constitute an emergency situation in which this would apply and if you can define that, shouldn’t it be ______ policy?

Second, given that we have procedures for interim appointments, why would we make an emergency hire other than exceptional hire which is a different category of this? Why would you make an emergency permanent hire when you could do something interim?

MILLER: Well, it’s a good question. I’m not sure that we should.

COFFIN: But let’s say the first part of it, what constitutes an emergency?

MILLER: Well, I think the typical case envisioned as an emergency would be if an officer of the university were to drop dead on the spot and so there’s an emergency. Something has to be done. I think that’s may be the case that comes to mind in this issue.
COFFIN: But then why a permanent rather than an interim appointment? Clearly it _____ that one could make the permanent appointment in an emergency situation, that seems to be in the old policy.

MILLER: Well it has happened in the history of Indiana University.

POMPER: My question is on the Exceptional Hires. It says one of the goals of an exceptional hire are to attract outstanding individuals, I think this is the goal of any search, regular or not. So, you probably put in there some clause that explains when exceptional hire could be made. For example, if the regular switch process would eliminate that candidates for some reason, would take position somewhere else or and you probably should also put in there that this candidate would have to clearly be among the finalists if a regular search would take place.

MILLER: I will say that this section is not something that our ad hoc sub-committee wrote itself. This is something that we found and I’m sure that—it was at Minnesota, they have a section like this and it may well be that these categories should be collapsed. In all like-hood that’s something that should be done. I think we recognize that this is a section that needs attention.

HUNT: I have a question about the definition of finalist. It’s not defined here but it seems like from a context it seems to be _____ may be campus visit. Now I would like us to think about that because I would like to see, names being public for the campus visits. So just for example, if a search envisioned bringing two candidates, by the time it gets down to the final five, let’s say those names would be made public before the decision is made which we of those that we call ____ son are going to come to campus. In the Bloomington campus I’ve mentioned this many times, that I think that one of the advantages of making names public is that if we go on that, sought of research and investigating the capabilities of the faculty to find out information about these candidates who might be important and when the names are kept a secret, you can’s _____ faculty. So I imagine that the names would be made public just slightly earlier, it might be possible to get feedback from the faculty who would be valuable in choosing the final three to visit the campus.

MILLER: Well I guess that, I guess my sense of the finalists would be the group that is recommended by the search and screen committee. It would be a group that would be forwarded to the appointing officer from the search and screen committee. Those are the people I would view I think as finalists and my sense is that those are the names that would be made public. And now, may be not all of them would invited to the campus but I would think that the broader group would be that group that we would—I think that was the intent of this language. So I think we’re on the same page.

BALDWIN: I’d like to suggest as well that the emergency hire part be stricken out _____, I’d like to save the last sentence and I suggest the last line be added on to the exceptional hires. It’s ____ not there but I would think that last sentence _____ would not be normal in our construction to be added on to the end of the exceptional hires.

FISHER: I think that’s a good point.
HERBERT: Other comments or suggestions?

NG: Ted, I don’t know where you—I tried to find the original language of the document that was sent to us by the Trustees. It seems to me, and I might be mistaken here, that the language dealing with revealing the names of the finalists was much more explicit than this. In other words, I’ve read even more positively than I read this now. So you may want to go back and look at that language again. I don’t know whether this language came again from somewhere or if it is in fact from the Trustees document.

MILLER: Well, I think we were trying in that part of it, we were certainly trying to reflect what the Trustees were saying because we thought it was also something that the faculty certainly would welcome and we certainly can review that.

HERBERT: Are there other questions or comments.

WATSON: I have two issues and some of them have something to do with exceptional hires. I think the term exceptional hire is ambiguous. It is not clear why the individual you’re trying to hire is exceptional and that’s why you’re trying to go after the _____ or whether the mechanism for hiring is exceptional [laughter]. So_______. So I guess what I just interpreted someone else would come up against this ____ but the term itself is ____.

