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3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
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*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Herbert, Professor Miller, and Professor Ng should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc.

AGENDA ITEM #1: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES  
(Don’t transcribe the discussion part but you can start with Ted’s thank you to John Ross)

MILLER: Could I just perhaps say, while we’re waiting for others to come in, that I appreciate very much John Ross’ service as chair of the committee. This is not the first time that he has served in this capacity. My recollection is that every time we have had nominees come forward under John’s leadership that we have had a very good reception for the candidates brought forward and I really do thank you very much John. Thinking back a little bit further in time, I recall some rather rancorous discussions in the UFC over nominees for honorary degrees and you have taken care of that problem for us and no doubt have earned yourself a prevalent role in our thinking about these matters.

KISH: I’m sorry to interject a sort of house keeping item, the product of John’s good work, the confidential paperwork you have about the honorary, if those of you that are here if you could leave it behind we will shred it. Those of you that are on remote sites, if you could please shred that at your home sites that would be preferred by the committee.

ROSS: And they have two more levels of approval because they become real, are they a secret still?

KISH: That’s right. This is a confidential until the various ceremonies occur.
AGENDA ITEM #2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: Ok, next order of business is approval of the minutes of January 23rd, 2007. Is there a motion that we do so?

TERRY: So moved.

HERBERT: Second? All those in favor of approving the minutes of January 23rd please say “aye”, opposed. The minutes are adopted.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

HERBERT: For my report let me just first tell you that at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees I did indicate that I’ve asked each of the chancellors and in the case of Bloomington, the provost and the vice president for student affairs to initiate processes for the development of No Smoking Policy.

We currently do have policies at both IUPUI and IU East. This is a reflection of the fact that our institution is a leader from a research perspective and also from treatment perspective with the second largest medical school in America that I think appropriately should take a very strong stand with regard to health related issues.

We also have asked the legislature for a major investment in the life sciences and I have asked that each campus through the normal processes that they engage in, assure broad based consultation that a proposed policy be submitted to the President’s office by October. Those will then be shares with the Board of Trustees and they will go into effect in January of 2008.

Let me just give you a legislative update. We are actively engaged in the legislative process. I can tell you that out legislative team, our Government Relations office doing an outstanding job. In addition, several members of the university family also have provided testimony with regard to some of the matters that we are focusing priority attention on. The House has finalized has finalized its budget proposal for 2007/09 budget fiscal biennium. The vote was along party lines, 51-48. Let me just highlight a few of the elements of that budget just so that all of you have the information that you can share with your campuses. I would also just note that this phase one of the process. That budget has now gone to the Senate and is being considered there.

With regard to the operating budget, there are two components; one is for our normal operating activities, the other is a special operating appropriations request, specifically for the Life Sciences Initiative. The House proposal does provide $25.5 million for our ongoing operation. At least that is an increase in our current operating budget. If you put that in context, that is a 2.1% increase over last year. That has been adjusted for enrollment change for campuses for which there has been enrollment growth. We did have one issue with regard to IU Northwest. We were able to get another half million dollars added to the budget that was originally pulled from it. So I think that will help that campus enormously and we were able to fortunately to catch that earlier on and we were able to get that adjustment. The House proposal in addition includes $40.8 million for a two year investment in the Indiana Life Sciences Initiative. As you know, that
is our major new initiative priority and I’m just very pleased that we have gotten the kind of traction in the Legislature that we have received up to this point. The challenge obviously is for us to not only keep the $40.8 million but also in the Senate we will try to move a little closer to the total amount that we have requested. That is, ideally what we would like to have is 30 and 20 for a total of $50 million at a minimum. This is still a challenging budget year, so I think we all can feel very good about the fact that the House has acknowledged not only the importance of providing continuing funding for our ongoing operations but also $48 million for the life sciences.

One other piece of good news is that we asked for funding for our Pathways to Success Program and although only half of what we had asked for is included, that is a very important step. Add it together; I think you will be pleased to know that our total operating budget increase for next year is 9.2%, as you include both of those parts of money. In any kind of legislative year, when you are able to get from one of the houses an increase of that level, it is very positive.

With regard to Capital Appropriations, there are a couple of elements of this that you should be aware of. The House has proposed a major funding for R & R (Repair and Rehabilitation) of infrastructure. This is of critical importance for all of our campuses and the House has proposed $49.5 million. As you know we have had some years when we have gotten essentially nothing. So $49.5 is very significant. To put that in context, our request was for $52.8 million and they are recommending or have proposed 49.5. Again, I’m very pleased with that and we hope that we can sustain that as we go in the conference.

I will tell you that there is $24.3 million in delayed payment monies that we did not receive. As you may recall we had a period a couple of years ago where the legislature did not—I guess it has been over 2 years now, where the state did not give us the money for one month’s operations. We did get some R & R money last year. Instead of giving it to us in cash as it was taken away from us with an understanding that those dollars had to be used for R & R. So there is still $24.3 million in delayed payments. The Governor had proposed that that be given to us also for R & R. we have to see what happens and it may very well be that that will somehow be another part of the ultimate negotiations in terms of what we receive. The ideal situation would be that we get 49.5 plus another 24.3. The sense I have is that they are going to come back and if we get those additional dollars it will be in the context of R & R. But however that plays out, if we can sustain increases at this level it will be very positive for us.

There also were five capital projects that were funded. One is the Bloomington Cyber Infrastructure Building. That is for $18.3 million in bonding authority. On the IUPUI campus, it’s $20 million for our Neural Sciences Building. That’s $20 million again in bonding authority. In the case of South Bend, we have the Education and Arts Associates Building and there is a $27 million allocation in bonding authority. There is at South East, there is a million dollars for architecture and engineering for a Medical Education Facility. We don’t yet have a Medical Education Program there but the money has been allocated for that purpose.

Finally, Notre Dame—a pledge has been received at Notre Dame for $10 million for the expansion of the Cancer Research Center, a medical education facility. So there is $10 million
and a cash appropriation to match the donor gift so that we would essentially expand the medical education center with $20 million in additional funds.

Just a few other provisions that I think you should be aware of; one authorizes the Trustees to create a School of Public Health. We currently have 3 academic units that are offering degree programs in public health. Ultimately if this is approved we will have to sort out how that plays out. But I think it is, again, tied back to the recognition that the life sciences are extremely important and that we have done a very good job of articulating the importance of that area economic development.

Another provision would be to make college textbooks sales tax exempt. Our students have done a very good job of lobbying this and the House has recognized that this is extremely important and it has been very impressive to watch the students make their case.

Lastly, this is an area that is of continuing concern for, it is a proposal for a tuition cap that would not prevent universities, and this is a quote, “to set a tuition rate for any two year period that exceeds the compound annual growth rate of Indiana median family incomes for the immediately proceeding five years.” That would be devastating for us. I have had private conversations with the speaker as well as the president of the senate about that. I am optimistic that we will get that addressed. But this is something that we have got to stay on top of and assure frankly that the Senate addresses this. We will have to watch that as it into conference, because it is part of the budget bill. To put this in context, that would limit tuition to a 3.27% increase over the course of the next 2 years. So that is a significant problem.

About 20 minutes that the Brain Gain Proposal has been adopted in the Senate. This is a very significant development. As you may recall, the Governor held a press conference announcing his desire to privatize the lottery. The House has made it very clear that it is not receptive to that proposal. Initially, the reaction in the Senate was negative. Senator Kenley has presented an alternative plan. He calls it the Brain Gain Proposal and there was a hearing held on that on the 20th. We did have some members of the IU community led by Vice President Brater talking about the issue. Professor DiMarchi took part in it as well. The bottom line is that what this essentially does is to reshape the Governor’s plan to create a competitive Indiana Life Sciences Fund. We hope that there will be some modifications still in this but essentially what it would do is provide $40 million annually for public and private university based research activities related to the life sciences. It also would provide $20 million annually for scholarships for high achieving students; nursing graduate students that are interested in teaching and also teachers willing to provide instructions and stem disciplines in distressed schools. So what they’ve tried to do is to focus this in a more prioritized fashion. Every valedictorian in every public school in the state would be eligible for one of the scholarships and—well, obviously that should hopefully enhance acceptability of it.

So we’ll see what happens. Basically the position of Indiana University is that we’re not getting engaged in the comment of whether or not it’s appropriate or not to privatize the lottery. What we are concerned is the in-game on that and the fact that however the legislature comes up with the money, it will make a material difference in our efforts, certainly with regard to the life sciences as well as dealing with the Brain Drain issue.
Let me just also note that we had Hoosiers for Higher Education Day last week. I was very proud of our record turnout. We had over 750 folks there; alumni, faculty, staff and students. We were very pleased to see the turnout. South Bend had the largest number, from what we could tell, folks there. I don’t know how many buses came from South Bend but there were about 140 folks there from what we were told. Chuck Schalliol, the State Budget Director, spoke along with Representative Pelath and Craig Brater talked to the group as we tried to explain—the former talked about some of their views and priorities. We also provided a special award to David Ford of Hartford City. That, I think, in a nutshell provides some insights into what is going on.

I will just make one final observation and that is with regard to General Education. We did have presentations at the last board meeting and Ted did an excellent job of making a presentation on behalf of the UFC and the faculty overall. As a final item, with regard to this, I did indicate to the board that the faculties on all of our campuses are continuing to work on this and that they want to assure that we’re continuing to make progress. The are some questions that they continue to have especially with regard to Bloomington. So, we will, at the April meeting, provide an update with regard to the ongoing efforts on each of our campuses to fulfill the mandate that the board has given relative to this area. I just want to once again thank all of you for your hard work. As I indicated to the Trustees, this is a very significant step that the faculty of Indiana University has taken. It is something that I think that all of us can be proud of and our students ultimately are going to be the beneficiaries of what is taking place. You have done this in record time in some respects as we have responded to the board challenge and I appreciate that very much.

AGENDA ITEM #4: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HERBERT: Let me now ask Ted if you have any comments?

