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1. Approval of Minutes
November 28, 2006
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/minutes/11.28.06.htm
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Adam Herbert)

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

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

5. Outsourcing at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)
(Vice President Terry Clapacs)

6. General Education at Indiana University [ACTION ITEM] (60 minutes)
(Professors John Carini and Elizabeth Jones, co-chairs, UFC Educational Policies Committee)

7. Labor Studies at Indiana University [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)
(Professor Bart Ng)
http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/IFCEC_rec_12-06.pdf

8. Review of IUs Core Campus and System School Operations [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)

9. President’s Fund [DISCUSSION] (20 minutes)
(President Herbert and Professors Miller and Ng)

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Why don’t we get started.

TERRY: Yes.

HERBERT: Ok. Who’s speaking

TERRY: This is Herb Terry at Bloomington. I either sat too far away from the mic

HERBERT: Are there objections

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

HERBERT: Let me
Secretary of State public diplomacy summit, 120 corporate and government leaders from around the country, further advance US public diplomacy around the world

Fundraising

… So that is our overall strategy; to focus our request on the operating side primarily for formula-driven increases and then to ask for special initiatives like the Life Sciences and STEM Outreach. I can also tell you that we do have on the capital appropriations side, an R & R request for $52.8 million. We think that is extremely important and just to remind everyone, we have a Cyber Infrastructure Building for Bloomington, Neuroscience Research Facility for Indianapolis, laboratory renovations for all of our campuses, infrastructure restoration for all the campuses, Education and Arts Building renovation for South Bend, a Systems Biology Building for Bloomington, and land acquisition for most of the campuses. That is about $24 million. So, again it does include all of the campuses and as we get a little deeper into the session, we will be calling potentially upon the campuses for additional assistance. Simultaneously, as legislation bills are introduced that may have an impact on us, we are sending copies of those draft bills to our network of faculty and others who have volunteered to be part of the process so that we can get feedback, suggestions, word changes if that becomes appropriate. Again, this is the time for us to be as engaged as possible in the process. I can tell you that J.T. Forbes and his staff and Tom Healy are doing an outstanding job everyday over there. I think that, again, the big question is what the revenue forecasts are? We will see what happens there. That will have major implications for all of our requests.

The governor’s budget does include a number of the things we’ve asked for. The Higher Education Commission has been supportive of a number of them. The one thing that you have been hearing of, I just want to highlight this very briefly because it is turning out to be controversial in the legislature. The governor has proposed a Hoosier Hope Scholarship and World Class Scholars Fund that would be funded through the privatizing of the lottery. Again, there is some controversy about that. What I just want to emphasize is that from a university perspective, what we have focused on is the bottom line on uses of money that is used to create Hoosier Hope Scholarship and the establishment of a World Class Scholar’s Fund. We think that those are two very worthy goals of providing greater access to higher education, keeping more of our best and brightest in the state, reducing the brain drain and obviously helping us to create professorships and the likes. We have been supportive of that. Where the dollars come from is a secondary matter. But I just want to flag this for you, that this is an issue that will receive a great deal of attention in terms of whether of not the lottery should in fact be privatized.

I’ll be presenting testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee on Thursday of this week. What we’ve tried to do is separate our general appropriations request from our second request, and that is for the Life Science Initiatives, so that they are in two different tracks. I’m just very pleased to report that the chair of the House Ways and Means has agreed to hold a separate holding on our Life Sciences Initiative. That will be on February 8th. So we will have an excellent opportunity to make our case on the house side. We’re having additional meetings, again, with individual members to assure that they understand. The senate has not yet scheduled its hearings but we expect that that will occur shortly. So we’ll be ready to make our presentations there. Again, as you can tell, this is a very active period for us on the political side.
But it is one that does demand a great deal of attention and follow-up as we deal with a very aggressive agenda to leave established.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me now turn to Ted and see if he has anything from the Agenda Committee business that he wants to report.

MILLER: What I thought I would do today with regard to an Agenda Committee report is to just say a few words about the presidential search, status of the presidential search.

As many of you know there was a round of interviews in Chicago a week or so ago. So the search is focusing down on a smaller and smaller group of candidates for the position. I at the last UFC meeting made a fairly positive report of the status of things, basically saying that the candidates, the people who were going to be interviewed, were people that the faculty advisory committee had a reasonable level of comfort with.

Now, since the last meeting, there have been several bumps in the road. But in the end, coming out of that round of interviews last week, I think the people that the Search Committee currently focused on … I could say this in a couple different ways. Maybe the most effective way to say it would be to say that the people that the Search Committee is currently focused on does not include anyone that the Faculty Advisory Committee had no enthusiasm for whatsoever. If there are enough nots in there! Now, the role of the Faculty Advisory Committee up to this point was to make recommendations about who should be interviewed. That was their last act. I believe they are going to be further involved in this as the process continues but their final acts, the last act they took was to make recommendations about who should be interviewed. The people who remain in the pool are people that were in the faculty’s list. That’s maybe as far as I can go in this regard.

The other issue that has been out there has to do with the confidentiality of the search process. I, at the last trustees meeting urged the board in the final phase, when the finalists start being interviewed by the Trustees, I encouraged the board to make that part of the process a more open process. Some of you may have noticed that it attracted-- a fair amount of articles, people on the radio were asking me to talk some more about that. Other people have made similar points in the press, to the Trustees. It is I think, from the faculty point of view, something that the faculty does feel really strongly about. Today I have no reason to believe that Trustees are going to do that. It's not for lack of encouraging that to happen in the process.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MILLER: So I think I’ll stop there are we can do questions and comments and maybe someone has a question about that.

SPECHLER: I would like to ask the President about an issue that I’ve been concerned about. I
noticed that we’re going to have additional scholarships offered on the basis of merit rather than on the basis of financial need. That’s been a tendency throughout the country. When I asked the President about that several meetings ago, he answered very well and said that in his opinion giving scholarships based on merit, they often go to people who come from comfortable families, keeps our graduates in the state of Indiana. I think that is a general expectation. I wonder if there has been any research about whether giving scholarships on the basis of merit often to well-off students does in fact keep them in the state of Indiana considering the job situation here and the other attractions of the other 49 states.

HERBERT: To be honest I don’t have an answer to that Marty. I just don’t know of any research. One of the issues that has been put on the table is coming from the governor’s office, and he has defined the parameters for that. But I don’t know whether or not in doing so, if he had access to research along the lines which you discussed. But what I can tell you is that, at least in the context of the Bloomington campus, we have tried to focus on both need and merit with the view that the combination of the two will make a big difference in terms of achieving the university’s goals, both for the quality of the best and brightest students and addressing particular attention to a very diverse population of students coming from all sectors of life in the state. But again, I just don’t know what the governor had access to in making and formulating his program.

SPECHLER: Well I think we all endorse the idea of a more diverse student body. But of course the research clearly shows that students from minority backgrounds face more financial problems than other students. That seems to be the number one reason for their dropping out of Indiana University, at least according to their own reports.

HERBERT: Well the key thing is that we’re trying to place greater emphasis on the 21st Century Scholars’ Program. We’ll continue to do that and as part of our fundraising efforts as well, we’re trying to place greater emphasis on need based aid and the anonymous gift that we announced a year ago, December, I think it is an example that is $70 million for student who have to work to go to school. So again, that is something we’ll continue to focus attention on. Are there other questions? Ok, if not….

AGENDA ITEM #5: OUTSOURCING AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MILLER: Let’s keep the questions on hold for a few minutes. Let’s try to do this outsourcing discussion because Vice President Clapacs has to leave us at a certain point in time. Let me just try to set this up.

I of course have been attending the trustees meetings as the year has gone by and have heard a lot of discussions, a number of comments about outsourcing and I have heard the trustees’ views of this. It seems to be that it would be useful for the faculty of the university to hear from a trustee, what really lies behind this, what the Trustees are really trying to accomplish by doing this.

Secondly we have a question of exactly where we are in this process and we invited Vice President Clapacs to come and give us a report on that.
Third, we thought it would be useful for the faculty to have an opportunity for faculty to make comments about this, ask questions about this. So that is kind of the way I see this being structured. We have with us Trustee Bill Cast at our Fort Wayne outpost. Welcome Trustee Cast.

**TRUSTEE CAST:** Thank you.

**MILLER:** If you would begin this discussion by giving us a sense of what initiated this particular project from the trustee point of view and what you hope the results will be.

**TRUSTEE CAST:** I’ll try to identify when I speak for myself and when I might speak for the group as a whole. I think it’s fair to say that what prompted the study, the beginning of looking at the auxiliaries was a fiduciary duty, I believe it might have been my second trustee meeting or there about. Can you hear me?

It may have been my second or third meeting that there was a slide presentation called “a bend in the road” or “the road ahead”, and it was not a good look ahead. The best case shortfall of funds was $50 million per year. Beyond that it only went down hill and the numbers rose very quickly into three digits.

Then more recently we had a presentation about health care costs for which I can take some small part of the responsibility and I can tell you that I agree with the presentation that if we are on the path that we are on of $15 million a year extra, that the $85 million in five years of an annual cost, is not out of line. So looking at the landscape which included the discussions in the public realm of tuition caps and discussions that we could accomplish a lot of this education at community colleges at great savings, at a lower cost for remediation, and then looking at talking with Vice President Clapacs about cut backs and maintenance of what I think is the most beautiful campus in America. We have some leaking roofs; we have deferred maintenance that can’t be deferred much longer. I don’t need to tell you these things: I just need to get it on the record.