The other thing within that paragraph that is somewhat _____ talks about well suited. First of all, that’s ______ which is okay. It is a low key term for exceptional hire but also I think that the reason we have search committees is because _____ people with different but then your person is being well suited or not. So the fact that someone thinks that the individual is well suited to me does not justify going after somebody as whatever exceptional hire means. So I think that we really need to work on the paragraph because it’s an important paragraph. Well, that’s all ____.

FISHER: I think one other ______ would be if we _____ continue that support the idea that exceptional hire, that there be some evaluative process that would be put in there that would have us look at the pattern of that and whether or not we think it could problematic. We don’t believe it would be problematic with you but it might be with other administrators down the road and we might have

HERBERT: Other comments?

SHORTLE: The majority of _____ first half doesn’t change it a whole lot [End of Tape 1, Side A, some comments lost]

HERBERT: By the way I would just note

ROHWER: As

FINKBINE:
HERBERT: The assumption

AGENDA ITEM #5: GOVERNMENT RELATIONS UPDATE

HERBERT:

FORBES:

JOHNSON: I don’t know if it carried

FORBES:

JOHNSON:

FORBES:

JOHNSON:

FORBES:

MILLER: If the bill pertaining to the bonding issue

FORBES:

HERBERT:

FORBES: I might add too

HERBERT: That’s coming out of the operating

MILLER: Let me just pursue this

FORBES: Well there’s a split opinion on that

HERBERT: Bart?

NG: You mentioned

FORBES:

NG: Yes, that’s very helpful. Thank you.

HERBERT:

FORBES:
HERBERT: Any comments

FORBES:

HERBERT: One of the things I can tell you

WHEELER:

FORBES:

WHEELER:

FORBES:

WHEELER:

FORBES:

HERBERT:

FINKBINE: We’ve heard recently

FORBES:

FINKBINE:

FORBES: 

FINKBINE: So is that extra funds

FORBES:

HERBERT:

FISHER: Well I always have a question

FORBES: Well for me

HERBERT: JT, thank you very much

AGENDA ITEM #8: POLICY ON VISITOR ACCESS TO LABORATORIES WITH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND LABORATORY ANIMALS
NG: What you have in front of you

ATKINSON: Thank you.

HERBERT: Are there questions

MOORE: I’d like to go on record

ATKINSON: This is on the agenda

MOORE: Well what I’m suggesting

[Beginning of Tape 2, Side A, some comments lost] worked with higher authorities who actually have a person who _____ is treated any different than the other faculty. The other thing that I hope to see here is a definition of research ______ to distinguish it from teaching laboratory. I think that’s also a series of ______.

HERBERT: Bart you had a comment on this.

NG: Do you want to comment on the substantive point first before the procedural point?

ATKINSON: Yes, I think that emeritus faculty should be exempted from this policy and I think we can add that ______.

IVIE: It’s something we just didn’t think of.

ATKINSON: And as far as the distinction between teaching in laboratories and research laboratories, the policy is restricted to laboratories that use hazardous materials. So if those are used in a teaching laboratory, then I don’t know how we could cover the distinction that we are teaching laboratory in a research laboratory. I’m not sure who has business to be in a teaching laboratory out of those who are teaching and those who are being taught.

HERBERT: Okay, let me ask Bart to comment.

NG: I just want everybody to understand that the IFC is going to take this item up a week from today. The problem is that it was—we decided to bring this up for UFC so that everybody can have a chance to look at this policy. To clearly say IFC have not approved it, the problem is that there is because of the timing of these meetings, we feel that it was unduly delayed of this particular policy. We just simply—nobody can actually even look at the problem until everybody has acted in sequence. So in some sense of what we’re trying to do is—this is in no way trying to bypass the discussion on the Indianapolis campus but it is just a way to make sure that everybody will have a chance to look at it as soon as possible and we try to actually make this in parallel. So this is the attempt but it’s not in any way trying to bypass the Faculty Council approval on either of the two campuses or all the campuses.
ATKINSON: I assume that there are serious concerns raised with the IFC ____ that will be taken into consideration by the research affairs and the ______.

NG: That’s correct.

HERBERT: Do you have two questions over here, come down.

FINKBINE: Yes, ____ about the visitor about English. Should we run that paragraph through the Disabilities Act Office? I have a son who’s deaf, are we saying that all deaf researcher will never be allowed to work if they at least speak sign language or something. I don’t know that, I realize why it’s in there but I also want to _____ to take a look at it.