MILLER: Let me say something about, I guess I have three topics. The first one pertains to a meeting that the various leaders of the faculty senates across the state public education system where invited to attend a meeting sponsored by the Higher Education Commission. That occurred last Friday and the main topic of the meeting was a focus on what the Commission calls The Framework for Higher Education in Indiana. There were trying to get some comments from the faculty in how we felt about such matter; the structure of higher education in the state, the roles of various institutions in the state, and that sort of thing.

The current framework is under review. The presidents of the institutions have been invited to make comments and what possible changes might be made with the consult of the faculty last week. The Commission is actively engaged in a review of this particular matter. I would simply suggest to all of you who might be interested in this to go to the website that the Commission has, look at the agendas for some of their past meetings, and look at the documents attached to those agenda. There are some—what you might think of as draft material that is under discussion by the commission that has a bearing on this framework project. I think it would be useful for the faculty of the Indiana University to have some information about that and to kind of keep in touch with what the Commission is thinking about from that point of view. So I talk about this just to encourage you to kind of keep your eye on that particular project. I think it is a fairly fundamental one regarding higher education in this state. If you look at the Commission website,
it is kind of interesting. If you look at the Commission website, they have their documents listed there. They are kind of categorized into various types and there are very few documents that the Commission views as policy documents. This framework of higher education is one of them. It is clear in their minds that this is a very important document, and whatever revisions might be made, I think will be a consequence for the institutions. I think it will be useful for the faculty to understand what is going on here.

The second topic has to do with Presidential Search as you have probably seen the news reports. The Trustees are now in process of interviewing what might be called finalists for the position. This implies that the work of the Faculty Advisory Committee, the work of the Presidential Search Committee is more or less over. I don’t think either of those committees has been officially disbanded at this point in time. The committees, I think still exist, but the active part of the search right now is clearly being conducted by the Board as they focus on the finalists to them by the Search Committee. One of the things that I think the Faculty Advisory Committee--I was talking to Simon Atkinson, who is a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee, as we were coming in to the room here. One of the things that the Faculty Advisory Committee wants everyone to understand and we can start with this group hopefully, trying to get this group to understand what the role of the Faculty Advisory Committee has actually been in this process [End Tape 1, Side A] Over which of these candidates, they felt were worth interviewing. And made recommendations to the Search Committee over which of the candidates they felt would be worth the Search Committees effort to interview. The Search Committee then did interview candidates and the Search Committee had its on ideas of course about who to interview as well. One of the things that I have been saying publicly about this process, is there really was a strong consensus in the Search Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee over which candidates were worth interviewing. Not a complete agreement down to the last item perhaps but there was a very strong agreement across the Search Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee over who should be interviewed. The interviews were done by the Search Committee. They were not done by the Faculty Advisory Committee so the finalists that were advanced to the Trustees were finalists that were selected by the Search Committee. Now I am pleased to report that the finalists that were advanced to the Trustees, all were on the list of the Faculty Advisory Committee’s list of who would be worth interviewing. The Faculty Advisory Committee did not interview these people. They did not recommend finalists to the Trustees. I believe that the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee are rather keen on having their role in this process made clear. Now Simon have I characterized it in a reasonable way?

ATKINSON: Yes.

MILLER: So, just what the trustees are going to do and when they are going to do it, I do not know. You have as much since of that as I do, I would say.

The third item, I just would like to make a comment about the Gen Ed comment that the President has spoken about. Really all I want to add is that the Educational Policies Committee, which is a standing committee of the University Faculty Council chaired this year by John Carini from Bloomington and Betty Jones from Indianapolis, did really a tremendous amount of work putting a report together. Kelly was very heavily involved in this. She did a tremendous amount
of work, kind of getting it on paper in a presentable form and made all kinds of other contributions to this process.

But we had ultimately a report that was presented to the President. The President delivered this report to the Trustees. You may recall that the approach that was at the center of this report is not necessarily what the Trustees started off asking for. We delivered to them a report that had a rather different structure from what their initial idea was. The President’s supported the faculty’s view of this in the Trustees forum. He basically recommended to them that they accept this report. Now, we are going to go through another round of this culminating in the April meeting. Various campuses are still working on the approach that they are taking. My own sense is coming out of the Trustees meeting a month ago. The Trustees by in-large are satisfied with what the faculty has done. The issues that remain are to my way of thinking rather minor issues. They are not make or break issues. I am just very pleased to report to you that the Trustees are basically positively inclined to go forward with the approach that we have developed. This of course has been a major item of focus for the University Faculty Council this year. I am very, very pleased that we’ve gotten to where we are. I have no reason to believe that anything is going to happen between now and April that is going to alter the outcome of this.

**HERBERT**: I share that view.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**HERBERT**: We’re now at the question and comment period. Are there any questions or comments?

**CORDELL**: At the April meeting when you have a general education update will you be updating the Trustees on all of the campuses programs or are there specific questions that they want address.

**HERBERT**: Essentially what we indicated was that there was still work being done on each campus and so this will just be to bring them up to speed. I think part of what we are trying to deal with here is to assure the Trustees that we are not going to just stop where we are now that this is something that is continuing. We are trying to reach closure on it as quickly as possible so I think. Again the charge that were passed out indicated that some campuses were still working on courses and that sort of thing. Hopefully, what we will be able to say is that most campuses we have completed the process. There maybe some things that are still underway and we will look at Ted to explain some of those matters. Or it may very well be that each campus will be given the opportunity to say something. I am going to try to avoid that. I prefer to have an overarching statement made by Ted and if they have specific questions, they can ask those. Just one more time, I think that Ted is accurate with regard to his characterization that they do feel that a lot of work, a lot of very good work has been done. We are accomplishing what they have challenged us to do. Ted and I have not talked about the exact manner in which we will present this but I think the way we did it the last time worked very well. And what I was able to say, is that what he presented in my view was fully responsive and my assumption is will be able to continue to take that same position.
MILLER: If the discussion surrounding this report is any guide to what really is of remaining interest to the Trustees, the big issue certainly is the date of the implementation of the program that has been developed in Bloomington. The document that we have indicates that is supposed to be implemented in 2011 and some of the Trustees are questioning why it is going to take so long to do this. They would really like us to implement that program earlier. What we are going to do to address that between now and April is that the Provost has undertaken, a kind of consultation process with the campus officials that would have some responsibility for implementing this. Trying to find out whether in fact it would be feasible to implement this at an earlier date. The faculty council at Bloomington is expecting to hear from the Provost about that prior to its meeting in early April. If it’s possible to implement it earlier, that will be a point of discussion. That really was one of the main issues that was under discussion at the Trustee meeting.

HERBERT: As a matter of fact I would just make one comment with regard to Ted’s characterization. Instead of saying, some of the Trustees were concerned about the date. I would say that most were. I won’t say all but I most were because as I had my conversations with each one of them, it was clear that the overwhelming majority did have a concern about the implementation date. Other than that is just how are we doing with regard to identifying the courses and are we reaching closure on that.

MILLER: The discussion really took-this whole issue really took me somewhat by surprise as we were talking about this in Bloomington, we have some new admission requirements as number of the campuses do and those admission requirements are going to be implemented at 2011. Giving high school students a chance to adapt to the new policy and the Gen Ed program at Bloomington is kind of tied into those new admission requirements. It just seemed like a no brainier to implement the Gen Ed program the same time the admission requirements were going to be implemented. We didn’t actually give it a whole lot of thought it just seemed like the obvious thing to do. But the Trustees clearly would like to see us do something sooner rather than later, so the Provost is trying to assess the feasibility of doing that, whether in fact it would be possible to do that without creating total chaos on the campus.

HERBERT: Let’s start over here and come around.

CARINI: So I just became aware of something yesterday, I guess a major initiative by the Human Resources called the Compensation System Initiative or CSI project and apparently they are in the process of reclassifying the professional staff position in the university over 5000. So this initiative they are reclassifying all the professional staff positions about 5000, and there is a concern among our senior professional support staff, apparently of one particular provision of this reclassification involves establishing a ceiling in each classification, salary ceiling. Of course right now there is a floor for each position. The fear is that if there is a ceiling, and they end up above that ceiling that it will have consequences for their future possibilities of getting increments in their salary. I don’t know if this is the right place to raise this but.

HERBERT: If there is interest, let me get Dan Reeves to come and give you a report on that and share with you exactly what is being done and what the rational is for that, if you find that helpful. I would love to facilitate his doing that. He can go into more detail of why this was
raised in the first place and what some of the issues are and also respond to that question. Is there interest in the topic, if not I have him give you a call personally? We will ask the Agenda Committee to consider that. I think Herb, you were next.

TERRY: Your announcement at the last Trustees meeting that the system should go smoke free came as a bit of a surprise for me. I just wanted to commend you for that. Today, you clarified that should kick in January of 2008 that is an aggressive timetable, but again I am very pleased that you are moving in that direction. As you know, I am not only a faculty member at IU Bloomington. I direct an undergraduate Living Learning Center there, and I have been dismayed in the three years that I have been there that number of our students that resume smoking once they get back in that environment or indicated that they intended to stop after high school or something like that and found that very difficult. I am glad to see that we are moving on that and I appreciate your leadership.

HERBERT: Thank you. Marty?

SPECHLER: Two money matters. Like Herb I was very pleased about the resolution with the so called outsourcing matter. So congratulations to you and Terry Clapacs for coming to a wise and seemingly universally accepted solution for the motor pool, I think that was certainly a very good move for the moral of the people around the University. My question has to do with the Life Sciences Initiative. If I understand it correctly, the request was for 80 million dollars and the House has tentatively approved about half of that 40 million dollars. Okay, 40 million is a lot of money even so my question is if in the eventual resolution some fraction like half of our request is approved, who will decide which of the parts of the Life Science Initiative will go forward most quickly. Will it be the legislature that will indicate certain projects, certain places, and so on? Will it be the University Administration? Will it be Vice President Brater? Or will it be in fact cooperation between the administration and the legislature?