The other reason is that we are interested in service and efficiency. We want to maintain service. We’re not looking at a chainsaw approach. We are trying to gather the facts. We want to end with efficiency and then another very important part of this is that we have capital that is sleeping. We have inventory that is sleeping. We own things: automobiles, food carts, books, etc., and looking about this, there is nothing new about the concept. We find that at various peer organizations, institutions and not all Big 10 as I was told by the other conveyors but at least at 6 of the 11 as I’m told, I could pursue that but the fact is that the model in which the contractor for managing the service also provides capital. We would free up capital. That would be a very attractive thing to the Board of Trustees because we see that there are area such as the humanities, such as Ballantine Hall and many other projects around the state where it seems very unlikely that the legislature is going to fund these things. So I’ll cut it short at that. I’ll just say that it is our fiduciary responsibility and our need to find both service and efficiency and to free up all the capital that we can to use for things that are not easy to raise capital for, nor likely. So I might just stop at that and I see Vice President Clapacs looking up.
CLAPACS: Let me add a few comments to that in general and then we’ll eventually get to where we take questions or answer questions. Indiana University is, as you all know, an enormously complex organization. There are 11,500 appointed permanent staff people that work at Indiana University; I’m not talking about faculty and staff, just 11,500 staff people. 5,200 of those are on the Bloomington campus. And we run an organization, or an operation, that’s about $2.5 billion dollars a year in terms of budget and so you can quickly see that the task of efficiency is one that is continuous. And while the trustees have certainly drawn a focus on outsourcing, and I’m a little reluctant to use that word because it has lots of meanings and in a lot of quarters but for the moment we’ll use it. I really would like to say that this whole notion of whether or not we do things ourselves or whether or not we purchase those services has been going on for a long time. Indeed, as long as a responsible Vice President for Administration, within that definition is the whole notion of making sure that the administrative side of the university is working in the most efficient way possible.

The decision about what we do and what we don’t do, as I said a moment ago, is one that has been in place for decades. Just to give you a couple of examples that are somewhat obvious but maybe we don’t think about it like that: just take the notion of housing, for example. Back in 1969 when the enrollment on the Bloomington campus was probably somewhere around 25,000 students we housed about 12,000 of those ourselves on the campus in the halls of residence. Somewhere along the way the university made the decision that that was enough. It started out in probably 1880 as a need to construct housing on the Bloomington campus because the city of Bloomington couldn’t do it and provide it on its own. At some point the community in Bloomington could. We haven’t built a dormitory building on the Bloomington campus since 1969—Eigenmann was the last one that we built. So, for the last 36 years we have grown up to 36,600 students but the number of students housed on the campus has remained the same or in fact has decreased a little bit. We need some because we want to create a certain quality of student life for an on-campus experience but frankly the private sector has taken care of all of the growth on the Bloomington campus since.

Now, let’s shift campuses to IUPUI for a moment where all of the students except for a few that were housed in the Ball Residence Center or over in the Werthem Apartments, all of the students that attended IUPUI were taken care of in the private sector until a couple of years ago when we decided to in-source a little bit of that housing here and we constructed student housing on the IUPUI campus for about 800. And so we sort of did a reverse outsourcing so to speak because there was a reason to do it and we thought it provided certain advantages in terms of retention and campus life and so those decisions were made. We’re getting ready to build student housing at IU South Bend and IU Southeast for the same reasons we did so at IUPUI. But that’s not the only way to do it. The examples I’m using simply say that for a long time we’ve been thinking about what we do and what we don’t do, and efficiency but also contribution to the university life, obligation to existing employees, are all part of the decision-making process. We buy utilities in a certain way on the Bloomington campus, we in-sourced, and then affirmed the decision to in-source the manufacture of steam in the central heating plant. In fact a year ago we spent almost nine months working with the governor’s office to determine whether or not that was still the most efficient way to do it. In the end the decision was that that was the most efficient way to do it. Rather than contract with a local utility, Indiana University Bloomington will continue to make its own steam and its own chilled water. And we make chilled water at IU
Northwest and a couple of other campuses. But here in Indianapolis ten years ago or so we made the decision to get out of the chilled water business, that it could be done better by a private utility provider and so we’ve purchased chilled water since. These are just examples of things that ebb and flow and go one way and go another and have for a long time.

If we were to sit down and add up all of the things that have been outsourced for decades I’m sure it would be more than half or maybe even three-quarters of all the business that we do at Indiana University that’s not directly in support of the defined mission of the university which is teaching, research, and service. There are lots of businesses that we need to be in or provide to the faculty to make sure that the university operates properly. The major obligation is to provide those services in the most efficient and cost-effective way. As Trustee Cast said a moment ago there are lots of pressures. Like any other organization we have revenue and we have expenses and there’s a hierarchy in terms of demand what revenue we have and the first call is to provide resources to do those things that are directly part of the core mission of the university. And that’s what it’s all about.

So while the trustees have made this an issue, frankly, there isn’t anything new about it, we’ve been doing it for a long time, and we’ve just made a point of publicizing what’s going on in a different way. We’ve chosen some units that, frankly, if you read any article that’s been in the Chronicle in the past two years about “outsourcing” you can see these are traditional services that most universities have taken a look at. There’s nothing new about looking at the Motor Pool or looking at the Bookstores. In fact, the IUPUI campus looked at their Motor Pool a few years ago and decided it was better done by somebody else. So it’s been outsourced at IUPUI for several years.

Where we are today? We are looking at the Motor Pool. In fact, by the end of the week I’ll have a recommendation to the president. As I said we have 11,600 full-time appointed staff people at Indiana University. The Motor Pool is a group of 12 employees. Does that make them not very important? No. Every single job is important at Indiana University. And it’s really important when it’s your job being looked at, by the way, and we’re very aware of that. But is there a way to do it and provide a better service? And, you know what, I think there might be. In terms of what Trustee Cast mentioned a moment ago, sleeping capital. Is it really necessary for Indiana University to own 400 cars and trucks, 66 rental vehicles that go in and out all day? Or, can somebody else do that better? Is there a better way to leverage the purchase of that? And there are, by the way, financing groups around the country that buy as many as a million vehicles a year and if you don’t think they don’t get a better price then we do, you are wrong, they do. So is there a way to do it better? And we’ll have a recommendation to the president, as I said, probably by the end of this week.

We’re also looking at bookstores. I don’t know the exact number but I do know that at least half the bookstores in the Big 10 have been outsourced. We’ve given those who are in that business a chance to tell us whether or not it can be done better and we have received proposals from those very folks you would suspect—Barnes and Noble, Follett’s, TIS. We’re looking at those proposals today. There isn’t anything wrong with the way those business operations have been performed at various campuses to date. The only question is there a better way to do it? Is there a way to generate some more revenue that can be reinvested in the academic enterprise? And,
frankly, that’s what it’s all about.

We’re also going to take a look at printing services on the Bloomington campus this year. But you know when you look at that it’s already outsourced. The printing operation simply competes for business against private printers. So it’s not just capital in terms of fund balances but real estate and equipment. Does it make sense to continue to devote a strategic piece of real estate on the Bloomington campus which is down in the Showers area—off the local property tax rolls by the way—and with equipment that’s worth several hundred thousands of dollars when there are people in the private sector perfectly willing to do that, and do that at a comparable price. Those are the questions.

Now if you make decisions to do it, what are your obligations to our employees? Our employee obligation is what it’s always been within the Indiana University culture. That is, we take care of our own. We try to make things work. It is true, and we’ve seen that already, that private sector companies generally have benefit packages that are not as rich as those we offer at Indiana University. That says a lot about Indiana University right there by the way. We have always been very good to our staff folks. Our health care packages, our paid time off packages, our retirement plan contributions, are all better than most of those you see in the private sector. And that’s a nice thing about IU. Most of this change, if it comes, will probably be done through normal attrition if at all possible. If not, we’ll cross those bridges when we come to it. Now that may not be very reassuring but that is what we’re trying to do. Rather than use the term outsourcing, and I know I’m opening myself up here and someone will say “gee what a spin that was”, but frankly it really isn’t outsourcing. We’re not talking about shifting jobs to Mexico. We’re not talking about sending services away to Illinois or Minnesota. We’re talking about what’s the right business model for Indiana University. And, probably in many cases, it’s a hybrid of doing things for ourselves and doing things in partnership with those that can do it a little better for a variety of reasons. It’s very true the state has given us some advantages. We don’t pay property taxes. We generally have other tax breaks. We have the advantage of being able to finance properly and cheaply and we also have the advantage of not having to make a profit. I mean, really, if an auxiliary service is running well it breaks even over the long haul. You don’t want to overcharge the faculty for those services. On the other hand, you want to stay in business and do it right. If the private sector comes in they only do it because they want to make a profit. So we have some built in advantages all along the way so there has to be some other reason why we would, so called, privatize these services. But they do exist and most of them have to do with the leverage of purchasing power or management or, and this whole thing of benefit packages. Having said all that and that’s just basically stream of consciousness on my part, I’ll be happy to open it up for questions.

HERBERT: Let me just also add, as you just heard, the first recommendation that will come to me relates specifically to the Motor Pool and it would be my intention to consider that recommendation and then advise the Board at it’s meeting in February on the actions the administration intends to take relative to fulfilling the charge that’s been given to us by the Board. That is, that this, in my view, is among the delegated responsibilities that the Board has given to the Administration. The board has challenged us to take a hard look at this and whether or not we can operate in a more cost effective and efficient fashion with sensitivity to [some comments lost] so we will make a decision [some comments lost].
The bigger project, frankly, is the bookstore. And we aren’t at the point right now in terms of recommendations from the Vice President, we’re not at a point to talk specifically about the bookstore. Just so you have a sense as to what is likely to happen from a timing perspective in the context specifically of the upcoming board meeting.