ATKINSON: Yes I think that provision only applies to non U.S. residents.

FINKBINE: I was going to say, we’re still going to have an issue though.

BALDWIN: I think I know the answer to this but this applies to all laboratory animals, not just ones used for disease or ____ research but in the behavioral research. If you have an animal in your laboratory, it could be in your psychology lab _____ anger of ____ in little glass jars could come under this policy because you have got an animal in your lab.

ATKINSON: I don’t know that ____ flies qualifies as laboratory animals. I don’t think they do because they are not required to file any paperwork.

BALDWIN: So what about mice used in psychological ____ , it’s not biological ____.

ATKINSON: That would qualify as the ____

BALDWIN: An insects generally doesn’t

ATKINSON: Right

BALDWIN: What about poisonous spiders? Because it says animals; an insect is an animal so if there ____ animals should be used it should be pointed out or something.

IVIE: One of the sentences does say that some ____ working with animals and lab animals ____________.

BALDWIN: We’re given this ___

HERBERT: There might even be a need to clarify some of these things, are there any other questions or comments related to this? Okay, Bart thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #9: UNIVERSITY REORGANIZATION
HERBERT: The next item on the agenda relates to university reorganization discussion. Let’s see, did one of you want to start, I do have a couple of things I’d like to observe.

Let me just bring you up to date on where we are. As I indicated earlier I did receive a series of questions consolidated from the many that were presented although they have several parts, I will get those responses to you next week. But let me just kind of go over some of the things that I think are important for you to be aware of. I think everyone understands that with regard to Bloomington we have eliminated the Chancellor position and we now use President Provost Model on that campus. We will be presenting to the board very shortly the new organization charts for the Bloomington campus. There’s still a few things that are being worked out but I think that we’re very close to being able to make a presentation and may do so at the board meeting on Thursday and Friday. I think all of you know that we have created the new position of executive vice president in addition, the dean of the school of medicine’s position, we’ve added the additional responsibilities of vice president with leadership responsibility throughout the institution for life sciences and he now sits with the executive staff of the university. We’re working on a number of organizational issues. We should be ready very soon to complete an organizational chart. There are a few matters that we still have to work out, just to give you an example, in the office of the vice president for research, that portfolio is being modified significantly. It’s not clear that at this point that we will need to maintain a position of vice president for research.

We identified four basic components of that portfolio. Two of those four have been shifted to the provost office virtually to research development in Bloomington that was the responsibility of the vice president. The second is we’re shifting all of the centers and institutes on the Bloomington campus to the provost office. So what that has left is research administration and compliance and our plan at this point is to go back to a model that was being used a year ago in which research administration was split between Indianapolis and Bloomington. We will probably go back to that model. I’ll be discussing some of this again with the board but under this model Bloomington will maintain responsibility for the regional campuses in terms of research. Indianapolis would have responsibility for the school of medicine and IUPUI.

The last area is compliance and what we’re looking at there is a model to be determined following an external review. We’re taking a look at all aspects of the compliance function and we have outside consultants coming to take a look at what we’re doing now. We’re looking at the role of the internal auditor and in general trying to get a clear sense as to the best way to proceed in that area. We may maintain a unit and if so—we will maintain a unit, the question is where would the report and we’ll make a final decision on that after we get input from the consultants. As all of you are aware we are in the process of beginning a review of the system as well as the core schools. I’ll be making a recommendation to the board or indicating a proposed strategy to deal with that so that we can have broad based participation but reach some conclusions that may very well be that what we’re doing with regard to both sets of those units continues to make a great deal of sense but we want to go through and do a systematic analysis.

You also should know that I’m asking—I’ll be meeting with the chancellors on Thursday and will be formally asking each of them to initiate reviews of the structures on their campuses and
all of the campuses should go through a review looking to determine if there are ways that we can more effectively fulfill our academic missions in light of some of the changes that are being made there as we add degree programs, as we look at experiences in terms of our ability to fill positions; are there lessons that can be learned from those experiences and I’m also talking with the chancellors on Thursday about the formal objective of reviewing all of our AA degree programs to determine which ones we want to maintain and with regard to those that are terminal AA degree programs, we’re asking that plans be developed for eliminating those problems.