HERBERT: It will certainly be a decision that the university administration and the trustees would be involved in. And with out question will be consultation with the budget office and with legislative leadership just to make sure. The thing to keep in mind is that this is a program that we have positioned for the next decade. For the next five biennium, the university will go in asking for additional money for this. So the metrics that will be used to assess our performance becomes very important. So as you begin talking about those, it extremely important that we are engaged in an ongoing basis with legislative leadership and the Governor’s office to assure that we are all on the same page of what we are going to be held accountable for. Our initial presentations were very specific with regards to what we felt that we could accomplish with the dollars that were allocated and our hope is that the Senate will add another 10 million dollars to the pot. That is still below the 80 but what we would then do is to modify the metrics to reflect a change that has occurred. And we have already dealt with some of the priorities, the challenge for us will be how to sort all of those out with the smaller amount of money. For example, one of the things that we have talked about is the importance of expanding the size of the class that enters the school of medicine. That has a set of dollar consequences. We talked about the possibility of creating at least one more 4-year site and that would be in Fort Wayne if we do that. So the question then is how do we deal with those while simultaneously increasing the number of senior faculty members in both Indianapolis and Bloomington to assure that we are
bringing in the kinds of senior research scientists in the medical school and the life sciences in Bloomington to accomplish the output expectation. All of that again will be decided by the administration and with the Board of Trustees and with consultation with the political folks in the state house.

**SPECHLER:** Well, Dean Brater, who I hope will be invited, I have never seen him at the University Faculty Council in many years, he is on record as saying that the major disadvantage of the state of Indiana in this area is the lack of sufficient numbers of researchers in life science. Many other states, of course larger than we are, have many, many more researchers than we have. I will tell you, for someone who was not deeply involved in this at all, that I’m concerned about the spreading of effort. If it is true as Dean Brater says, that we need a core of researchers working on common problems, I am really worried that we have spread it out too far over the state and thereby dilute the results of that research.

**HERBERT:** Well I think that the answer to that is that we’ve got to balance those factors. The practical reality is that one of the reasons that we have such broad based support in the legislature is because there is a possibility that at one point or another; whether it’s during this biennium or another, that we are going to provide opportunities for expanded opportunities for participation in the life sciences throughout the state. That is why so many of them vote for it. I’ll tell, this has incredible support throughout the state. I’ve told Dr. Brater that at some point I want his autograph because of the number of times he’s been on television with that little ad that you’ve all seen I’m sure. The thing to keep in mind is that this is a decade long initiative. We’re asking for $1.2 billion and in the context of this state, almost any state, that is a lot of money. So you have got to deal with the politics of it. That is the practical reality, to get those kinds of dollars. There has to be a perception that this is ultimately a statewide initiative that is going to be transformative in nature. It is clear that the overwhelming majority of the money will be invested in the Medical School and the Life Sciences in Bloomington, with support for programs that are related in some kind of fashion. So we do want to engage university community; broadly defined, in this effort. But when you look at it in the context of $1.2 billion, spreading that around, you could still have a significant impact. Again, I think that for this year, given the current budget situation, I think that we can get fifty or sixty million dollars. Fifty in the context of this project plus the other money that could come from the Brain Gain initiative. That could be very significant for this institution. Again, I think that we have to be politically shrewd enough to understand that we have to deal with this in a broad based context and look at it in the kind of fashion I just described.

**BALDWIN:** Did you just say before I go spreading this around, that there is consideration of may be establishing a second part of the Medical campus, is that what you said?

**HERBERT:** No, the thing that we are looking at is the possibility of—right now I’ve forgotten the total number of students that are in Fort Wayne, but what we are talking about is the possibility of keeping the same number but allowing those students to take two additional years in Fort Wayne.

**BALDWIN:** So the M.D. would be granted only in Fort Wayne?
HERBERT: Well, all the degrees are technically awarded...

BALDWIN: People could do all their work in Fort Wayne?

HERBERT: That’s correct.

VERMETTE: When we talk about sharing the money for the Life Sciences Initiative, you very clearly state the Medical School on the IUPUI campus and the Life Sciences Initiative down in Bloomington. What about the life science research that is going on in the School of Engineering and Technology on at IUPUI and going on in the School of Science? Are they not going to get funded out of this? Is it just for those two major units that you have determined, are life sciences?

HERBERT: I was using those two as the primary and I thought I came back said that other units that are ultimately in some kind of fashion engaged in it. The key is, and this is where the conversation will take place, it will be tied back to the matrix. So what we are going to be focusing on is how we achieve the goals that we are committing to the legislature with regard to research being generated, new companies being started, tech transfer kind of possibilities; all of that becomes part of the overall equation. We have not the form of mechanism yet for how we are going to deal with those distributions. Right now we are trying to get the money. I think the second thing will then be how we are going to deal with these other issues and that is something that Craig Brater will have the responsibility for coordinating.

VERMETTE: I just wondered why you wouldn’t say that research is going on in the IUPUI campus and down in Bloomington because this initiative here is not simply the Medical School.

HERBERT: The practical, political reality is that the folks in the state house regard the Medical School as the driver of all of this. So I talk about the Medical School because whatever happens has got to begin with the School of Medicine.

VERMETTE: _____ clear to the senate, it might be better than to the legislature.

HERBERT: But I’m just telling you about the politics of it and the politics of it is to get this kind of money, the dean of the Medical School is driving force and is the spokesperson for the university on this. The reality is that members are particularly interested in the kinds of things that are happening in the Medical School; numbers one. Number two, there are nine medical education sites around the state and that is part of, as I said earlier, what draws people to this. So I am always careful to zero in first on the Medical School in everything I say because that is the gorilla in the state house in terms of how they look at this.

BLACKWELL: I’m going to change the subject… last month you told us you were talking…

HERBERT: Wait, let me just say one other thing. The one thing that we have got to be careful of, and this is how you kill the golden goose, is for us to start fighting early about distribution of money as opposed to our trying to do all we can to get the money and recognize what the end game is, and that is to address our life sciences priorities in a fashion that does not create silos.
Rather, we are trying to break those down, we are trying to enhance research, we are trying to increase the numbers of outstanding researchers that we keep and bring to the campuses and obviously they want to see new businesses and they want to see a significant increase in revenues generated from our tech-transfer efforts. Those can come from a whole host of places. But we just have to be careful that we don’t start fighting among ourselves early on before we get the resources. That is the point, I think, at which we have got to then come back and talk about how we are going to deal with these issues. I’m sorry.

BLACKWELL: No, that’s ok. President Herbert, last month you talked about the Bonser Report and you said you would have additional information to share with us at a later date. One particular interest I had was in the core campus part of that report. So is this the time or is that something that you will be discussing later.

HERBERT: Right, I didn’t have a chance to get that on the agenda and if we have time we can certainly talk about it. I do want to have one more conversation with Ted about this. I can tell you that we have been going through, thinking through a number of the issues. Again, at some point I can share with you some of the basic conclusions about it.

BLACKWELL: So that could be for next month’s agenda?

HERBERT: I’m trying to think…the Board has asked me for some comments on this, is it at the next meeting or is it the April meeting.

THOMPSON: They had asked for it for the March meeting.

HERBERT: Let me tell you that, again, there is still two or three issues that in my mind are outstanding but let me give you a sense of some of the kinds of things that I’m thinking about right now as part of what my observations to the board would be.

It is clear that our regional campuses have matured to the point that they are able to make decisions about problematic areas that are consistent with their mission so that, it seems to me that with the exception of—I’m not talking about what are called core schools now but system schools, that we should move to a model in which, with the exception of social work, that the basic concept of system schools should eliminated and that each regional campus should have the opportunity of engaging in conversations with academic units where they would like to have an affiliation if they would like to have one. So let’s take SPEA as an example, any campus, what we would essentially say is that SPEA is no longer a system school, but if Northwest or another campus decides that it would still like to have a SPEA presence, then it would work with the dean of the faculty, the faculty would work together, and develop an appropriate agreement related to that. Otherwise the programs would be separated and each campus would stand on its own with regard to the degree program. If SPEA did not have an affiliation on a campus, then that campus would have it’s own name for the unit and would offer a degree that does not have SPEA’s name in it, so that Northwest would offer a degree in public administration. With regard to Social Work, in that case, accreditation is tied back to the existence of a system school. So in that context we would keep Social Work with a dean that has responsibility for that overall program. Mary.
FISHER: What about schools such as Nursing where the Commission of Higher Education has required us to have one curriculum for the undergraduate programs. It is difficult and it is labor for us to accomplish that. But the idea that students then can transfer from one campus to another, they move throughout the state or whatever, that has been assured to them because we do have one curriculum and if we cease to be a system school, then there would be no need for us to do that. It would be impossible for us to actually accomplish that if we are no longer a system school.

HERBERT: That’s not necessarily the case. The reality is that we talk about confederation and I think the answer there is that each of the programs would have to work together. If it is clear that that is the expectation, then all the units would end up having to operate within that context and it is my view that it is possible in Education or Nursing for the faculties on the campuses to reach an agreement on some of those matters, particularly if they are license issue, if they are state requirements, then there is not a great deal of choice on that.

FISHER: But we accomplish that through our University Faculty Council bylaws which assume would cease to exist and the way we negotiate and the way we accomplish those things are through that university council and they would be no university council at that point, for the school, if we weren’t a system school.

HERBERT: Well, there may not be a university council that is governing in the sense of all the units, what happens on each campus, but you can still have a confederation in which you talk about those issues and reach mutual agreement. It also is the case that all the units can say “we continue to want to be part of one whole” and that would be an option. Marty.

SPECHLER: Adam, I join my friend in that this is really a profound issue with many, many complications. We haven’t heard from all of the chancellors and representatives from the smaller campuses about this. I think we need quite a wide range of discussion and specific recommendations because one condition is major change in the nature of Indiana University system. I’m troubled by the idea that you present, that because of the maturity of smaller campuses which definitely exist, that they should be more independent. On the other hand, the core campuses are supposed to get closer together. Well, if South Bend, Kokomo and so on become more mature, surely IUPUI has also become more mature. That argument would turn against the idea of a closer cooperation in the core campuses. So I think that the areas of contradiction and we need to talk about this I think a great deal more.