MILLER: This is just the Bloomington Motor Pool?

HERBERT: That is correct, Bloomington only.

VERMETTE: And what about the Bookstore, will that be just Bloomington also or that will be the whole university?

CLAPACS: We accepted proposals for the entire university but we allowed interested vendors to give us a proposal for one or two or four or all of the bookstores. So we made that as flexible as we possibly could. In the end, one of the vendors chose only to give us a proposal on the Bloomington bookstore. The others gave us proposals on all of them.

VERMETTE: Is that like Coke? Like Coca-Cola has to be on all the campuses?

CLAPACS: Correct.

VERMETTE: Will the Bookstore be the same model?

CLAPACS: Doesn’t have to be and as I said it’s a very complex discussion. For example, the bookstore here on the IUPUI campus is scheduled to go into the new campus center that we’re building and there’s already, it’s already part of the financing model that was used to put that project together, and that bookstore is scheduled to pay about $40/square foot for space. In Bloomington the bookstore occupies a very strategic part of the Union Building, a beautiful space, and they pay about $8/square foot. So there are lots of differences to work our way through and make sure that we understand that we’re having an apples to apples comparison. And, by the way, we’re not alone in how we’re doing this. We, as you might expect at a university, we are more inclusive than exclusive. We hired a consultant, Crowe Chizek, an accounting firm, to be our consultant and Crowe Chizek was chosen because they have done this for a number of universities in the Big 10. And so they are very experienced in this. Two, we invited two faculty members from the Kelley School of Business in Bloomington and Dean Dan Smith was gracious enough to give us the help of two and they’ve been tremendous partners in analyzing the data. Three, we invited the students to be part and I don’t know if they are out there somewhere but Betsy and Andrew have attended, one or the other or both, have attended all of our meetings as we’ve discussed the Motor Pool and the Bookstore. If they are out there somewhere, I can’t see everybody, and would like to comment on what the experience has been, that would be helpful. And then finally, of course, those who are responsible, those who have a vested interest in all of this and in the way it turns out—Bob Martin from Indianapolis, Neil Theobald from the Bloomington campus—have all been part of the review process too. In the end, one way or another, these auxiliaries contribute to the overall funding model for Indiana University and each respective campus so it has to be right.
SPECHLER: Terry? This is Martin Spechler. You and I are friends and neighbors of the 5,000 staff employees that you mentioned on the Bloomington campus and I know that, I hope that you and I are going to have an opportunity to live here a long time and retire and I’m for privatization. I think there’s a lot of inefficiency throughout any large organization but two things bother me very much, even with your very comprehensive discussion. The first is that when you mention the individuals you’ve consulted I didn’t catch any kind of mention about the government and the leaders of the City of Bloomington. And it does seem to me that there’s been absent any kind of discussion, the kind of thing you have just given us, would have I think persuaded some people in Bloomington that the objectives of the university are benign. And I missed that. The second and more important thing is that from what you say privatization is going to mean that the fringe benefits that our staff receive, generous as they are, considering their meager salaries, are going to be reduced by the privatization. That’s the expectation. That’s one of the sources of the profit that’s going to come from the privatization. My question to you, Terry, is this: in negotiating for a proposal have you specified that these vendors should be protecting the benefits, the salaries, and the union protection that our friends and neighbors receive as staff members of Indiana University?

CLAPACS: Those are part of the negotiations, Martin. And, but the way you posed the question, assumes that all employees are excellent employees and should carry over. And while we believe that that’s true in general you have to give a private company some say in who they hire. But let me just say this about the Motor Pool. In the end, if this turns out the way I think it’s going to turn out, there will probably actually be two additional full-time positions in Monroe County, in the City of Bloomington. There may be a couple fewer at Indiana University but three or four more for whoever might operate part of the Motor Pool—and by the way, just so we clear the table on the Motor Pool there will continue to be a Motor Pool. Of the six services that we asked for proposals for there was only interest in two of those services. The other four things that the Motor Pool does the Motor Pool will continue to do, under any outcome that this has. And so there will continue to be a Motor Pool without question. But the whole notion of who goes where, they will interview everybody, if we decide to go that direction, but in the end there has to be some leeway about who works where. And we will do everything we possibly can to protect our own employees. We’ve always done that at Indiana University.

TRUSTEE CAST: If I might add a word, Vice President Clapacs.

CLAPACS: You bet.

TRUSTEE CAST: A statement that I didn’t catch all of it, about not consulting Bloomington government. The Trustees have heard from both the legislative contingent and city government. And they have made their case and I think it would be no surprise to anybody in any of these tables that depending on what your duty is, what hat you are wearing that day, depends on how you would pose the question. In this case, from the legislative contingent, came in the very first paragraph of the letter the concern that contracting for these services might lower the wage base and it went on at some length on that in this particular region. I think that’s a very appropriate concern for government in that area and for city fathers. If you put on another hat and go up to Marion or Valparaiso their concern that they pay more in Bloomington is not as great as the
concern that Bloomington would have that the wage base be very high and the benefit package be very high. I think what the Trustees are trying to do is exactly what Vice President Clapacs has said and that is to arrive at a fair wage that is fair to all the citizens of the state and to the people who have dedicated their service to Indiana University and that is probably the number one topic of individual one-on-one conversation between the trustees. But I think you’d have to also say that part of our job is not a very good one and that is to try to fund the university and be responsible knowing that the mission is primarily teaching and research and that they must come first and if hard decisions are to be made when we put on our hat that is the hat. So I’ll try not to go on any further. Thank you, Vice President Clapacs.

CLAPACS: Thank you for that comment. And Martin may I add to that, you certainly would know that President Herbert has talked with our various legislators about this. I have spoken with Senator Simpson and with Representative Pierce about it and I intend to talk to Representative Welsh. We have responded to their letters and so as much as we possibly can in recognition of the political process that’s always at play we want to be responsive to those who are around us.

HERBERT: Let’s go around each of the sites. Bart, do you want to just call a site and see if there are other questions?

NG: Are there any more questions from Bloomington?

TERRY: I think we have two.

PRYOR: Just one fairly short question. As you are aware, Vice President Clapacs, there’s quite a concern on the Bloomington campus regarding sustainability. Is sustainability or a move toward increasing sustainability, going to play any role in the outsourcing discussions?

CLAPACS: Well I think, maybe, I can’t tell who asked the question, but if you are up to speed on all of the sustainability discussions we have met recently with the group led by Professor Emeritus Ben Brabson and others to establish a sustainability task force which will evolve into a permanent organization of one sort or another. And of course that will play a role in all of university life. As I stated in the beginning, we already manage outside of Indiana University, probably 75 percent of all the business functions that are out there. I mean the ones that we don’t are certainly the ones that you see and understand they are Motor Pool, bookstores, and other things and there are so many other things that we purchase—and not only that we purchase, but folks like the City of Bloomington purchase as well, ironically. When the sustainability value is embedded in the university in the right way it cuts across everything we do, including managing whatever contracts we’ll have with outside vendors.

HERBERT: And I would also just note that from a presidential perspective that is something to which I attach a great deal of importance and will be commenting further on that over the course of the next few weeks.

TERRY: I have just a quick comment or question based on something specific that Vice President Clapacs said. He said that one of the bidders on the bookstore contract was TIS which raises in my mind the consideration that the university will place on competition in making these
decisions. At least here in Bloomington if TIS acquired the IU Bookstore they would in effect have a local monopoly on physical sales of books, they would still compete with the internet, but they would have this local monopoly. And in general we depend on competition to provide good services at affordable prices. So I hope competition play into that decision. And then maybe to speak to Trustee Cast a little bit, maybe one of the things the Trustees should take a look at, is whether there are other instances at Indiana University where competition, rather than selecting another preferred vendor, might be something we should do. To be very honest there’s a great deal of small scale physical plant work here that can’t be afforded to be done because of the rates that Physical Plant charges that might be done by painting contractors and that sort of thing in the area. So I hope there’s consideration of both the advantages of seeking an alternate vendors but also opening us up to competition and getting the efficiency that competition creates.

CLAPACS: I think that’s an excellent point. I would like to respond in saying that in the negotiation for any privatization one would protect the university, hopefully, at least it’s our intent to do so by having control over price increases, charges that are made against the university, or charges that are assessed students or placed on books for example and certainly that’s part of our negotiation as we look at the Motor Pool. With anybody that’s interested we would want to say over the length of the contract what sorts of increases would be allowed.

In terms of competition I think you are absolutely right. There are a lot of things that we could do to generate competition. You mentioned the Physical Plant, I know a little bit about those sorts of things and we do test the prices of the Physical Plant charges and, by the way, a lot of what’s in that of course is just the distributed cost of operating a plant. But I think that we could do more to create efficiency. It would send some of the work outside the university but I think your point is well made.

NG: Ok, let’s get around the sites quickly. IU Southeast any questions? IU East?

FRANTZ: No, I will just make an observation just to underscore the importance of looking at long-term savings. I think sometimes the savings show up in the short-term, just to be vigilant about that. It’s a tough decision but I support the efforts of the university though.

NG: Thank you. IU Kokomo

KINTZELE: No comments.

NG: IU Northwest?

BODMER: I have nothing to say from here. Thank you.

NG: IUPUI?

HAMILTON: No comments here, Bart.