There are several other things that are happening, we’re taking a look at RCM. We have a task force that is conducting an analysis of that. We recognize that the environment in which RCM was initially created has changed and the question is what modifications, if any, need to be made to assure that we’re dealing with the realities of what is currently going on, not only on our campuses but also in the state house and the manner in which resources are being allocated to us.

You will hear over the course of the next couple of months a great deal of additional discussion about housing. Each of the campuses has been asked to provide feedback on a housing policy. We have not had one up to this point. My intention is to bring that to the board at the meeting in April. At that time I will also suggest a strategy that would provide for housing on some of our regional campuses and that long term it is important for us to have housing on more than two of our campuses. But we need the policy framework in place in order to deal with that. This obviously will have a major impact in terms of changing the major character of some our campuses. But I think that as we look to the future, it’s an important component of a long term university wide strategy to serve the people of the state.

You will hear a growing focus on accountability. This something about which this board feels very strongly and Vick Borden’s office will play a major role in the development of the databases that will be used and I can tell you that the board is strongly committed to this. You will see that manifested in what we’ll be talking about increasingly relative to peer institutions. Each campus has already began the process; Vick Borden has visited all the campuses and we’re trying to develop a list of peers and what you will see happening is that the board will then begin to pay attention over time to the evolution of campuses relative to it’s own characteristics and performance and also in the broader context of the peers that have been identified.

Finally, I think we’re going through a period now where you will see a much greater strategic focus with regard to what we’re doing. This was clearly evident a few years ago as the university established an IT strategic plan. We’ve developed an Advancing Indiana Strategic Plan. We just released a few down ago; a couple of weeks now, a life sciences strategic plan. At the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday I will announce the establishment of a process for developing a strategic plan related to a greater internationalization of the university and I think all of this combined reflects not only a commitment to be more strategically focused, but also, there is a very clear intent to eliminate or change the structure of the walls and silos that have divided us, cutting across campuses and also on our campuses and that’s why the multidisciplinary science build one and two was so important. You will see an effort to add additional building that will further achieve the goal of facilitating greater collaboration among units. The life sciences initiative is a clear effort to build closer relationships cutting across our campuses. So I think that is another very important part of this overall period of change within the institution and my
assumption is that any structural changes that will be proposed will have all those including the research item. We’ll have all of those done before the end of the semester. Let me stop there and see if there are any questions about any of that or if the co-chairs have anything that they would like to say. Bill.

WHEELER: This is a question is spanning through comments although not due to the general topic of reorganization because you had alluded to the accountability in taking of Vick Borden’s office and I wanted to mention that I hope that his office will take account of the report presented by the Department of Education. report. One of the most interesting things there was a study that followed people from freshman year of high school through graduation and it continues on to the statement as seen and one of the things that was pointed out in that report is that the retention does not really _____ mechanisms of success and _____ to pop-ups before, in particular Ted Miller on our own campus _____ faculty office, their report which was looking at the _____ courses _____ and trying to use success from those courses as a measure and I thought one very important aspect which is very important for accountability purposes coming out of this report was that the author of the report identified what he called Academic Momentum beginning the first year as being the key measure of the success later on. That was the one measure where it says that to be ____ an academic momentum that one may need to clear at least 20 credit hours ______ grades of B and not have a _____ controls. And I think that this report for all our accountability efforts, that we do move both veteran measures in our institution and research data and hopefully that his office will empower this concept of academic momentum in this institutional research phase ____.

HERBERT: One thing I can tell you is that Vick one of the best in his field. He’s president of his national association. Those of you who are on IUPUI campus know him very well and there are very few folks in the field that aren’t as knowledgeable as he with regard to trends and issues. So if it’s happening I’m sure that he’s definitely aware of it.