HERBERT: Well, I don’t agree with that. I think if they are totally different, I have an obligation. The board has asked me to submit my thoughts with regard to it. They have given me a timeline within which to do it and it seems to me that the natural follow up to that is for the faculty to have a conversation about that. So I have no problems with that but I do have an obligation since the board has instructed me to provide some of my thoughts relative to structure, I am going to do that. I think that there is clearly room for conversations about this in terms of where ultimately it goes. I do think that it is legitimate; it is not inconsistent to have core schools. The reality is that it would be very difficult and I don’t think it would be in the best interests of the university to break up the Kelley School and if you break it up, which one is going to be
called Kelley, on which campus. If they are totally different, you can't have the Kelley School
with totally different deans and missions on the two campuses. So, again, what I’m going to do is
lay out thoughts and it may very well be that it will be the next president that deals with it and
the next iteration of this group, I don’t know in terms of timing, but we’ll figure out how that’s
going to play out as I talk with Ted and Bart in terms of the follow up discussions. But it is my
intension to respond to the board in terms of giving them my initial thoughts on this.

AGENDA ITEM #6: INDIANA UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMPOSITION REPORT

HERBERT: Item #6 Faculty Composition Report. Ted?

MILLER: Yes, this is an item that is on the UFC agenda annually. The report on the
composition of the faculty; today we have two documents in front of us. The first one is a
campus level document where the composition of the faculty is shown for each campus. Some
trends are shown. There is information about full-time appointments, part-time appointments. It’s
a fairly complicated report reflecting the structure of the appointment—the academic
appointment policy for Indiana University. There are various kinds of academic appointments
that are possible to make and if you just look at the first page you can see the various categories,
the various possible appointment categories are listed there. Over the columns you see the
change in the number of people appointed in those categories beginning in 2003 through 2006.
The data is for the fall of each year. That is because the policy or the practice of the university is
that on October 1st there is kind of a frozen file created regarding how many appointments there
are and this the data from that particular file.

There is some information about changes of the four year period that is given as well. As I said,
we have information for each of the campuses. This is a report that is called for—a report about
such matters is called for the in the academic appointments policy. One of the main reasons that
the faculty wanted to see such a report was to sort of track, in particular, the trends in tenure
faculty appointments, tenure eligible faculty appointments, versus the non-tenure track type of
appointments. That is something that is possible to do at a campus level in the context of this
particular document. Our main interest initially was in the lecture and clinical appointment
categories. These are the main non-tenure track faculty appointment. There is a significant
interest in Bloomington on the trends in those particular categories. One of our concerns of
course, going back to the year 2000 when the current policy was under development, one of the
concerns was that Indiana University was going to sort of abandon its tenure-track faculty with
the number of such people going down and replaced by non-tenure track faculty.

One of the good news features of this report is that by and large that has not happened. The
number of tenure-track faculty has either been constant or have been increasing slightly at least
on most of the campuses. There is significant growth in the non-tenure track appointments; there
is no question about that, more so in some campuses than others. In general, this document
doesn’t present us with an alarming picture of what is happening to the composition of Indiana
University faculty. The document is primarily for use by the campus faculties thinking about their own particular situations.

The second document is a more detailed document that sort of disaggregates the campus totals into schools and responsibility centers. One of the things that is true about the academic appointments within Indiana University is that not all of those appointments are made within the context of an academic unit. There are academic appointments that are made across many of the other units of the university. That is why this document doesn’t just focus on the academic units. There is a long list of administrative units that are in this report to the extent that there are academic appointments that is tabulated here.

So this document gives us a complete count. At least in principle the count is complete regarding academic appointments in the university no matter where they might exist. As I said, this is very detailed information and it’s of most use in the various campuses, I think, in the context of the various campuses. [End of Tape 1, Side B…. some comments may be lost] … within their units and they think that the count is wrong somehow or other. Of course it is possible that the count might be wrong. But more often than that what happens is that we, as faculty or staff in the university, don’t exactly know where some of our colleagues’ appointments might be. We may think that they are appointed in our unit but the fact of the matter is that they may not be. There are a number of situations like that, particularly in these administrative unit appointments.

Anyway, we are hopeful that this data will be useful in the context of each campus as the faculty continues to think about what is happening on their campuses and continues to try to develop the kind of faculty that is desired on that campus. So those are my comments, I would be happy to try to respond to questions if people have them.

HERBERT: Are there any questions or comments?

NG: The figures for Fort Wayne, do the numbers include faculty that are appointed by Purdue?

KISH: We can get some clarification on the Fort Wayne numbers but my understanding of the Fort Wayne numbers is that these are the folks who are still IU faculty in Fort Wayne. Any new appointees, even in these units are appointed as Purdue faculty. So these are, if you will, the grandfathered employees in Fort Wayne that have academic appointments through Indiana University.

NG: I’m surprised because if what you said is true, then all of the new appointments will be counted toward Purdue, but the numbers stay pretty constant, in fact it is going up. It should be a decreasing sequence. Does anybody have any idea how many total faculty there are in Fort Wayne?

KISH: We can do some investigating. I’ll ask them to write something and we’ll send it over email to explain the Fort Wayne numbers. The Fort Wayne numbers, as you can imagine, have become more and more difficult to gather. So their inclusion in this report is really at our demand. The administration is really reluctant to include them because we don’t know exactly what’s going on in Fort Wayne from a data point of view. Karen, do you have any idea how
many faculty are in Fort Wayne? [Inaudible comments from Karen Moustafa] We’ll get some clarity and we’ll try and send that around.

HERBERT: Are there other questions? If not, thank you very much Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #7: LABOR STUDIES AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

HERBERT: Now, let me turn to Bart for item 7, Labor Studies.

NG: This will be a very brief report. As you know that Labor Studies was looking for a home and I think that we have now, by all indication, I can report to you happily that they have found a home and it is in the School of Social Work. We are in the midst of really—Chancellor Bantz will make a formal announcement really soon but I can tell you that at this point all indications are that the Division of Labor Studies will become part of the School of Social Work. The Indianapolis Faculty Council has already voted on its recommendation and these have been forwarded to the Chancellor and the School of Social Work faculty has voted to accept the Division of Labor Studies by a vote of roughly 27-3. The Labor Studies faculty themselves have voted to join the School of Social Work by a vote of 9-2.

So now we are in the process of setting up a transition team to make sure that all the issues that need to be attended to will be addressed before a formal merger agreement is, I suppose, is signed. Chancellor Bantz perhaps can say a little bit more about that. But as I said, I am happy to report that things have worked out reasonably well. Charles?

BANTZ: Bart has made a very good description of where we are. I waited for the IFC’s vote and then they reconfirmed the vote at a meeting—we had two snow days obliterating our Faculty Council meeting. And I’m now looking at that and I’m trying to put together a letter that puts in place all the pieces. We have, I guess, in merger and acquisition language an agreement to merge but we have not got the definitive agreement and we will provide a timeframe for which that should occur because there are still some details. As I have said frequently, I congratulate Bart Ng, all of our faculty council, Mark Sothmann, and Ruth Needleman, and our colleagues who spent an enormous amount of time and energy to work this one through. Dean Patchner and his colleagues have expressed a willingness to partner with this unit and I think enhance its excellence going forward. So unless something truly unusual happens between now and the next 48 hours I expect I will issue that letter and we will launch about a 60-day or a little longer period to work this out.

HERBERT: I might also just share with you that from a legislative side we have been able to secure additional money for the program on the House side. We’ll have to see what happens on the Senate side. But the good news is that it is not a line-item budget matter. We’ve been able to weave it into the budget for IUPUI. So I think that also becomes very good news in terms of sustaining the program at a level that is appropriate. So, we’ll continue to monitor that just to make sure...part of the thing that we want to do is to make sure that this doesn’t continue to be a political issue as you go from one party being in control of the House to another.
MILLER: Could I just express my admiration for the work of the Indianapolis Faculty Council in this matter? I am just exceptionally pleased at this particular end point. I think this has been, this of course is a process that has been ongoing now for some period of time and there were points when it appeared that we were going to have a rather messy situation on our hands. But, due to the really outstanding work of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, the leadership of Bart Ng, this really I think is an achievement that we ought to really take note of. It was really excellent work. [Applause]

NG: There were a lot of people who really spent a lot of time on it. I’m very happy just like Ted say, that it turned out the way it did. I think we can look for a really bright future for the Division of Labor Studies at Indiana University. Thank you for all your support as well and all your comments. I think that this body was very helpful in stating what the issues are as the Indianapolis Faculty Council had its deliberations.

HERBERT: I just want to add from an administration perspective as well that I am very proud also, Bart, of what you and your colleagues have done. This has been a period of uncertainty for our faculty colleagues and for students. It has been a somewhat controversial issue—I can tell you that because a number of legislators have talked to me. I also want to thank the chancellor for what he has done as part of this also. It really has been a case of a lot of folks coming together, working to address what it is the best interests of the entire university, and in particular this program. And I hope you’ll also express our shared appreciation to the dean for stepping up, and his colleagues, and recognizing the kind of role that that unit can play in responding to these educational needs. Thank you also for what you’ve done.

SPECHLER: I have a question for you, Adam, and also for our chancellor. As it’s probably known to most people, the School of Social Work is headquartered in Indianapolis at the IUPUI campus. When the School of Social Work takes over Labor Studies, how it does of course is up to them, but the School of Social Work also offers courses regularly on the Bloomington campus and perhaps on other campuses. Will the Labor Studies continue to offer courses on other campuses as the School of Social Work has regularly done?

NG: There will be no change in the programmatic offerings of the Division of Labor Studies, as far as I know. I don’t think any change is being contemplated.

SPECHLER: So they will continue to offer courses and degrees on a number of our campuses.

NG: Absolutely. I think this is really the heart of this agreement to make sure that the coverage and programmatic breadth of Labor Studies will be preserved.