NG: South Bend?
CLAPACS: May I ask a question? I understand that there are students at the IU Bloomington site and I would be interested in knowing whether those students feel like the student interests have been recognized and protected through the process that they’ve experienced so far.

ROHWER: I think our concerns have been well handled by Betsy Henke who I appreciate you putting on the task force that’s looking at the outsourcing initiative. That’s about all. I think we’ve been fairly kept abreast of the issues that have gone forward. Thank you.

NG: Thank you very much.

MILLER: Bart, before we finish here, I know you need to leave in a moment or two.

CLAPACS: I’ve got ten minutes.

MILLER: Ok, we did get some questions by email that people wanted to have addressed. I think a number of these things I think you’ve addressed but there are a couple of other ones. Let me just go through them. There is always a risk of fraudulent use of public funds in private contracting procedures. What will be the permanent legal oversight over this process and what will be the cost of this oversight?

CLAPACS: Well there is that risk in everything we do. We have literally hundreds of contracts that exist today and it’s the same responsibility that in any new contract for any of those hundreds that are there in existence now. And that is someone at Indiana University will be responsible for monitoring compliance with the contract. My guess is if we were to take the Motor Pool for example and if there is a continuing operation called the Motor Pool and the motor pool leadership that exists today would also monitor and be responsible for ensuring that the contractual provisions are met in a way that’s certainly legal. The university counsel with review all contracts that are signed by Indiana University and so it’s the normal business mode that is there now and it will continue and will be done in the good way that IU does its business.

MILLER: Thank you. Then a final one: When a corporation—Barnes and Noble and Follett are the main ones—takes over a college or university bookstore, a typical pattern is for it to sign a contract agreeing to keep the same workers, same pay, same benefits, for a year or two. After that, it typically replaces full-time with part-time workers. If IU outsources its bookstores, what’s to prevent the same thing from happening here?

CLAPACS: I don’t know that that’s typical, that a contract would say everything remains the same for a year or two. In our case, we would first look at the person rather than the position. Frankly, I suspect that some positions will be, if they are privatized so to speak, at some point they would change. We can’t control that at some point. None of us have a lifelong contract with Indiana University. What we would do is do everything we could to protect the incumbents, to be sure that they are through normal attrition patterns helped in any way we can, but we can’t control once we privatize a business what happens to all those positions. Frankly, there’s where some of the savings is. We’ve been really up-front about that. Indiana University has a very rich benefits package and that’s great for all of our people at IU. But it’s better than what most of the
rest of the state enjoys.

TRUSTEE CAST: Mr. Chairman?

HERBERT: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

TRUSTEE CAST: You asked one question and passed by, did we hear enough from the students. I will just add for your records that one of the wonderful benefits of having your email on the homepage of Indiana University is that you get a wonderful variety of email. A number of them have been from the students, commenting on the high price of textbooks, and it has been part of our discussion that if any group should be protected it would be to try to find any way in what is a serious national problem even being looked at by Congress, that if we can in any way, we would try to see that those services and those prices to students would be, to the degree that it’s possible to do so, be protected.

HERBERT: Ok, Terry, thank you very much. Trustee Cast, thank you as well. Now we’ll shift to the next topic which is general education.

AGENDA ITEM #6: GENERAL EDUCATION AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: Ted, let me turn to you to facilitate this conversation.

MILLER: Well let me just start off by orienting you to the documents that you have in front of you regarding general education. There are three documents. One of them is a draft of a Report to President Adam W. Herbert. One of them is a spreadsheet printed on legal paper. And then a third one is an amendment to the Report to President Adam W. Herbert regarding general education at IUPUI. Oh, and then there is a fourth document, I’m sorry, which contains a resolution that is actually the focus of our meeting here today. We’re hoping that the UFC will act on this resolution.

So, the document about General Education at IUPUI is a substitute for the material that is currently in the Report to the President. IUPUI has a section in the Report currently. That material will be coming out and the new document General Education at IUPUI will be going in. Now, if we take that as a given then we look at this Report to the President and there really are two main parts to the Report. The first is a rather brief section on pages three and four which is a Statement on General Education at Indiana University. This tries to explain what it is we think we were doing as we prepared this report which is ultimately going to Board of Trustees. Then we have material from each of the campuses regarding the status of general education on those campuses.

The spreadsheet document is basically focused, many of you will recall that a year ago the state legislature passed a law regarding a so-called Core Transfer Library, and this spreadsheet is basically focused on how Indiana University is going to deal with those Core Transfer Library courses. And in particular, how those Core Transfer Library courses are going to play into the general education requirements on the various campuses. This spreadsheet document is a work-in-progress. This is not something that is complete at present. You know, there are some things
that we’re still kind of working on. We had a discussion in the Agenda Committee earlier about those kind of blanks and we have I think we’ll have information that will be put in here next week prior to the report actually going to the Trustees. But that document is an important element of what we’re going to try to say to the trustees because it bears very heavily on transferability among all of the public institutions in Indiana. And that’s a topic that the trustees have actually been interested in over a number of years now.

So, what I’d like to do is to, I believe that Betty Jones was not going to be here today so John Carini is at the Bloomington site and John I’d like to call on you please to represent the views of the UFC Educational Policies Committee in this.

CARINI: Thanks, Ted. I’d also like to point out a few other members of the committee who are present. Don Coffin at Northwest, Steve Cox at Kokomo, and Paul Rohwer is our graduate student moderator at Bloomington and also a member of the committee. Betty Jones was not able to make it. I think Indianapolis is being represented by Sharon Hamilton. Sharon are you there?

HAMILTON: Yes.

CARINI: At the other IUPUI site?

NG: I believe both Trudy Banta and Sharon Hamilton are at the other IUPUI site.

CARINI: So of course we’ve always had a strong general education component in all of our degrees. Now what started a number of years ago was that each campus moved towards a campus-wide general education program rather than a school-defined general education program. And in fact, finally this year, we can say that all of the campuses, all eight campuses, either have a program, are developing a program, or are revising an existing program. And so that’s I think the first time we can say that in our history. Several things to note about that. One is that there has been a very strong faculty commitment towards creating those campus-wide programs, running them and maintaining them, teaching the courses obviously, but also reassessing and reviewing. As I said, some of them are now in the process of being revised. The faculty are very strongly committed to general education and I think anybody who’s been involved in any of those processes has in fact come out of it realizing how committed each faculty is to the process that has gone on.

Now the other interesting thing is that each campus has gone to a campus-wide program for its own reasons and in many cases have ended up with a program that’s very well suited to their particular campus. For example, at South Bend they have moved toward a program that emphasizes a more interdisciplinary approach with a relatively small number of core courses. At Bloomington, on the other hand, we have tried to emphasize giving the students an opportunity to explore the breadth of opportunities that are available at a large, research-oriented university. But the thing that has really come across to me is that the faculty, one reason they have embraced the process is that it allows them to define the undergraduate experience at their campus and of course that is now merging with the mission differentiation process that’s ongoing. But I think the people at South Bend and Southeast and Bloomington really believe that they have come up with the best program for their students using the resources that they have available to them.
And so from my perspective having gone through the process in Bloomington I realize that the decisions we’ve made, while they’ve been the best we can do at Bloomington, are not necessarily appropriate to the other campuses they are not going to have the hundreds of courses on their distribution lists that we can offer here. Similarly, we could not do what they are doing at South Bend with a smaller number of core interdisciplinary courses because the intimacy of that sort of program would not work very well in Bloomington with the diversity of programs here. Indianapolis has its own unique challenges because of the even broader range of majors that are offered there.

Let me just make a few comments about the Core Transfer Library matrix also. In some cases, for example, at Indianapolis and at Southeast, an existing faculty committee that governs the general education program has looked very closely at those Core Transfer Library courses and so what you see there is a judgment about how those courses will fit in to their current programs. In the other cases where the programs are still being developed they give the best guess for where those courses might fit in the future. I think the case of Southeast is very interesting from the point of view of transferability. When they first looked at the list of about 80 courses they were able to make obviously a fairly easy judgment about the courses that are offered at IU Southeast, maybe about half of those courses, about whether they fit into the general education program or not. Most of the courses that they did offer did indeed fit into their general education program. But then they took a second look at courses that are not offered there and found that a large number of those would also be acceptable, or in the spirit of their general education program, even though they were not actually or necessarily taught at their program. So I think that’s the direction the other campuses will move, like in Bloomington when the course lists are defined and we’ll start to look at easing the transferability process. I think it’s a very good example of where, even though each campus has a somewhat different program, they are willing to work with easing the question of transferability. Now I’ll just open it up to any of the other committee members who want to make comments and then the rest of the faculty council. Sharon, do you have something to say about the new document?

HAMILTON: The document from Indianapolis, you’ll be pleased to know, is fifteen pages shorter than the document that preceded it. We hope it presents a nice concise, coherent, summation of our approach at IUPUI and we gratefully appreciate the patience of the UFC with our getting this in at the last minute and including it in today’s discussion. It begins with a preamble, just a one-page statement that outlines our general approach. Then we have a graph that integrates our Principles of Undergraduate Learning, which as you know are the keystone of our general education program, with what we call our empirical core, which is the courses that most of our students take in their first- and second-year, these are required by most of our undergraduate programs. And that spelled out as efficiently as we can in a graph. Then we have a section on implementing the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, a part on the structure of IUPUI that supports general education, and how we go about assessing general education in the major, in the minors, and in electives because general education permeates all aspects of that. We also spell out a couple of key programs on our campus, our Integrated Department grant, that provide funds for departments to integrate the Principles of Undergraduate Learning across their curriculum using our electronic portfolio and themed learning communities and capstone
courses. And we do address also the transferability on the STAC list and then we conclude with a statement about our approach and the recognition it has received so far.