I can tell you that this board is interested in retention. It’s interested in graduation rates and one of the things that will definitely occur, graduation rates is a classic example. It will take a look a campus in the context of its peers and how well it’s doing. It will look at retention and it will look at a number of other variables and all of these are going to be ones that we are going to be aware of and so I think we’ll have an opportunity to add to the list of those we’re going to incorporate into our annual reports to the board on performance that will be campus. In the case of Bloomington by the way, I can tell you that because of some of the concerns that were raised by faculty and the assertion that they were seeing a decline in quality, they’re not only interested in overall campus performance, but they’re also interested in looking at what’s happening in the context of the individual units so that we can begin to identify those areas where in fact it is true, then we can identify those areas where we are experiencing a decline. What they want to know is, are these assertions that we’re seeing a down turn with regard to quality, indeed occurring and if so where? That may have implications in a broader context so the board is definitely paying attention to what faculty have said in Bloomington about that issue and they want to zero in on it and find out where the problems lie. We’re looking at it on the campus level but also in the case of Bloomington, the intent is to delve more deeply and to find out again where those problem areas might be.
SPECHLER: My question is a bit shorter. Why did you do this?

HERBERT: Why did I do what? Do what?

SPECHLER: Why did you do all this? That’s my question. The administrative change among other things to make the medical school and business schools directly report to you rather than the IUPUI Chancellor, was one of the things that caught our eye in Indianapolis and I paid a lot of attention to this but I’ve never received any rationale. I’m sure we all want to improve Indiana University from the Michigan border to Kentucky, definitely. But what was your rationale for making these fairly dramatic changes?

HERBERT: Well, you have to talk about specific changes, that’s just too broad for me to respond to. I can tell you that some of these are a direct response of the Board of Trustees. Some of them are matters about which I feel strongly after being here for two and a half years and observing some of the things that are and are not happening. After talking with former presidents, getting a feel for some of the problems and issues they have identified as being ones that are recurring and need to be addressed. Some of it is about strategic changes and ways in which we can better highlight the directions in which we’re trying to move as an institution. So again, those are just examples of some of the reasons, so you have to be specific if you have a particular issue in terms of a particular change.

SPECHLER: Ok, so given that there was no overall reason, for reorganization…

HERBERT: I just gave you several reasons that were overarching.

SPECHLER: Well let me take the one that was most concern to us in Indianapolis, that the enormous unit, the medical school which we’re very very proud and the business school which we’re also very proud of has great potential here, were made directly reportable to you rather differently…

HERBERT: That’s not true.

SPECHLER: That’s not true?

HERBERT: That’s not true. The School of Business reports to the dean and to the provost in Bloomington. It’s not reporting to me.

SPECHLER: So there will units in Indianapolis that report to this provost, whenever he’s appointed in Bloomington?

HERBERT: The Dean of the Kelley school will report, does report now to the interim provost in Bloomington and that by the way was a recommendation that came from the Deans Advisory Council. I met with them. I heard some of their observations. I talked with the chairman of that committee. It is a recommendation from the dean of the school and it was something about which a number of the members of the Board of Trustees felt very strongly. As you take a look at where a majority of the faculty members reside, they are in Bloomington. As you take a look at
the research generated, the majority of that is generated on that campus. It was not something that was just drawn out of the air but rather was the result of feedback from those individuals and in terms of the logic, as we added more responsibilities here to the Executive Vice President, we’re trying to also balance out some of the responsibilities so that he’s able to do that expanded role as well. Were there other aspects of it?

SPECHLER: Would you care to comment on the Medical School?

HERBERT: With regard to the Medical School the dean of the Medical School is also a Vice President. He reports to me operationally; with regard to the day-to-day activities of the Medical School that continues to report to Charles Bantz. That is a reflection of several things. One is that we’re trying to make very clear that the Medical School is a unit of major significance within the university. If you take a look at the Medical School’s budget it is larger than all of the regional campuses combined. It makes no sense for the dean of that school not to be a part of the senior leadership structure of Indiana University. So now he does sit at the table with the other vice presidents and me. He still, on a day-to-day basis, works with Charles, and deals with issues impacting the school there.