SPECHLER: Well I think that’s the great advantage of this solution which I congratulate you for. Some other schools that were mentioned were not in the business of offering courses and programs throughout the state. The School of Social Work has a reputation for doing that effectively. I think that’s the great merit of this resolution.
NG: I should also add that one of the reasons why the School of Social Work is also interested is because there is a great deal of interest in distance education which will fit very much into the thrust of what they want to do. So there is a great deal of common interest so I think that’s the reason why it works.

CORDELL: I had my hand up but my question was the same.

BANTZ: Professor Spechler and others, let me put a footnote to that. I think Bart’s description is very accurate but I do want to be clear that as the unit moves into the School of Social Work it will become part of the School of Social Work and as a faculty they will need to decide which programs are delivered on which campuses. Certainly Social Work has a statewide presence—that was one of the reasons, as you pointed out, it was such a good solution on the part of Bart Ng whose idea it was frankly to raise this. But I don’t want to leave someone with any impression, and I doubt this group would, but have the impression that things will always be as they have been because obviously this is a very dynamic discipline, in Labor Studies as it is in social work. The School of Social Work is a program which has taken on new responsibilities in this state, most of you have no reason to know this, but Dean Patchner has signed a multi-million dollar contract with the state government and they are providing bachelor’s degree programs and other training to many of the, and we hope eventually, almost all of the social work employees in Family and Social Services and Child Protective Services and so forth. So they will have an increasingly large impact on the state. We hope to enhance the quality, particularly of child welfare in the state, which Dean Patchner can say more eloquently but has serious problems.

HERBERT: Ted?

MILLER: Could I just make a comment as well? It’s very interesting to look at this new, this unit, from the perspective of this data that we just talked about here. If you look at the Bloomington data by School/RC one of the things that you’ll find is that the Labor Studies faculty that are located in Bloomington are not reflected in this report as being Bloomington people. Nor, for that matter, are the Social Work faculty that work in Bloomington where they offer a bachelor’s degree in social work. They are not reflected in the Bloomington data. So you might think that all of the Social Work faculty would be in the Indianapolis part of the report and all of the Labor Studies people would all be in the Labor Studies part of the report, but that’s not true. There are, in South Bend for example, they have Social Work people in the South Bend list, and Labor Studies people show up in various places. Well, I just suggest that we have an opportunity here to clean up our act a little bit and think about what we’re doing in terms of faculty appointments. From my point of view one of the important principles, now people may have different ideas about this, but to the extent that a faculty is offering a degree on a campus it seems to me that the campus where the degree is being offered ought to have some way to oversee what is happening in that unit. With regard to Bloomington and Social Work and Bloomington and Labor Studies that of course is not the case today. I’m not sure what the situation is at other campuses. But it really does seem to me that we really ought to try to clean up our act to the extent that we have these niche programs that are kind of operating in a way that’s rather different from the way we ordinarily think things are happening. We ought to try to clean up our act a bit. That’s just an editorial comment.
HERBERT: Are there any other editorial comments?

NG: I think Ted just pointed to the structure of Indiana University.

MILLER: But there really are very few examples like this, Bart, and I’m just suggesting that we could try to clarify things.

HERBERT: Charles?

BANTZ: At the risk of making a great deal of work for Maynard Thompson, there are in fact a very significant number of these kinds of things, probably fewer than 50 faculty but maybe more who do have these. The President has made the point about Social Work and accreditation which is one of the dynamics here. And the other is, and you need to know this was part of the topic with Labor Studies, is how do you have a faculty on a campus and have people who can evaluate, hire, review, if in fact there’s only one person there or two people there, which is in fact the case with Social Work. So this is one of the challenges, I think, of a multi-campus model if we’re going to develop programs statewide. Other universities have dealt with this and what they tend to do is clearly make them extension kind of programs like we have done with the School of Medicine, predominantly but not exclusively, and with Social Work, predominantly but not exclusively. So the question of making it more standard I think is a good one but I hope that I will be alive when it all gets cleaned up.

NG: Well actually I think, also I want to caution that one should not read too much into these numbers, because these are primarily based on budget, who is paying who. So it’s not necessarily a programmatic supervision as such. So while I agree with Ted, I think Ted has a very good point but at the same time I don’t think that these numbers, the classification for example, I think are in fact in error. I know for sure. So, it’s just who is really responsible for paying the person that is how they get counted. Like, for example, Labor Studies, Needleman is not listed under Indianapolis because it’s paid by Northwest.

KISH: This report is not produced by the budget office—I mentioned to the Agenda Committee a separate report—but this report reflects where the academic appointment is, the official academic appointment is reflected in this document.

AGENDA ITEM #8: CIC PROVOST’S STATEMENT ON PUBLISHING AGREEMENTS

HERBERT: Ok, Item #8.

MILLER: We have asked Julie Bobay to make the initial presentation of Item #8 today. Thank you, Julie.

BOBAY: You have in your packet a handout called CIC Provost Statement on Publishing Agreements. This is a document that comes to us from the CIC provost’s who got together to
write this document and presented it at a meeting of CIC faculty leaders at which Bart attended on behalf of Indiana University but wasn’t able to make this presentation. So, the provost’s have written this statement in the hopes that they can present it at all the CIC universities along with the faculty leadership as suggestions to faculty authors.

Now as you may know many universities have statements of principle on this issue, including the Indianapolis Faculty Council, the Bloomington Faculty Council statement supporting the idea of broad access to scholarship. This statement ups that a step or so in that it would come to the faculty, not only from the faculty council, but also from the CIC provost’s and with a suggested addendum that the provost’s are asking the faculty to consider when they submit their manuscripts for publication. Now you can see in the text of this statement that the provost’s are focused on the issue of extending the reach and impact of the scholarship produced by our faculty and the tension that sometimes arises between that need to extend the reach and what they call the “social and economic conventions” of some sectors of the publishing industry.

Understanding the complexity of this issue they have come up with this statement encouraging authors to consider publishing strategies that optimize short- and long-term access to their work. Now one of those strategies, they suggest, is that faculty authors should understand that they own their work and that it is their choice to transfer that ownership to a publisher. And the typical scenario up to a few years ago was for authors to transfer all rights to publishers and that was the end of it, it was a very black and white thing. I used to own it, now you own it. On the backside of this sheet entitled “Addendum to Publication Agreements for CIC Authors” is a suggestion for authors, instead of signing the transfer all copyright agreement, to send this addendum back to the publisher and ask if the publisher will consider this partial transfer of copyright rather than the entire one.

Now this Addendum to Publication Agreements is one that has been worked through by a bunch of groups at the CIC level—librarians, provost’s, other groups. And this particular version of this Author Addendum asks the publishers to agree to granting authors the right to fully distribute the published version of the article six months after the date of publication. You can read the Author Addendum in this statement. I think that it was brought here because it was a request to the faculty leadership of all the CIC universities from the provosts for this jointly written communication to the faculties at these institutions.

MILLER: Thank you very much, Julie. Now, I think that the discussion that we had of this in the Agenda Committee was such that one of the primary things, I think, that the provosts are trying to accomplish with this is to inform the faculty about these issues. So I think what we decided to do is to take this document back to our local faculty groups and have a discussion in the faculty senates or faculty councils about this issue so that the campus faculty can kind of come to understand what this is about. Perhaps at our next meeting we will come back with a resolution which would seek the UFC’s endorsement of the principles that underlie this, and then we kind of go forward at that point—sort of arm and arm with the provosts and whatever is going to happen. So that is kind of the strategy that we decided to take here. Comments please?
HERBERT: Any comments?

COFFIN: This is Don Coffin from Indiana University Northwest.

HERBERT: Sure, Don.

COFFIN: Just a couple of questions, one, just in terms of the addendum agreement, it seems to be focused largely on journals or book chapters. Would the intention be that this would also apply to full length book manuscripts? The second question is, I know Indiana University publishes a number of scholarly journals, has anybody talked to the editors of those journals about what their reaction would be to this kind of an addendum?

BOBAY: Hi Don. First question, this addendum was written with exactly as you say, with journal articles and book chapters in mind. It was written really, I think I can say this, the notion was that it was most relevant with commercial publishers. Commercial publishers play big roles in some disciplines and are entirely irrelevant in others.

The second question about journals that Indiana University publishes; yes there have been a lot discussions on a lot of levels that I am aware with various—it’s a complicated issue. Many of the journals that are published at Indiana University are published here on behalf of other scholarly societies or associations, and then the discussion is really with that scholarly association. Some journals are published by departments, some are published by the IU Press and there have been discussions at all those levels and they have gone in as many directions as you might imagine, depending on the culture and the economics and the outcome of that particular discipline. So some of those journals are already published openly with no gated access, some are partially, some are seeking ways to accomplish broad distribution while maintaining a sustainable level of revenue. So they are all over the map.

TERRY: In some ways the most specific thing in this addendum is in part two, in the sense that it appears to me as if it’s designed to give a commercial publisher a six month window during which they can make money from the publication material and then to close that off after six months and encourage electronic publishing. Do we have any idea if commercial publishers are amenable to a six month window? I ask this because we have made a number of efforts in the last few years to influence the commercial journal publishing industry, for example the idea that we would encourage people not to use commercial publishers that charge outrageous rates, and those haven’t had much effect. I would probably certainly endorse but I want to know if there is any reason to hope that this particular six month window might actually be something acceptable to the commercial publishing industry.

BOBAY: In my opinion there is certainly room for hope in some disciplines. And there are some real promising experiments out there. There’s a couple in library science, there is a discussion of the federal mandate that would require federally-funded medical research that would go into these kinds of repositories after six months. So things are happening out there in different disciplines in different ways that, from my perspective, make this feasible.
MEISS: Well, getting a paper published in the appropriate journal of your choice is often a very arduous task taking many months and lots of paper and I can see an addendum like this, when everything is almost cut and dry as being a deal breaker and undoing a huge amount of work if that publisher says there is no way that we can do this because we are already doing what we think is the constructive things towards free dissemination.