CARINI: Thanks. Steve or Don, anything to add?

COFFIN: I think John’s summary was excellent.

MILLER: Alright, well thank you very much John and the rest of the committee.

CARINI: So, what we’re asking for in the resolution is an expression of support for the process that has gone on each campus, not necessarily the product of that process but the process itself that we have confidence in our sister campuses that they have acted wisely and we hope to the benefit of the university and its students. Thanks.

MILLER: Well, the way I read the resolution, John, it seems to me that the focus is actually not so much on the material that comes from the individual campuses but rather on this Section I on pages three and four of this draft Report to the President.

CARINI: Yes, that’s what I meant.

MILLER: So I would invite members of the Council to comment on this Statement on General Education. This is something that we want to include in the Report. If there are things about it that you feel could be improved it would be useful to have a discussion about those. We are going to vote on this resolution today. So to the extent that this Statement on General Education is problematic from your point of view we should undertake to deal with that.

TERRY: If I could start this off. I’d like to say that I like the Statement in principle. I like it especially because it recognizes that it’s just not going to be possible to develop a system-wide, uniform, general education system but that that does not mean that we’re trying to undercut transferability and all of that. It’s balancing those two interests that is part of the problem and I like the arguments made or the justifications made in the Statement for why, given the differences of the campuses, there will be differences in the general education programs of each campus. And at this point, you know, absent much more detail from a number of the campuses final details that we haven’t even settled upon in Bloomington, I’m not sure that you can say much more than these principles. But I think these are good ones and ones that I would endorse.

MILLER: Herb, the first paragraph of the document, the purpose of the first paragraph is actually to try to make the point that even though we are taking different approaches on the various campuses when you look at the outcome there actually is a great deal of similarity across the campuses. Right? That’s really the point that’s made in the first paragraph.

And then in the other three paragraphs on page three we talk about why it is we think that the differences that exist are really important and why we think that they should be there. And then finally, the final paragraph on page four goes to this Core Transfer Library idea and trying to facilitate the transferability issue. So that is my take on the structure of this document.
TERRY: I agree. I think all this does is reflect that there are legitimate different means on the different campuses to achieving the common goals in the first paragraph. And given mission differentiation and everything else, I think that’s the way we should go.

HERBERT: Why don’t we just go around to each campus? Let’s start off with East and see if there are any other comments.

FRANTZ: I am supportive of the document and I’m glad we’re at the point where we might be able to move forward.

POMPER: I have one request for a change, namely that East currently is listed with Bloomington as making progress. Actually, our general education curriculum is practically in place so I suggest we move the East away from the Bloomington and put it together with all the other campuses in the previous sentence.

MILLER: You mean you don’t want to join with us in this? [Laughter] We want a little bit of company.

NG: You’re on your own, Ted.

HERBERT: It sounds to me like there’s an incentive to include all the campuses in that earlier sentence.

SCHNEIDER: Move up your date.

HERBERT: That’s right! Ok, what’s the next campus?

NG: South Bend?

HERBERT: South Bend any questions or comments? Southeast?

FINKBINE: No questions, no comments.

HERBERT: Indianapolis?

BALDWIN: I have a question. One thing I thought might be here which I don’t see here in the last paragraph on transferability and I don’t know how to phrase this. Is there any way you can say that when questions arise about the transferability of courses that students should be given the benefit of the doubt? When there’s doubt if the course is equivalent, so often it’s a rigid decision, when a student shows up with a transcript that doesn’t exactly match. There should be something that says that the student has the benefit of the doubt.

HERBERT: Can everyone hear that comment?

BALDWIN: I thought there might be some sort of statement in the principles here about when courses are transferred and when students apply to have courses transfer that they be given the
benefit of the doubt when there’s a reasonable chance that the courses are equivalent or nearly equivalent that the student should be given the credit. Rather than exactly the same duplicating...I don’t know how to put that. There’s a tendency to have the courses match up exactly.

**MILLER:** I guess, Jim, I don’t see this document as necessarily...I’m not sure it’s trying to make a general statement about transferability. The context that we’re working in here is kind of delimited by general education and we, in particular, because of this state law that mandates that we deal with this Core Transfer Library, we are trying to make a statement here directly about that. So we’re really going quite beyond what you’re suggesting with regard to that because what we’re doing is we are basically guaranteeing that students will be able to transfer these courses and we are specifying how they are going to fit into the requirements on the campus they transfer to. So it’s really a stronger statement but it’s more limited. It’s not talking about every transfer course that there is.

**SCHNEIDER:** It also is clear that this is a preliminary draft so it’s not the final document.

**BALDWIN:** Ok.

**HERBERT:** Any other comments from Indianapolis?

**HAMILTON:** I just want to comment that I really like the work that’s been done on the Statement. I’m glad that we have a nice strong Statement about how we think about general education in our students’ undergraduate careers, that we’ve related it to the major, and I think whoever brought all of that together, that introductory statement, should be commended for doing a nice job.

**MILLER:** Must be Kelly.

**HERBERT:** Well said. Any other comments from Indianapolis? Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** No comments from Kokomo.

**HERBERT:** Northwest?

**COFFIN:** I would agree it was Kelly who did most of the work in bringing that together and I think she deserves the praise of all of us. We have no additional comments.

**HERBERT:** Fort Wayne? East? We already heard from East. Ok, we have a resolution on the floor.

**CARINI:** Can I read the resolution? It turns out the copies did not circulate here.

**SPECHLER:** I have a comment. I’m not sitting at the campus where I usually teach so of course it seems that we decided that general education should be handled on each campus in accord with its mission and its capabilities. My doubts are about the transferability matter and of course a lot
of work has been done but what is really accomplished here by this draft? I think very little as a matter of fact. If you look at any of the lines, for example, I’m looking at Sociology, not my field, in South Bend. That’s on page 10, just as an example at random. Well, we’re told that this course counts for general education in South Bend. No objection to that. The issue really is whether this course would transfer to any other campus and I see absolutely no assurance here that it would. It’s listed with another course at Northwest with the same number and several other courses with a different number but the same title. I think that when Ted says there are no general rules here he’s actually right. This does not assure us that any one course will transfer to another campus nor does it assure us that a student who fulfills all the requirements on one campus will be recognized as fulfilling general education on any other campus. And those are the two things that seem to me required for transferability.

CARINI: Let me just say that the courses will transfer. That’s what the legislature has mandated and once the Commission for Higher Education accepts all these courses, they will be regarded as equivalent. So a sociology course at South Bend will be equivalent to the course that’s on the list for Bloomington, if the student transfers to Bloomington.

SPECHLER: For general education?

CARINI: No, they are equivalent. They are counted exactly the same way. Once the student transfers it will count the way the course counts in Bloomington. Now, as far as the larger issue, I think what we’re saying is that each campus has to define what the requirements would be, and those don’t necessarily transfer because they do not match up in terms of numbers of courses or the precise requirements.

SPECHLER: So, John, let me understand because I didn’t understand before. A student who says “I fulfilled Sociology S100 in Kokomo”, now he comes to South Bend and he or she can be assured that because they passed the course S100 in Kokomo, this will count as if he or she took Sociology S161 in South Bend.

CARINI: That’s correct, that’s the meaning of this list. Once they are accepted by the Commission for Higher Education. So, would you like me to read the resolution?

HERBERT: Yes, please do so.

CARINI: “The University Faculty Council endorses the principles outlined in the Educational Policies Committee “Statement on General Education at Indiana University” in their January 2007 General Education at Indiana University: A Report to President Adam W. Herbert.

The University Faculty Council transmits to President Herbert evidence of the current status of each campus general education program and any revisions underway. Furthermore, the UFC transmits to President Herbert the Core Transfer Library-General Education assessment matrix which, in a preliminary way, demonstrates the extent of expected transferability of general education coursework.”
HERBERT: Ok, the resolution has been read. All those who are in favor please say “aye” [aye], no. These sense I have is it is adopted unanimously.

Let me just also first thank and congratulate all of you who have worked so diligently on this. I know that discussions of general education have been going on for many, many years. I think that this action is very significant. It is my intention at the board meeting to indicate to the board that it is my belief that the faculty have responded specifically and very effectively to the mandate that was given to us. My report will be broken into three parts; I’ll talk first about the framework and make some general observations about the philosophy that underlies all of this. Second, I’ll talk about the courses and third we’ll focus on the timeline of implementation. I have talked with Ted following my introductory comment, which I will indicate to the board that it is my belief that the mandate that is given to us has been met but there is still work that will be ongoing as it relates to the courses. Again, I think there will be some additional conversation about implementation timeline. But they will ask Ted to comment in more detail. Finally I will ask the vice chancellors for academic affairs on each of the campuses to be ready to respond to any questions that may rise relative to what is included in this report from each of the campuses.

I think the conversation with the board will be a positive one and although I can’t speak for them, I think they all feel very good about where we are at this point. I can certainly tell you that I do. So thank you for all of your hard work. I think that this is a very exciting day for Indiana University and I’m looking forward to giving a very positive report to the board.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD (continued)

HERBERT: So in order to accommodate Terry Clapacs’ schedule, we did not allow full time allocated for questions and comments. Let’s go back to that to see if any members of the council have questions that you would like to pose to Ted, Bart, and me.

BALDWIN: I just wondered when I saw the news reports about this new proposal to divvy up the state lottery, if IU and other state universities have any ethical qualms or concerns about these funds depending on the success of the lottery which is in fact a regressive tax.