The second thing is that from a legislative perspective it was my view and it’s one that was shared by the trustees that for a whole host of reasons, some of which are very political in nature it made sense. During the last legislative session, as you know, we all had budget cuts. One of the things that happened was that when we called to the attention of the legislature the fact that the Medical School’s budget was cut, the answer that many of them gave was very similar: if that’s the case then IUPUI should have come back and made them whole. The practical reality is that given the way that some of this has been structured it’s very difficult, it’s a lot more difficult for us to make the case that we can’t utilize the budget from IUPUI to deal with budget deficits of the future or failure to allocate money in the future to the Medical School. They have got to be treated as separate entities in that context. And so what we’ve tried to say is that, on the one hand, if you want to make investments into the Medical School you can do it. And if you want to cut you have to make a conscious decision that you’re going to cut because we’re not going to rob programs in the IUPUI general budget to support the Medical School. It would be a kiss of death for this campus for us to put the IUPUI general budget in that context.

And so what you will see is that we have said that the Medical School budget will still be part of IUPUI’s budget but it’s separated out so that they can deal directly with that budget. If you’re doing that it becomes more important than for their to be some relationship to the president’s office, just in terms of the logic of it. And so the way we’re setting it up now is that you have medical sciences with everyone but medicine, you have medicine, you have IUPUI general all within the IUPUI budget. So some of this is a reflection of the significance of the Medical School within the context of the university; part of it is about the need for a leader on this campus, and so you have an Executive Vice President, you have a Vice President, and he is working every day, almost every day, with Charles. The three of us meet to talk about these issues. Yesterday it was Charles, Craig, Michael, and me sitting down talking about research and how we’re going to deal with these issues.
So I think part of the challenge here is you have to get over this stuff about what do I have what do I have—the bottom line is that we’re trying to work together to enhance this institution. We’re trying to ensure that each of our campuses has the potential to fulfill their aspirations and I think that ultimately this is in the best interests of the Medical School, it’s in the best interest of the IUPUI campus, and from a longer term perspective what’s going to happen is that you’re going to see greater collaboration between the Medical School, the science faculty in Bloomington and across the institution. I think it’s very significant that the dean of the Medical School has been visiting HPER and other units on the Bloomington campus talking about ways that we can work together and generate more resources to benefit the entire institution. I see these as being very positive kinds of moves. So that was the rationale for that.

**BALDWIN:** The Life Sciences Strategic Plan that’s out. Is it on the web?

**HERBERT:** It is on the web, yes.

**BALDWIN:** I’m wondering to what extent does it spell out the duties, posts, and responsibilities of the Vice President of the Life Sciences and if there are procedures for implementing the strategic plan, to what extent are faculty members involved in it as well as administrators?

**HERBERT:** Well first, there was faculty involvement in it as we pulled it together and you can’t pull off this kind of thing without active faculty involvement. And the role for the vice president is to lead that effort, to facilitate the collaboration, to identify opportunities for collaborative grant applications, and that sort of thing…

**BALDWIN:** It’s a coordinating role.

**HERBERT:** A coordinating role, that’s correct. Coordinate and leadership in terms of identifying targets of opportunity, pulling together faculty or units that can work together, go after some of these big grants. The bottom line is to achieve the goal of doubling our externally funded grants and contracts we’ve got to be much more aggressive. We simply must go after bigger grants than we have in the past and to do that we’ve got to have stronger research teams that are working collaboratively; hopefully many of those are going to be inside the university but also there will be some that are external as well. So one of his challenges is to identify opportunities for collaboration with Purdue where that makes sense or Notre Dame, if we’re going to do it within the state and other Big 10 institutions. And so by having the title of vice president that gives him added standing in the context of going after those kinds of opportunities, in addition to being dean of the Medical School. Part of the key is that we want him to think, obviously about the Medical School, but we want him to think as a university officer and have the portfolio to be able to go forward and talk in those terms. Also he’ll be talking before the legislature as we go forward. If the life sciences are one of our highest priorities—and by the way that does not mean that it is the only priority but it is a very high priority right now and the state today when I was over at the State House, we were talking with some members and they are very excited about our coming forward with initiatives in the life sciences because it attracts so well what the state wants to accomplish. It makes a lot of difference to have someone who is a scientist and a biologist to be able to go in and talk about some of those things. I can tell you that as a social scientist my vocabulary in that regard only runs about four minutes deep. So it’s
extremely important to have someone with those kinds of characteristics and communication skills articulating our case. Other questions?