BOBAY: I think one of the visions of this is that that would be, that scenario, if this done in a piecemeal way. But one of the things driving at the provosts at the CIC level is to really encourage this across the CIC is that if enough people do it then it won’t penalize the individual who goes out there and tries it. It’s also true that there are publishers out there who are not the three biggies who always come to mind. There is a lot else going on in the publishing world who really welcome such a thing so they don’t have to negotiate with each single author, neither of them understanding that this is a standard addendum, that there are publishers who actually want them.

SCHNEIDER: Julie, following up on that specifically, has this form been used by people with certain journals that are accepting it now?

BOBAY: Yes.

SCHNEIDER: Is there a list of them available?

BOBAY: We could probably work on that.

SCHNEIDER: That would be very helpful.

HERBERT: Other? Marty?

SPECHLER: Julie, I agree with my friend Richard that there is a problem here of collective action. Our livelihood at Indiana University, those of us who are professors, depends on publishing the very best research in the very best journal available to us. As an editor, I know that this copyright process comes at the very end. Now you asking a professor who has had an article accepted at a very good journal to send this for her or his own article which will endanger the publication of that article and tries it. It’s also true that there are publishers out there who are not the three biggies who always come to mind. There is a lot else going on in the publishing world who really welcome such a thing so they don’t have to negotiate with each single author, neither of them understanding that this is a standard addendum, that there are publishers who actually want them.

MILLER: Marty, if I could just intervene on Julie’s behalf. Julie actually is not the one that is asking you to do this. Julie is not the one who is asking you to do this.
SPECHLER: Okay, so who is?

MILLER: The provosts of the CIC institutions have drafted this statement and they are seeking the faculty’s support an endorsement for it. So we need to target our thoughts appropriately.

SPECHLER: Well that really doesn’t change a thing about my suggestion Ted and you know it.

BANTZ: I’ll give you a target. In a previous life I was a provost. I was not a CIC provost. This has been a conversation for nearly a decade among the provosts because the provosts view themselves as the responsible parties on campuses in America who support the fact that in a faculty’s work and they have come to the conclusion, pretty large group of them, including the CIC apparently, that we are engaged in supporting faculty work and paying for it at least twice, sometimes three times and sometimes four times. Since we routinely, under the provost, and the universities pay, for example, Martin Spechler’s salary when he is not being funded, the institution does him some of that time is used for the work. We pay the cost usually of helping you to work with the journals that you have mentioned. In some disciplines we actually pay page costs to get them published in that discipline and then our university libraries buy those journals back with your work in it, which we have already paid perhaps two or three times already. And then to make it really exciting, we charge our students for the content through the copyright collection process that they have already paid in the journal, that we have already paid for the work. The provosts happen to think that this strikes them as an unreasonable demand being placed on them by a publication system. Shulenburger from Kansas was the person leading this effort at the beginning, as I said, more than a decade ago. The group has had this conversation. This would not be my first, I assume it’s not the first for President Herbert, of this conversation and the concern is, literally long term what is the best outcome. And that is, of course, as they point out more eloquently and I am glad to see the discussion has gotten more eloquent about making information available as rapidly as possible.

Now the good news is that Dean Lewis said at the budget conference on this campus for the library, believes that in 20 years this will probably be a moot point because people like mathematicians and high energy physicists are already moving their publications into free access journals and that those journals are literally, David believes, going to be the core of all the scholarly communication. Now if I am an Elsevier, I’m not frankly happy about this visionary picture. Although, I credit them to be smart enough to figure out a way to make some money out of this. But that vision David believes is actually the direction it’s going on and the question that you pose Martin is exactly the fundamental question is, how do you act? In the discussion in 2001, the group was not willing to come back with a recommendation that said that every member of our faculties will in fact follow this, because the group wasn’t quite sure we can get everybody to agree and stick with it. But I think that is the direction it appears to me the CIC provosts are going. I wasn’t in that discussion so I don’t know. In the absence of another provost I thought I would drop back four years in my life and give you the context for this discussion.

SPECHLER: I’m glad we agree, Charles, that the appropriate and effective action comes from associations and ....
BANTZ: I did not agree with that Martin because I want you to know there are scholars in my discipline who have refused to grant their copyright for 20 years and what’s amazing is that they keep getting published. So if you’re going to act individually it’s a risk and it’s a risk that some of us can or cannot take. Frankly I’m in a better position as a full professor and several of us are on the table are than some of the others. But I don’t want to get involved but I thought the context wasn’t clear for any of you here for some of this discussion and I certainly don’t think that our colleague who unfortunately got handed this report should take the heat for all the provosts. The provosts are perfectly capable of taking their own heat.

SPECHLER: We’re not angry at Julie of course. But the issue is not just how many times supposedly we pay for research but how much we are paying for research and what is the cost of disseminating that research. And if the cost is—if what we are paying in the total cost is way out of proportion to a reasonable cost of providing it, then we’ve got an issue. Again I say, and apparently the CIC chancellors or provosts were in agreement that it is going to be extremely difficult to get individual professors to abide by this.

HERBERT: Okay, I think we have time for one more question.

CARINI: So I was just going to point out that in the sciences, many of the journals have a fairly liberal policy about authors who carry the rights to their own work, the figures, the tables and the text itself up to the point where it’s actually the final published version, the one that actually appears in a journal. They seem to draw the line there. So right now we are free to upload the final accepted version on e-print servers and serve it off of our own websites or the university’s websites. They seem to distinguish between that pre-print version and what they actually end up printing. Comments anybody about that?

MILLER: Professor Carini is a physicist by the way for those who don’t know this.

HERBERT: Well I don’t hear a response but I think the Agenda Committee’s request is that each campus engage in a conversation on this and then provide feedback. Julie is that the case?

BOBAY: Yes.

HERBERT: And the one thing that I don’t recall is was there a time frame that you have in mind in terms of when you would like to get feedback on this again. Did the provosts indicate how quickly they would like to get a response back?

MILLER: Well I think we would like to do something in the context of this academic year. We have two meetings of the UFC left. One in the end of March and one in the end of April and we want to do this some time in that time frame.

HERBERT: Why don’t we plan on the April meeting?

BALDWIN: If this is already adopted by the provosts, or a draft by the provosts. So they are simply asking for us to confirm it?
MILLER: Yes, but my understanding is that in the course of reviewing this on various campuses, there have been suggestions made to the provosts about how they might kind of revise their thinking about this. There are a variety of things that we can do. I think fundamentally what we are trying to do here is to get a broader segment of the faculty of Indiana University to kind of understand that this is an issue that they should be thinking about.

AGENDA ITEM #9: SCHOOL OF CONTINUING STUDIES REPORT AND UPDATE

HERBERT: Okay, the next item on the agenda will be a presentation from Dean Callison from the School of Continuing Studies. He is here with us today. [End of tape 2, Side A…. some comments may be lost]

CALLISON: Hello and thank you for accommodating my schedule today. I just arrived here from the IU East campus and wanted to be here in person on this campus so that I would be able to see eye to eye with each one of you as I try to respond to any questions that you might have. I’m also very appreciative that two of my close colleagues with the Continuing Studies Program and the Community Learning Network agreed to be with me this afternoon. Hopefully you understand that I’ve been immersed in the job, a new one for me starting January 1 as the Dean of Continuing Studies, a system-wide appointment. So I am still learning a few things as I go along with this and so Amanda and Henry have agreed to be with me so that they can correct as many things as they might be able to, in case I misspeak. I’m going to ask for a little bit of direction as to exactly where you want me to go with this presentation. I know that there are perhaps a number of questions out there that hopefully I can address. I know there was the issue of the front page newspaper article a week ago in the Indianapolis Star. I didn’t read the Star today so I assume there aren’t any additional articles. If there are I would be happy to try to address those. Hopefully you received some information that includes an online piece that was written shortly after the Star article that I think came closer to clarifying and describing a number of the issues that related to the 3+1 program which is for all intents and purposes a shorthand marketing device that I have some problems with and some concerns with. And that was actually taken down as the marketing approach for our School about 4 to 5 weeks ago. There are some areas that I can hopefully try to clarify. I welcome comments, questions, and concerns as I continue to look at some of the programs associated with Continuing Studies.

The other piece that I have received is the broader one that concerns the recommendations from this body from I think a couple years ago. And I don’t know whether I am expected to address those today or some other time down the line.

MILLER: We’ll have opportunities to invite you back to talk about more general issues.

CALLISON: That’s good to hear. I was hoping that there would be future opportunities to come back.

MILLER: But I think today—I am not sure how everybody around the table views the School of Continuing Studies but I have been around Indiana University for a long time. I have to say it is a unit that really has a certain opaqueness about it in terms of what it is really up to and what it’s really trying to accomplish. I think some general comments along those lines in terms of your
view of the School and where you think it is going would be very useful. Then if we could focus on this program that was a subject of the Star piece, I think there is some curiosity about that.

CALLISON: Well I’ll try then to make comments along that line. I think that you need to keep in mind the context currently for the School of Continuing Studies. It has gone through essentially about four years of scrutiny and rightfully or wrongfully that has taken place. But I think you hopefully understand that there has been more than one review of the School over the last four years. I think I have copies of all of the Task Force reports and all of the reviews on my desk or with me. I have not counted them up specifically but I think they probably total about six or seven. That’s a lot of reviewing in four years. There are some good recommendations in the conclusions from those task forces, but one of the things that has happened with the school is that it has been sliced into several different pieces. As I have gone around the state and I have made it to every campus now in order to visit the Director of Continuing Studies or General Studies on each one of the campuses. As you could imagine on eight Indiana University campuses, there are eight different ways of developing a program and delivering a program, each one of them trying to figure out their local constituency and local needs. Some of them quite successful, the Indianapolis program, the program in Fort Wayne, I think the program at Bloomington stand out as exceptional programs of working very closely with their faculty, developing very strong advising committees, not only with the faculty, but advising to students. They care very much for the student body that they have developed. I think that you would find in total the General Studies program is now responsible for over 1500 graduates each year.