HERBERT: What I can tell you is that when we talked; when the presidents talked with the governor, the focus initially was focused on needs and his belief that there was a need for additional resources and for financial aid so that we can do more to help the Hoosiers students second he indicated earlier about the brain drain. Finally he said that it is clear that if we’re going to achieve the economical and developmental aspirations that we have as a state, that we simply must add additional intellectual capital in our universities.

So my bench point at least, to have a governor come forward and say I’m prepared to commit a billion dollars over the next decade to support those activities is a very significant decision. The second part of my view on this it is really a legislate decision as to how that is to be funded. But the reality is that we do have a lottery in place now and the question is whether or not those issues of public good are ones that …I would only add one other comment and that is that when the lottery was first sold in the state, the references made at that point at this being something to enhance education. So, one way to look at that is that we are coming back full circle to the proposition that this is one of the few available sources of significant revenue that can be utilized
to fulfill the original promise to the people of the state. So in that context, whether the legislature chooses to generate a billion dollars from this program or from some other source, it seems to me is of less important than fact that these are critical needs for the future of this state and for the young people of this state. I’m comfortable in the fact that this was initially sold to the citizens of Indiana as something to enhance education.

**BALDWIN:** But I can’t get over the irony of the lottery taking income from the lowest part of the state’s population for merit based scholarships going to support highest half of the state population; the poor being taxed to support the well-off.

**HERBERT:** Well, if you ask me what I would like to see monies being used to support 21st Century Scholars and that sort of thing, the answer is yes. But the program is what it is and the alternative is to say that we oppose the establishment of a billion dollar program to enhance education and I cant do that in good conscience when I look at what our critical needs are the transformative impact that this kind of program will have on all of our institutions and the students that we serve.

**BALDWIN:** But the irony is still there.

**HERBERT:** I understand Jim. Are there other questions?

**SPECHLER:** I have one other question for the co-secretaries. Of course, lottery is not a tax at all, it’s a voluntary payment. But this has to do with the Life Sciences Initiative. The Presidents opening remarks mentioned very large sums for the Life Science Initiative and IU. But as far as I know in my seven year term here we have never received a report from the people responsible, Vice President Brater for example, how this thing is going to work, on which campuses and with what cooperation and what its influence will be on academic departments in the natural sciences and beyond the natural sciences. I want to suggest that we invite Vice President Brater to make a presentation about his strategy for developing life sciences because a lot of money and a lot of influence are involved here.

**HERBERT:** Ok.

**MILLER:** Good point, Marty. I don’t think we have, as an Agenda Committee, I doubt very much that we have a problem with that. It would be a good thing to do.

**HERBERT:** Any other questions or comments?

**AGENDA ITEM #9: PRESIDENT’S FUND**

**MILLER:** Could we go to #9?

**HERBERT:** Ok, let’s go to number 9. I’ve been getting messages about planes and they are changing flight plans and that sort of thing here. So we want to cover a few of these things while I’m here. So let’s go to item 9.
MILLER: Yes, well Item #9 is here in a way as a point of information. Many of you know that at the last Trustee meeting there was a recommendation from—I guess it was technically from the RCM Review Committee to establish a President’s Fund. We thought it would be useful for the University Faculty Council members to have some kind of understanding of what that means. Maynard Thompson is with us today. He was a member of the RCM Review Committee and we’ve asked him to give us some general information about how this President’s Fund is going to be developed and how it will work in a general sense. Following that we can have questions from the council members. Maynard?

THOMPSON: Sure, the RCM Review Committee made a policy recommendation that there be such a fund. That recommendation was a result of discussion with a wide variety of people: deans, faculty leaders across the campuses, with some consultant help about the availability of resources at the level of CEO university -- level campuses elsewhere. The review committee concluded that in fact it was to the university’s advantage for the president to have discretionary resources.

The board adopted that recommendation and charged the president with developing implementation plans. So there was a second group consisting of those who where on the RCM—or some of those who were on the RCM Review Committee and some who were not, to develop implementation plans for the President’s Fund. There were several considerations. Obviously there are no resources that are not currently being used or are in general available for reallocation. For the basic principles, the implementation committee developed was resources went to the President in this discretionary fund, should be resources that were not now in the institution. That is, they should be resources that would appear next year or the year after that or the year after that.

Secondly, they developed a feeling that we should identify a pool of these new resources that was as large as possible in order to keep the tax rate, if you will, as low as possible, to generate a fixed pool of money if you have a large pool to be taxed, you get taxed at a lower rate to recover a fixed amount. So that the implementation committee recommended that all incremental revenues look at the resources that appear as anticipated resources during budget construction. This year, was not there last year. Instructional fees, state appropriation, indirect cost income, earned income; all such resources would be available and those resources—a certain fraction of those resources would be set aside, provided to the president for discretionary use. Based on current budget projections, in the short term, that is in the next year or two years, we expect somewhere in the neighborhood of $80 million to be available as discretionary funds. If those resources are taxed at the rate of 12.5 percent, that would generate about $12 million. That was the goal of the implementation committee, that we generate $10 million of new base money each year for the president.

It should be emphasized that these are base resources to the president. That is, recurring funds for the president. But the president does not have to allocate them as recurring funds. The president can allocate them either as recurring funds or as one time funds. If for example the President would choose to allocate the resources on a one time basis, for say three years, then at the end of that three year period, the president would have a pool of $30 million of base resources. To use a phrase that is used by the time you get to $30 million dollars thats real money. The President and
whoever he looks to for recommendations, can make significant changes to the institution with financial resources of that magnitude.

That basically is the summary.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much Maynard. So if there are some questions that you would like to ask please feel free to do so.

**COFFIN:** Ted, this is Don Coffin at IU Northwest. Is there any plan at this point for determining how people will apply for use of those funds and how decisions about that will be made?

**HERBERT:** At this point, no. My assumption is that that will be one of the first things that the new President will have an opportunity to do. Quite frankly at this point, we don’t have the resources available and I think that this is one the pluses that board is using to utilize as it talks with candidates for the presidency because this is a fund that will be available to them. So my assumption is that the person will come in and will make a decision and terms of how input would be given relative to priorities, and any input that would come from faculty as decisions are being made. But we will not do that at this point. I think that’s something for the next president to deal with.

**COFFIN:** Thank you.

**HERBERT:** Other questions or comments?

**TERRY:** I just have a comment I guess on what President Herbert just said. Two trustees’ meetings back, not the one last week at the IU Foundation, but the prior one, at the end of the meeting I remember Trustee Ferguson asking President Herbert to report on what kind of a system was going to be created to distribute the funds and what faculty input on those would be. I assume what the President just said to us is probably what he will say to the Trustees on that matter at the February meeting. By and large it seems to me like a good course of action and I can certainly endorse the idea that few people would want to be president of this institution if when asked what discretionary funds do you have, the answer is zero. So I think this is a good way to go. Nonetheless, I hope that the process eventually used by the administration, which won’t change massively with the new President, is one where it’s clear that there’s an advantage to that president, of talking to the campuses and to the faculty councils and then the campuses that have them, the budgetary affairs committees, before making a decision as to how to allocate that money. The amount of the money depends on such things as what kind of tuition increases we have but we’ve thought about it here in Bloomington and it’s possible that $4 or $5 million dollars that absent to this plan would have gone to the campus will go to the president. We’re historically under-funded. To some extent a good year for this university should be a good year for its units and we’re not taking that much money out of the new money to create a president’s fund. But I would hope that in the course of sort of briefing the incoming president on the things that are on the table that a strong encouragement comes from the leaders of the faculty council that this is something that requires a good deal of deliberation in which the chancellors obviously have an interest but also the faculty on the various campuses will have a strong interest.
HERBERT: Herb, I can also tell you that this will be one of the items that I will have on the discussion agenda with the new president as well. It seems to me that this, without question, is one of the most significant initial process discussions that must be held. So, in addition to what your faculty leadership will recommend or comment on, I will also do so. I can assure you of that.

TERRY: Thank you.

SPECHLER: I’d like to ask Maynard a mathematical question because it wasn’t clear to me just how much this fund will amount to after say two or three years. Now Maynard let’s suppose that every year, for the sake of argument, $10 million is put into the fund. OK? After the first year the fund, if the president doesn’t spend anything, has $10 million in it. Now in the second year, this is the issue, an additional $10 million is put in but is there also a carry-over of $10 million from the first year. In other words, after the second year, if the president hasn’t spent any money does he have $20 million in the fund or $30 million in the fund?

THOMPSON: He’s already spent the $10 million…

SPECHLER: No, forget about the spending. I just want to go on the source side because…

THOMPSON: He would have $20 million.

SPECHLER: He would have $20 million. So that first $10 million doesn’t continue indefinitely. It’s just $10 million every year.

THOMPSON: I don’t see the difference. If it’s $10 million every year then it’s $10 million dollars that continues indefinitely until he spends it as base.

SPECHLER: So after the second year he’s got $20 million if he didn’t spend anything the first year.

THOMPSON: Oh, I’m sorry, didn’t spend anything. Then he has $30 million. I misunderstood the question.

SPECHLER: So the $10 million, putting aside spending, is a flow that goes on indefinitely and then the second year there’s a new flow that goes on indefinitely. So in actual fact at the end of the third year he’s got $60 million which was available for spending had he not spent anything.

THOMPSON: Had he not spent anything, that’s right.

SPECHLER: Ok, I see. Well, thanks.