**HOYT**: It’s my understanding that RCM was sought of implemented in different ways on the different campuses. Are we trying to look at the whole spectrum of those?

**HERBERT**: Yes we’re looking at the entire structure of it. It clearly differs; the regional campuses have a different approach from Bloomington and IUPUI. They push down the units for accountability purposes to the campus. Again it varies by campus but in the case of Bloomington, the deans become RCM units. That’s not the case on the regional campuses. But the thing we’re doing is looking at this from a broader policy perspective and what happened is that when this was implemented, a number of assumptions were made about the increases in tuition and increases of state funding. The reality is that state funding has not come close to meeting the projected increases over time and so one of the questions is should we periodically recalibrate to assure that units that are more heavily driven by tuition—by state funds are not adversely impacted. So that’s just one example of a policy issue that we need to think through and understanding that once you do that, everyone else—_____ is in that process. But you have to engage in that kind of conversation and so what we’re trying to do is to assure that we’re thinking about all of the important questions that need to be addressed. The Associate Dean from SPEA, Kurt Zorn is chairing the group. We have a couple of outside experts—one actually helped us initiate the process here. Maynard who was there at the very beginning of this, but we have several folks on the team who have in depth understanding of all the issues, couple with the outside experts to help us sought out the answers to the questions. Are there others, okay Charles?

**BANTZ**: Could I ask you to kill a rumor here which I have now heard twice in two days and I’m trying to think of how to state this in such a clear way that no one interprets it the opposite way [laughing].

**HERBERT**: Good luck, I want to hear that.

**BANTZ**: This is a good luck thing in this environment I understand. The Dean of medicine as Vice President for Life Science will not supervise units on the Bloomington campus?

**HERBERT**: That is correct, was there another one that we would need to clarify?

**BANTZ**: No. I’ve heard this twice.

**FISHER**: What about other life science deans?

**BANTZ**: Nor will he supervise the life science deans on this campus?

**HERBERT**: This is not a supervisory role as a vice president. This is a coordinating leadership role. There’s a fundraising dimension of it, there’s a legislative representation element in it but it is not a supervisory portfolio. Thank you for raising that. Maxine.
WATSON: I have one more question relating to the Medical School. In the version paint which ___ legislature or whatever body it is ____ IUPUI while the medical school is ____ because the part of it—I have to read to ______ rescue the medical school _____ detrimental. What are about the congress case when the legislature decides that they’d like to keep funding the medical school ___ don’t care very much about the rest of us, how plain do we lose by having them ___?

HERBERT: I don’t think, well strategically, I think that it is difficult to do that. It is certainly the case that it is possible that the Medical School may get additional resources to respond to some of the challenges that the state regards as being a priority and I don’t think that we should—well I think that if we are able to get those resources, we ought to get those. This is one of the significant assets of the institution. But I think that what will happen is that especially—and this is one of the reasons that I’ve tried to identify major strategic areas by talking about cancer for example and saying that we want to be one of the top 5 cancer research, diagnosis and treatment institutions in the country. We can’t do that without making investments, not only in medicine but in basic science as well. And so the strategic plan talks about the linkages between the medical school and some of the other areas in the university that are engaged in research that is fundamental to the achievement of those aspirations. So it is clearly possible that during a particular period of time some units will get more money than other. But that is all part of a larger strategy of enhancing the institution. A classic example is in IT. This is before I arrived but the legislature made a major investment at this institution in IT and in doing that some units did not get what might have otherwise have been the case because as J.T. indicated it is a zero some game. But we’ve got to look at this I think in the broader context of time and recognize that there are targets of opportunity, there are issues that are going to be more significant in one point than other. So we make take advantage of those and in doing so and to the extent that we are able to broaden the base of what we’re asking for, that may enable us to help other units as well. But in every legislative session, there are going to be some issues that are regarded as being of paramount importance and legislatures are going to want to fund those; in one year it might be the arts. And you see this evidence not only in the context of the legislature but also with the Lilly Endowment and others where there are particular issues during the year that they regard as being priorities. And so what we want to do is consistently be there ready to talk about the significant things we’re able to do and whatever their interest area might be. But right now that is clearly in the life sciences and so we’ve got to be there and take advantage of that opportunity and we will be able to grow and enhance what we’re doing hopefully across the board. Again, if the medical school is doing its job right and it’s saving a number of lives and it is and we’re engaged in a major fundraising effort now to build addition facilities. Even in that context, we know that there’s a possibility of generating additional money for facilities for the life sciences that still helps the overall campus because it provides additional space that becomes very important. Again I think we have to look at this in a broader strategic kind of context and just recognize that what we’re trying to do is to be ready for the targets of opportunities that are around us.