The alumni groups that I have been fortunate enough to meet with in just six weeks of being on the job include exceptionally strong representatives in this state and in the professions of this state. They are very proud of their degree in some cases individuals working full-time, raising a family, finishing their degree after 15, 18, 19, 20 years of work and being gratified that they have a degree from Indiana University and from an institution that was enlightened enough to also recognize their military experience, their professional experience, their test and certification experience in culminating with a degree that quite frankly probably didn’t get the job that they had but confirmed that they have the academic abilities that they want to display. And on a superficial note in many cases around the room with those alumni groups, I wouldn’t be surprised if the average salary of those individuals isn’t well over $150,000. So these are successful individuals in many cases and I know that is not the story for all of the graduates of General Studies.

But the school as conceived 35 years ago with the mission to find ways in which Indiana University could deliver in a meaningful and quality way, but in a very flexible way, the opportunities for the non-traditional student to obtain a four-year degree. And over that time my understanding is that between 25,000 and 30,000 graduates have been successful in that program. My understanding also is that over 90 percent of those graduates remain in Indiana as tax-payers in Indiana and as professionals in Indiana in a state that still ranks, unfortunately I believe Charles what is 3rd or 4th from the bottom in the percentage of individuals in the state that hold an undergraduate degree. It’s been a very unique, I think, approach for this university. There are a number of diverse audiences that are addressed by the services of this particular school, including people who are incarcerated and have no other opportunity in order to advance themselves academically, including a number of individuals who not only put together the degree
over 15 or 20 years but those individuals who find that during their college experience they are much better suited for that particular point in time in their academic career to seek multiple disciplines of study rather than concentrate in one area of study. And so I think as one of the conclusions that I have drawn in five or six weeks is that the General Studies degree is the wrong name for the degree. It is the interdisciplinary bachelor’s degree of Indiana University because it spreads across disciplines. It still asks for a concentration and it has a high demand for its graduates. The number of stories that I have heard from those people who have been able to put together their degree on a positive basis. Just coming from the IU East campus, it is one of the highest number of graduates at that campus as I think we would also find at Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, and South Bend, and also IU Northwest.

The major challenge that I face—I think—at the present time is not as much this 3+1 program and we will talk about it a little bit further here in a few minutes. The major challenge that I face as dean—I’ll articulate two just to summarize—is that I inherit a school with an insightful and visionary mission but is 35 years out-of-date in delivery of its coursework. The courses are developed, rewritten, and designed based upon faculty approval, but we still work with about 80 percent of our courses being mail-correspondence courses. Well that’s fine if you are incarcerated in a prison. It’s the only way you can get to that academic interaction, but if you are a person, looking for an academic experience in this day and age, in the 21st Century with hundreds of colleges and universities developing online interactive coursework, this school on a system-wide basis in distance education is gradually eating itself to death because its not delivering the coursework that we need through online delivery. So my first request to a very capable instructional staff at the Bloomington campus. Now keep in mind there is the system-wide division at Bloomington and then there is the Bloomington division of Continuing Studies. My first request is that by January 2008, 10 months from now, everything be converted to online delivery. That doesn’t mean that the correspondence courses completely disappear. It means that we will begin to condense them so that we have select few to deliver. It means that by a year from now, we have already invested in additional staff to do this, we will be able to provide both for our high school experience for our associates degree and for our general studies bachelor’s degree a menu of faculty approved online courses, many of them moving to the more sophisticated level of being interactive, of being within a timeframe so that those students that take those particular courses actually qualify for student assistance.

A very worthwhile conversation that I had about two hours ago in Richmond and I have to say that I am delighted by the surprises that I find as I go around the IU campuses and this is my surprise today. I would not have thought that this would have happened. That IU East—I think that I probably have outside of Fort Wayne and here in Indianapolis—maybe the richest possibility of a cluster of already online developed interactive courses that can be a part of our curriculum. I don’t find that at IU Southeast, hopefully it will happen sometime. I don’t find that at IU South Bend hopefully it will happen sometime. I don’t find that at IU Northwest, hopefully it will happen sometime for General Studies and we will encourage and work with them. But there is a possibility through conversations today and we will have further conversations that hopefully over the coming year there will be perhaps a half-dozen or so interactive, web-based, online delivered courses that we will work with in cooperation with IU East. So there is lots of potential out there. There are a lot of possibilities. There is a lot of energy. There is a good staff. There are dedicated advisers. I think that there are well-meaning and satisfied graduates, but with
a division that is delivering coursework that is three decades old as far as format is concerned we need to concentrate very heavily to bring that up to date.

Now when I was initially contacted by Larry MacIntyre, who is the public relations guru on the Bloomington campus a couple weeks ago Larry said, “The Star is interested in distance education. They want to talk to you.” I said, “That is fine. I guess I am willing to talk to them but Continuing Studies is not a leader in distance education, yet.” Hopefully we will be. We are certainly not a leader in online education, maybe we will be at sometime in the future. The primary and exemplary programs in online education at Indiana University are Kelley direct and the IU Nursing School as far as I was concerned. The Star should be talking to them. Four or five days later, a phone call came back. Larry said, “Well the Star wants to interview you about General Studies and distance education.” So I don’t know if this was the second or third conversation about this, we agreed that I would do a phone interview. And in the process of responding to the questions, it was clear that it was not distance education that was the question. It was a question about a 3+1 program that had been developed out of the school for marketing purposes probably first launched about three or four years ago with seven community colleges in Illinois.

Since that time and a few months before I came aboard, that particular program was expanded into a number of community colleges in California and in Arizona. And I think with good intention by my predecessors because I think that they found that there was a good possibility that cooperation with those particular community colleges would create a population that could be supported academically to move through what is standard practice according to their understanding and my understanding in individuals completing up to 90 credit hours outside of Indiana University but being expected of course to complete the upper-level final 30 credit hours from Indiana University for the bachelor’s degree in General Studies. The agreements between the School of Continuing Studies and those community colleges, I don’t know whether or not there has been a copy of that’s been given to you but we would be happy to send it to you. I haven’t assigned any additional agreements, but essentially the letter states that that community college agrees to promote the option with Indiana University, it’s not the only option but its an option to make them aware of it, to include it in the universities promotional activities, to host a representative from Continuing Studies from time to time in order to advise directly if need be but that Indiana University would certainly provide advising and articulation plans to students from that community college through online email conversations and a lot of phone conversations. That was basically the commitment between the two institutions.

There is nothing in that commitment that is any different from a commitment that the school would make to any individual or any other institution in that we would try to work out as best we can a reasonable path for what we would accept into the program and the courses you would need to take in order to complete a bachelors in general studies from Indiana University that degree follows the admissions criteria and review criteria of the coursework through the IUPUI campus and eventually the general studies degree if one is ever awarded through this program comes from Indianapolis. To date after being in effect for a little bit over three years, there has not been a graduate from this particular program. We think that there are likely to be about 4 or 5 graduates from Illinois next year who are relatively close. Keep in mind the demands of the program, we are talking about individuals who are still working in many cases full-time or part-
time. We are talking about a menu of courses that are correspondence, many of them on an independent basis that may take them anywhere from 8, 9, to 12 months to complete so it’s a gradual process. We are talking about the expectation that they meet upper level quality coursework so the coursework is demanding but we have not had any graduates from the program from the original six or seven institutions in Illinois. The number of students who have entered into this program from the Arizona and California community colleges, I am not certain of an exact number, but I would imagine that we have anywhere from 100 to maybe 150 up to 200 who are considering it. And who are quite likely are taking additional coursework at their community college that would be acceptable to come on into the program.

Now I am an old liberal arts grad for whatever its worth from a small college in southern Kansas. I have spent most of my career with Indiana University with the graduate program in Library and Information Science some of you know about that particular program as I look at faces around this room. You know it’s a top rank school. You know that the programs that I have dealt with over the years have been ranked in the top 10 nationally, including the school media program. So my 23-24 years with Indiana University has been primarily with graduate level education so I have not paid much attention to undergraduate programs except to say in my years of examining the transcripts of students who have applied to our program with a general studies degree. I can’t give you exact numbers but I will tell you I have been impressed with the array of classes that they present. It’s a very broad spectrum of liberal arts classes that are accepted on in to the School of Library and Information Science for either the Master’s Degree in Information Science or the Master’s Degree in Library Science. While over the last two months, I am getting more of an education of undergraduate education standards as far as Indiana University is concerned so consequently my response to one of the interview questions was I concerned about this program enough that I wouldn’t proceed with it. My response was had I known about the program probably six months ago I would not have allowed it to grow. I think you need to know it is still on a moratorium basis, no additional letters have been signed and if we do in some way proceed with the program it will be under a great deal of scrutiny. It will be under a great deal of better articulation of program options that are available for those students. It will be looking at the quality of those programs and others that might come our way in which we can develop good relationships. I was a little stunned as an old liberal arts graduate to find out that you can do a 90/30. I just didn’t know that and then as I started to be more and more informed I found it out that its not just general studies there are an array of degrees around the university that allow that particular practice although I think they are very guarded against whether or not those credits would exceed 60 coming from a community college or a junior college.

Let me conclude with just one other aspect and then maybe we can open it up for questions or concerns and if I haven’t covered enough territory to satisfy people. And I would encourage you if you haven’t to read the article from the Inside Higher Education piece that was sent to you. In trying to find someway to deal with this program and salvage from it what I think is actually a very worthwhile opportunity for a school that’s been charged with finding the best flexible most outreaching, and those are the words that are here in your charge to me in your review two years ago, approach for distance education, I think that there is some mileage in continuing to look at these community college programs but some others. That is not saying that I am signing them on to keep them going. It is saying that I want to look a lot closer at what they may have to offer and the reason for that. As I have been more and more educated by my staff and by many others—
because I have asked this question now hundred times in the last six weeks—that includes meetings in Washington, D.C. with people who are officials of associations for accreditation of community colleges. So what can a community college possibly provide because I am from Kansas where we call them JuCo’s. I am from Indiana where we call them Ivy Tech’s. What could a community college possibly provide that any four-year college would respect or accept even beyond that two-years that might be completed at that community college. I found that these are not true characteristics across the board, but are there are such things and these are initial criteria. Some of these community colleges have as high as 30 percent PhD’s as their faculty. Some of them have resident faculty, where the percentage of PhD holders is as high as 60 percent. Now that might not be as high as what I would find at Bloomington, may not be as high as I would find at IUPUI. It might not be a convincing factor for you. I think it measures up to most of our campuses outside of Indianapolis and Bloomington, and I am happy to be corrected if I am wrong. The other thing that we tend to find at some of these community colleges is that they have a long history of articulation agreements with other four-year colleges where a substantial amount of the work at that community college if not more than 60 credits can be transferred. So they have a history of providing what I think most of the faculty review committees would find to be upper-level 300-level quality courses. Not just stopping at the lower-level course delivery. They have a broad menu of liberal arts offerings of the humanities, mathematics, science, earth science, behavioral sciences, that we look for as part of a general studies degree. And in some of these community colleges we have a broad enough menu of coursework that we are not going to strand an individual by not having the kind of courses that will transfer in.