TERRY: When we restructured the IU Medical School, It’s no longer quite as much a part of IUPUI as it was in a budgetary sense and we’re making this huge request for Life Sciences. If we got the Life Sciences appropriation, or even if we don’t, is the Medical School contributing to the
President’s Fund and would the new life sciences appropriation if it comes through be counted as new revenue?

HERBERT: These are all very good questions and I think that there’s going to have to be some fine tuning on all this. I think the biggest question is would the life sciences initiative be included and politically I’m not sure that that is something that is likely to happen. But, again, I think that these are matters that the Board is going to have to take a look at as we go through this. Frankly, there may be a few other issues where there’s a need for some fine tuning and I will raise those issues with the Board in terms of what some of the added considerations will need to be. I’m just not prepared to do that right now. But I don’t think that this is the last discussion of the formula for generating these funds. But what you’ve heard is what came forward to the Board. What the Board wants to do is to assure that the next president has some financial resources that can be utilized to develop new initiatives and to enhance what we have currently in place. I can tell you from first-hand experience that those dollars are not there. I don’t even have enough money to fulfill the commitments that were made previously. So this is a very significant step for the institution in terms of attracting a new president. That, coupled with the organizational changes that have been made, I think will make this a much more attractive position for a potential president. We’ll keep you posted. Again, I think you’ll hear, you’ll definitely hear over the course of either the March meeting or the subsequent meeting of the Board, additional conversation about this as we try to get a clearer handle on what realistically we can do with the fund. Again, going back to the issue of the life sciences, I have some doubts as to whether or not that would be included even though it would be new revenue.

NG: I actually think it would be helpful that the recommendation from the Zorn Commission, Kurt Zorn’s recommendation, is there a readily available document so the faculty can read up on this? I’m not so sure that was widely circulated.

KISH: There’s a resolution in the Board minutes but I’m not sure there was any other document.

NG: That seems to come from the RCM study.

HERBERT: That’s correct.

NG: That doesn’t seem to…if they produced a document or report that we can actually look at. There’s a lot of talk, for example, for the Budgetary Affairs Committee chairs to look more into this and I think that would be helpful.

HERBERT: I’ll get to you whatever they’ve produced and/or presented to the Board. We’ll get that to you so that you can put it on the website.

NG: That would be helpful. Thank you.

HERBERT: No problem. Maynard will make sure that happens. Any other questions about this topic? If not, Item #8.
AGENDA ITEM #8: REVIEW OF IU’s CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL OPERATIONS

MILLER: We’re working, now we’re working in reverse order of our agenda. You will recall that at our last meeting we had a report from the committee that was studying the core campus and system school configuration. We had some discussion at that meeting. We thought that it would be worth putting this item back on the agenda in case there were other thoughts that the council members wanted to make with regard to this item.

Let me begin the discussion. If you take the report and try to generalize it, it seems to me that what this report actually seems to recommend is that the system schools should be essentially—well, they’re not recommending that all the system schools be dismantled but it certainly seems to provide an opportunity for that to happen. But, the core schools are to be maintained. And those schools that used to be system schools will be refashioned into core schools. That kind of, in a very general sense, that’s what the report says to me; that we’re really going to try to consolidate our multi-campus schools into a set of core schools and whether we have system schools or not is of lesser concern.

Well, the point that I would like to make about this is that I really believe that before we sort of consolidate all of these things into core schools that there really should be a process involving the faculty in these schools—I believe the faculty has to have a bigger role in this than they have had to date. I personally am not opposed to multi-campus units. I think there may well be a place in Indiana University for multi-campus units. But, I believe that really the faculty in these units has got to engage the question, or possibly re-engage the question, because as many of you know I have been a member of a multi-campus unit faculty for 30 years now and it’s very clear that in the beginning SPEA was a genuine multi-campus unit with a faculty that was more or less integrated across the various campuses. But with the onset of the RCM system SPEA has just sort of slowly kind of evolved into a set of five or six, more of less, independent academic programs—still with a single dean, but the amount of interaction between the campuses is much, much reduced over what it was. And I think that’s probably happened in most of the multi-campus units. So my feeling is that if we’re going to try to re-energize this multi-campus idea we somehow have got to get the faculty engaged in this. And to the extent that they don’t want to engage it then I don’t think we should do it. That’s kind of where I am.

HERBERT: I read the report and in talking with Chuck Bonser, the chair, I have a different understanding of the basic premises that underlie what they’ve put forward. With regard to the system schools what I heard was a statement that originally the system schools were created because there was some question about capacity on the regional campuses to offer these programs by themselves. Now that we’ve gone through a process of mission differentiation which we have devolved the campuses, decisions about admissions, decisions about a wide array of other matters that what that says is that those campuses now are in a position that they have the capacity to offer programs on their own. And that what we should do is provide the opportunity for the regional campuses to assume responsibility for those programs, that they will no longer be directed by either Bloomington or IUPUI but rather be stand alone programs as a reflection of that maturation process.
And, the second issue was one of whether or not there continue to be benefits to having a few, what are now called core schools, that would benefit by continuing to have a relationship between specifically Bloomington and Indianapolis. And so those were the issues and then as part of that conversation the conclusion was in looking at everything—in the case of Social Work for example, there are accreditation issues such that if we broke up the “system school” that the programs on the regional campuses would not be accreditable. Therefore, the group urged that we maintain that as a system school. But in the case of SPEA, in the case of Education, that have already devolved, they still have a federation model where there is some discussion and collaboration but clearly not to the extent as the case way previously. Nursing is a slightly different model again. So what they did was take a look at individual schools and make some slightly different recommendations but I think that basically the question is, as we’re going through the process of providing opportunities for the regional campuses specifically to carve out their own destinies in the broader context of the total university, if in fact that characterization is correct. That is, that they are no longer in need of guidance and control from Bloomington and Indianapolis, and where that is no longer necessary we give those campuses a chance to run their own programs. That’s basically the heart of what I was reading and what I heard from Chuck.

Now the issue of the core campus, that’s the very simple question, does it make sense to continue to have programs, to have a school that has a presence both in Indianapolis and in Bloomington. In the case of some schools, the Kelley School for example, I think it does benefit from having presence on both campuses. We’ve taken a look at some areas and what I’m doing now is coming back and looking at the context of each of the core schools just to get a clear sense as to what the issues are. It is clear to me that there are some administrative matters that have not been addressed even though we’ve had a policy, even though these schools have been in place for a number of years—what is the relationship of the dean of a core school, or a system school, to the chancellors on the campuses where those programs are operating? How are positions filled? What impact does a dean have on the budget of one of those programs? So, anyway, I think that and you’ve heard the presentation and what I have done, by the way, I have indicated to the Board that we’re not prepared to make a set of recommendations at this meeting. We’ll delay that until the March meeting because I think that the attention of the Board at this meeting ought to be on gen ed. This is such a big issue that I don’t want to have this clouding the conversation of something that is so significant with regard to the academic character of the institution. So, I’ll put this on the agenda at the March meeting and we’ll continue to have a conversation. But that’s the basic conversation and Maynard is working with me on this and he’s helping me with the data collection. I have to go get to the airport but if there’s any follow-up conversation I’ll be talking with Ted again in a few days and we’ll have a follow-up conversation because there are some other things that I need to hear on this. Thank you.

MILLER: The President is leaving us, you may have noticed.

HERBERT: My flight time has been changed; one flight was cancelled, the other time was pushed back, but I have to get to Washington.

MILLER: Thanks, Adam. Well alright, then, if anybody else would like to make a statement about this matter maybe…Maynard, would you like to say something?
THOMPSON: No, I don’t think so. I think the President presented his current views on this.

MILLER: My main point is that I don’t think the faculty has been engaged in this process to the extent that it really need to be involved if we’re going to make good decisions about how to go down this road.

NG: I agree.

AGENDA ITEM #7: LABOR STUDIES AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MILLER: Alright so then we have the final item on the agenda, Labor Studies at IU. This is a report from Bart on the status of this particular situation.

NG: I think some of you already know that the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council made a recommendation to the full Council and that document was posted on our website, I would say since December. And since then the Council have actually met with representatives of Labor Studies, they came to a Council meeting on January 9th, six of them representing various campuses. And we had a very productive conversation. First of all, there was some discussion of the budget. At least by my reading of the budget it seems to be, by the latest figures, we came to the conclusion that there is in fact no budgetary difficulties for the Division as we see it. The conversation that took place at the IFC on January 9th was very much focused on the missions, the character of Labor Studies as a academic subject, there was quite a bit of exchange on advocacy, in what way the Labor Studies faculty see themselves as advocates. In fact, that discussion led to the Labor Studies faculty rewriting their response to the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the IFC. And all these documents now are on the web.

So the Indianapolis Faculty Council will be voting, will be taking a vote on the recommendation of our Executive Committee at the February 6th faculty council meeting. And, of course I can’t really guarantee how the vote is going to go but my feeling is that very likely the recommendation of the Executive Committee will be accepted. In the meantime, I understand that there is some discussion that is taking place among at least one school, the faculty within one school, about the possibility of taking in labor studies. I will in fact be participating in that discussion. So the process is very much in place and I think it will come to a resolution; at least the faculty governance role in this issue will come to a resolution by February 6th. And so I’ll be happy to answer any questions you have.

SPECHLER: Bart, this is Martin Spechler, I guess I’m a member of the School that you refer to.

NG: Don’t make any assumptions, Martin.