SPECHLER: As part of the many changes that have been announced so far, you announced that you would be leaving us in less than two years. May I say that I regret that; I regret that ______ you had here but Chancellor Bantz explained to the Indianapolis faculty that there will be some proposal for increasing the chair of discretionary ____ courses that will be made available to your success. The idea again along with the legislature to allow the president to vote resources to the
most pressing priorities, do you have in mind any institutional changes that will increase the amount of the budget which after all allocated geographically to the president’s office?

HERBERT: At this point I haven’t focused as much attention on that yet. There are several members of the board that are taking a look at that but I haven’t put forward any ideas in that regard up to this point. It is the case that I indicated that my contract ends in 2008 and when I came here I told the board that I was definitely prepared to commit for five years to the institution. What became very clear to me earlier on was that the institution had really not prepared itself for a leadership transition for a new president and I had the challenge of dealing with a number of issues that a new president should not have to deal with. But the reality is that there was a job to be done and I did it. What became very clear to me was that the way that I can best serve the university is as a change agent, trying to position it. When I talked to _____ speech about building a cathedral, the metaphor I thought was very important for laying a stronger foundation for the future.

There are a number of difficult decisions that have to be made if we’re going to lay the foundation for greater strength. Some of my views were reinforced over the course of the past several months and as I talked with other presidents, one of the things that stood out was that four of us in consecutive order, have experienced some of the same problems and challenges and my belief is that if we’re going to attract the kind of president that this university will want to have to lead it hopefully over the next decade, we must fix some of those fundamental, structural and or cultural issues that create an environment in which every president for different reasons is subjected to some of the kinds of challenges that all four of us have. I don’t take any of this personally. My view is that there are things that have to be done to make this a better place. Some of the kinds of things that I particularly endured over the past ten or fifteen minutes are really part of that kind of process. I think that changing the structure of the university was absolutely essential. I think changing the nature of how Bloomington operates is very important. I think dealing with all the other kinds of things that I described, ultimately are going to create an environment in which the next president is going to have an opportunity to experience a great level of success. That does include some additional resources that enable a president to respond to priorities.

I have more money to utilize to address university priorities as president of a university with fifteen thousand students than I do here. Something is wrong with that picture and the reality is that deans in Bloomington have much more money to distribute than I do and I don’t ___ that but it’s just a simple fact. So what we’ve got to do is to assure that we have an expanded ability for our colleagues to look to the president to make strategic investments that will truly enhance the enterprise. And I think that’s what the board is concerned about. I can tell you that I am strongly committed during the time that remains during my tenure to do all I can to lay that stronger foundation. I also should make clear that I told the board that one of the things that it has to deal with is the reality that sometimes search processes, especially for presidents, in today’s environment can be very challenging and this university needs a special kind of person to come into this role and I have urged them to begin the search process this fall and that if they don’t find the right person, then they still have an opportunity to reopen the search to find the right person. But hopefully what I’ve done by stating my intentions, I’ve made it very clear that this is not about personal agendas; it’s not about trying to do things to garner more power for me. It’s
about what is truly in the best interest of the university and every decision that I make now until the time I leave is going to be focused specifically on that and nothing else. Other questions?

AGENDA ITEM #10: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES

HERBERT: If not, we need to go into executive session. So let me ask if those number lot [End of Tape 2, Side A, some comments lost]