SPECHLER: Looking at the report it seems to me that one thing is missing. You very properly emphasize the necessity for Labor Studies faculty to embrace all the responsibilities and restraints that other faculty members have at Indiana University. That’s very good. But, where
the report does not refer, to the institutional way of assuring that that occurs in the immediate
future. I would have thought that the proper recommendation, and I don’t think it’s here, would
be that Labor Studies faculty be appointed in various departments but that they have some kind
of committee structure by which they could confer about common interests. Much like African
American Studies or Women’s Studies where all of the faculty, as I understand it, have at least
part of their appointment in a more traditional department but where they get together for
intellectual exchange and curricular matters and so forth. Is that the intention of the Executive
Committee, Bart?

NG: No, it is not. You said several things that caught my attention that led me to believe that you
are making certain assumptions on facts that are not in evidence. Mainly, you think that a
decision has been made to place these faculties into various departments. Frankly, no such
decision has been made. And in fact the Executive Committee does not see as it’s role to make
recommendations of what is the future structure of Labor Studies, except to the extent that we
believe that keeping Labor Studies as a cohesive group has academic advantages. In fact, I think
this is our recommendation. Also, I want to tell you that the Executive Committee has not really
made its final recommendation in some sense to the Faculty Council because following the
January 9th meeting Labor Studies actually re-wrote their response to our recommendation. So
the Executive Committee will be meeting this Thursday to perhaps revise our recommendation
and one likely revision is that we recommend that Labor Studies, once the structure issue is
settled—mainly that they are either joining a school or as a department or what not—that the
program, the academic program, will be taken up for review. So, I think that precisely what the
faculty responsibilities should be, what their relationship with the rest of the university, I think at
this point it’s premature. It is of course assumed that if they want to become academics they will
in fact avail themselves to all the opportunities that we all participate in. So it will be superfluous
to actually tell them, to get down to that level, to tell them what issue they should or should not
do at this point.

SPECHLER: Since I didn’t assume that any decision has been made. Rather, I’m
recommending to you and will make this clear at the meeting in February that if you are serious
about the recommendations that we need an institutional structure that will assure everybody that
those recommendations are carried out. You talk about a cohesive program. That is a
recommendation. But I really think that it is our role to recommend that the Labor Studies people
have a home, each of them, in the most appropriate traditional academic department.

NG: But I think the statement you just made seems to imply that each faculty member would
have a home. Is it a separate home? Or is that a home that the group would have a home as a
group?

SPECHLER: Well, this is a major issue, Bart. I think that each individual should be attached to
the traditional academic department which is most appropriate for that person but that all of the
Labor Studies department of course could have meetings together, coordination, and so on. The
model would be similar to the successful model of Women’s Studies and African-American
Studies.
SCHNEIDER: Can I ask a question here, Martin? It’s Bill Schneider. I think your comments are really more appropriate for the IUPUI Faculty Council or even for the Executive Committee discussions. I’d like to move from that to really the point of where this goes from here because in fact this is only an IUPUI Council vote on the recommendations to the IUPUI Chancellor. So then will, I’m not sure that it will formally or not be taken to the president or the trustees, but let’s start just with the chancellor. To what extent the Executive Committee has been in touch with the chancellor to let him know and to get feedback as to whether or not these will be accepted or enacted by him. In other words, what do you expect?

NG: Put it this way, at every step of the way, I have kept my chancellor informed as to the thinking of the Executive Committee. What I cannot do is to extract from my chancellor what his thinking is on our so-called recommendations. And so I would just leave it at that. But I and Rosalie in this case, in every meeting we have with the chancellor, we kept the chancellor informed as to how we see our recommendations and what direction it’s going to go. The chancellor seems to have taken the view that he wants to maintain objectivity until he gets our formal recommendation. So, therefore, I cannot, that’s another way to tell you that I really cannot share with you what I think the chancellor is thinking.

MILLER: My recollection, Bart, is that, maybe I’m wrong about this, so a point of clarification. The recommendation not only is a recommendation to the chancellor but also to the president of the university.

NG: Yes, absolutely.

MILLER: So it’s a recommendation both to the chancellor and to the president to engage this question and make something happen that is reasonable. That was my understanding and I thought that was perfect.

NG: That’s correct.

VERMETTE: But it cannot happen if the Board of Trustees [some comments unclear].

MILLER: Well, I don’t know if it will go to the Board or not. I’m not sure this is a trustee issue.

TERRY: Bart, can I ask a question? This is Herb Terry in Bloomington. I read the Executive Committee’s recommendation and I’m very impressed with their analysis of the problem. I’m also impressed with the list of criteria, the five things that they hope the DLS faculty would agree to on Page 7 of your report including the third one that Martin pointed to. I’m wondering if you can give me any insight as to how you believe that DLS faculty, in that January 9th meeting, responding to those recommendations. Does it appear that they are going to buy into those? Do they fundamentally disagree with them? What was their reaction?

NG: Well, Herb, I think that there was some misunderstanding about the word “efficacy” at one point. And so there was really quite spirited discussion that happened in that meeting. But I think that at the end it all worked out to the good of everybody in the sense that the DLS faculty actually went back and re-drafted their formal response in which they actually clarified, for
example, that their view about their academic obligation is no different from all of us. That means they have to take a very critical view of the issues or the problems that they study and they do not necessarily always believe that they have an obligation to advocate for labor unions, for example. If you will actually if you get on the web now on the IFC website you will find a updated revised version of their response that can actually answer the question that you posed directly. My feeling is that they in fact find those recommendations very reasonable and they are quite prepared to actually adapt and change to you know make the division to stay as a division and work together as they have been doing in the past.

TERRY: I appreciate that. Your report was linked to the agenda but their rewriting was not. I guess I would add one more thing to this discussion. Here at IU Bloomington, we started out with African American studies programs and Women’s Studies Programs. With experience those have evolved into departments and I think you may not want to necessary to decide that question at IUPUI when you consider this. If this continues, I wouldn’t foreclose the option certainly. In the initial stage when you don’t have very many faculty and this sort of thing, it might look like something like a program. But I think there has to be the opportunity there for this to grow into a department of some kind.

Finally, I was about to suggest when we were discussing the bookstore since we had members of the School of Business School on the bookstore committee. It might have been important to add critical and objective members of the Labor Studies Faculty, but I didn’t.

NG: I just noticed that I think Chancellor Bantz is actually at the Indianapolis site. Are my eyes playing tricks on me? Perhaps you heard the question that Bill Schneider raised and I didn’t want to speak for you. Perhaps you can answer, maybe Bill can restate the question.

BANTZ: Bart I heard the question. I have actually been here almost the time since we got the door unlocked over here. And I can answer it. I want to say Bart’s description of keeping me updated and Rosalie and both of them keeping us updated is exceedingly accurate. It is accurate that I have been less than forthcoming with a conclusion because I do not have one. It is quite clear to me that the governance process needed to work through very thoroughly the issues and frankly I am exceedingly impressed by the work that has been done by Bart and Rosalie and all of my colleagues on the executive committee and the Faculty Council in general this is a very complicated matter. The discussion in the last two meetings has been exceedingly rich and thoughtful on everybody’s part. What I have been doing now is listening to those discussions and I will read exceedingly careful the reports as they come to me. I have a limited time to make a decision. It is only 10 days. We are following by the book the IUPUI process. It has been guided by Mark Sothmann who seems to be the only person living that has worked through this process at IUPUI so that’s the way we are going to handle it. I am looking forward to the opportunity to look this through based on your recommendation.

VERMETTE: Charles, this is Rosalie…could you comment on what the process is after you look at it and make your decision? Does it go to the President? Does it go to the Board? What happens?
BANTZ: I have looked at what happened with Health and Rehabilitation Sciences as I read the document and you can be assured more than one time before I put this in writing. But as I read the document this is not something that the Board approves and this case. But I will confirm that as we go forward. What I found in the files from Chancellor Bepko a letter to President Brand informing him of the reorganization of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences.

COFFIN: Bart? This is Don Coffin from IU Northwest. Since we’re the other campus that seems to be directly involved here, do you have any, because I haven’t heard anything from our administration here. Do you have any sense for what is going on here? I hate to sound that I don’t know what’s going on. We’re getting less feedback than you are getting.

NG: No I think that the feedback part, I think there has been a lot of conversation especially prior to the so called Sothmann report but I think at this point everybody is just waiting for the process to come to a final resolution. I understand that as various points there was some feelers sent out to your Chancellor for him to take over the entire Labor Studies program but his concern as I understand it was that IU Northwest doesn’t have any program that really has a system wide responsibility so there is a lacking of a model that gives him pause at accepting Labor Studies in its current form, as a single unit that has Statewide responsibilities. Having said that, I think that Chancellor Bergland was very forthcoming in stating very clearly had the so called Sothmann model be adopted he would certainly support labor studies on the Northwest campus. So what I am saying is that there were as far as a statewide program concerned I believe its fair that Chancellor Bergland was hesitant but was very supportive if that Labor Studies should be split up and there is a component in Northwest that Labor Studies would be fully supported in that context. I think that Ruth Needleman is very much aware of this. I have had various conversations. I think that Chancellor Bantz has a comment.

BANTZ: What I would add is that as these discussions are coming to a close and the discussion of the faculty council at IUPUI, I have asked all of the units named in the report as possibilities to consider what there faculty response would be to the proposals that are being made and that has been true for both the Sothmann recommendation of the two hubs and that is where Chancellor Bergland is the most important interest and also the schools that are named in the report as well. Because it is critical in my opinion, I be in a position to know how the schools will handle the question of faculty input on a decision about any change in faculty into those schools.

NG: Thank you. Are there any other questions?

MILLER: Well, alright, I know of no standing committee reports that are ready to be given, nor do I know of any old or new business and therefore I will say that this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very, very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:08 pm.