The final thing of course is that these community colleges have a strong record of advising and they all have accreditation. We need to look closer to as whether or not they have the range of accreditation that we would want. But all of them seem to have the accreditation pieces in place. Now of the 22 community colleges that are apart of this—there maybe a little more, but I think its 22—also in looking at some of these and figures that I have been fed today. It does not mean that all of them fit this exact criteria that I have described. There are some with criteria that I think is a little bit a low, there rate is a little bit low. And I would want to look a lot closer at what they have to offer before we would issue to them, although we would certainly want to continue to talk with your students, it seems to us that it is quite likely that the students from your particular institution are going to have a great deal of difficulty meeting the expectations that we have for the General Studies bachelor’s. On the other hand, there are some of these community colleges, where I think that there are programs that we can talk about in terms of very special tracks that can create a new opportunity for distance education delivery for us to open up some new avenues that haven’t been there before. It is a small operation to this particular point. There has not been a great deal of revenue of course that has come in on this program and represents under 1 percent of the revenue of the total school. On the other hand, I think that there are some conversations that could continue with some of these institutions to create what we could identify as being model cooperation’s between Indiana University and some rather substantial community colleges, especially those in California. Hopefully, I have touched on some things that are of interest to you and I welcome any comments or questions.

**HERBERT**: I’ll save mine for later.
SPECHLER: Dean Callison, welcome to this new job, I appreciate that you have been on the job for only a limited number of weeks and I’m sure when you finish reading all of these reviews on your table and decide what to do, I hope you will comeback and tell us what you are doing. But let me be blunt about some of the objections and criticisms that were made of the School of Continuing Studies before you came on board. This is based on personal experience with the School of Continuing Studies. My son holds a degree from the Bloomington, or has a degree in General Studies. He never completed a proper major, never had a capstone course. He never wrote a long research paper. He did not complete the general education program such as it was at Bloomington. In fact, he is a traditional age student, not a non-traditional age student. Now I think what has happened, let’s be quite straightforward about this, the School of Continuing Studies has offered a second rate degree for students who are traditional students but do not wish to meet the exacting requirements of majors on their own campuses. That is my personal experience and the wide-spread reputation of the School of Continuing Studies in Bloomington. I think that is something that you have to address. I am very much in favor of offering courses to non-traditional students, through distance education. You are on the right track in my opinion in that but there are how many of these 1500 students are 22 years of age or lower and have bailed out of other programs which demand more of them? I think that’s the central issue. Indiana University has to offer a quality degree whether it is from general education, continuing studies, physics, economics, whatever. We are responsible for high quality degrees and really the criticism of the general studies degree is that it is not of the same quality as other degrees on the Bloomington or other campuses. Excuse me from being blunt, it is not a criticism of you. The school has had many, many problems, I know. It is not a criticism of anyone in particular, but I think that this is an issue that has to be addressed if that school is going to rise to a level that you want it to be.

CALLISON: Professor Spechler, I deeply appreciate your comments and I would have to say that I have read all the studies and I’ll continue to re-read them along with the comments that you delivered. I also have to say that I have read minutes from this particular body and your comments in particular stand out to me as ones that I’ve taken note of. I think that, this is Avi, right? He’s a great kid, my wife knows him personally. I think that she’s provided him a lot of service through the Monroe County Public Library. I think Avi, is he a recent graduate of the master’s program in Information Science?

SPECHLER: Yes.

CALLISON: Yes, he was an active student in that particular school as well.

SPECHLER: Well, we’re proud of him but not that he was able to get out of all of these other requirements, which he would have had to go through in the department of history.

CALLISON: Well, it may not get at what you really want but I think that one of the things that we try to deal with in public education and through general studies is that students do have differences. Students have different ability levels at different times in their growth. I’m not going to make excuses in any way as to whether or not the general studies degree is necessarily looked upon as second-rate or not. I think that I probably could find some situations where students of a traditional age have found that the general studies, perhaps for whatever reasons, is more suiting
to their needs at the time, is more flexible. Or perhaps, it is easier for them to move through the program than the original program that they selected for their studies. But I think that we’d also find a high percentage of people who have been satisfied with that particular track, perhaps individuals that have salvaged an academic experience that would not have had it any other way. And the success rate of people who have gone on to graduate studies, including information science, including law, including other areas of graduate study, is pretty substantial for the general studies area. I don’t know the exact numbers…

**HELMAN:** Thirty percent.

**CALLISON:** Thirty percent? One-third of them go on into graduate studies. Maybe that’s good, maybe that’s bad. I do know that just the term ‘general studies’ sometimes sets people off. And, again, from the curriculum that I’ve seen at least to date, and we’ll continue to look at it and try to be educated along that line, I really think it needs to be called an interdisciplinary bachelor’s because of the demands. Now specifically a couple of things that you mentioned along the lines of the expectation that they would write a long research paper and that they would do a capstone experience. Those were two pieces of conversation that I had on the agenda as I visited the people at IU East this afternoon and as I talked to other directors of continuing studies around the state. We intend to develop what we feel is a capstone experience that involves those kinds of writing and information literacy demands. I think there are individuals here in this room who would probably support the fact that I have a long history of working with information literacy and the use of resources and the documentation of resources and to wide such discussions. How that would be implemented? We are still unsure because we do want to deliver it across all eight campuses. The ingredients of what it will involve in addition to the research paper are quite likely to involve field internship experiences, building the portfolio of artifacts of academic success and tying those together and reflecting on them, presenting information effectively in front of a group of individuals—perhaps not this large but four or five individuals. We’ve had several campuses experiment with that sort of thing but I am willing to predict that within the next two to three years what you will see will be development of we’ll consider to be a model program for capstone experiences through general studies that we hope other disciplines will examine and perhaps use as a model for what they should be employing in those disciplines as well.

**HERBERT:** Ok, we have ten more minutes. Let’s start here and then we’ll come down the table.

**G. HOYT:** I do have a real problem with the 3+1 no matter how you configure it. It’s still an Indiana University degree—even though Mr. MacIntyre of course disassociated it from the flagship campus and put it with the ostensibly less prestigious university here in Indianapolis (that in itself is indicative of something but I don’t know what exactly). We have an associate dean of international affairs and we look at 3+1 programs offered by some of the [inaudible] and just determined that was not appropriate for Indiana University to have less hours than two full years at our university. I would really like you to look at that really closely and continue that moratorium on having anything more added until this is clarified. I would just ask the administration on the faculty council to keep an eye on this so we don’t damage our reputation—even though it’s from Indianapolis. In this new structure, you are in Bloomington and we have continuing education here and the degree is offered through here and you’ve already mentioned
that there is a system school and yet there are campus-specific things that answer to whom? I thought I knew this but I guess I don’t.

CALLISON: Well I’ll give a shot at it. I described my responsibilities as Dean of Continuing Studies as serving eight campuses in the IU system but that there is a ninth campus which is a virtual campus, which I hope will be truly virtual over the coming years. And that particular ninth element has been charged with the delivery of distance education. So my responsibilities actually concern nine front doors. Now, to the extent that I serve as a dean of those eight campuses, to me is in question. From what I’ve been able to tell so far I have no input in the evaluation of the directors of continuing studies or general studies at those campuses. I have no input in the selection of a new director that might be placed in those positions on those eight campuses. I have no input nor review of the budgets of any of those particular entities.

G. HOYT: Including Bloomington?

CALLISON: That’s right.

VERMETTE: Why did you take the job? [Laughter]

CALLISON: Well the President promised me things will get better.

HERBERT: Help is on the way!

CALLISON: I think partially I took the job, not knowing that it was that decentralized but I knew that it was a School that needed help and I think I can help it. I may not be able to satisfy everyone around this room but I think that I can help it. But you know it’s pretty difficult to leverage units around the state when I have no input in who’s going to be the director and no input as to where the dollars are going to go. The only budget that I deal with is the one for that ninth entity which is the system-wide entity. And the only staff that I have responsibility for reviewing, hiring, and firing is what I have at the system-wide entity. This is a School that’s been carved apart into ten, fifteen different pieces to somehow solve problems but it’s only created more.

BALDWIN: One of the pieces was Labor Studies.

CALLISON: You can keep that piece.

BALDWIN: I do have a question. One thing we haven’t mentioned here as a faculty council is faculty. There is no faculty in continuing studies. My question is, how are faculty involved with curricular matters and creating a new program such as the 3+1 program, were faculty involved at all?

CALLISON: Well my understanding is that there was a discussion of the program with what we call faculty advisory committees. Each one of the campuses has a faculty advisory committee-they range from five up to eight or nine very impressive, dedicated faculty, quite frankly, to the continuing studies program who are ready to defend it as a quality degree on each one of the
campuses. I think that the faculty advisory group at South Bend that I met last week is just an extremely talented group of individuals and that’s been true around the state.

HERBERT: I think we have time for one more question before 4:30pm.

CORDELL: Well, I’m sure, having known Danny Callison for many years that he will push quality in these programs. I just want to mention that there is reference made to the fact that the program was originally meant for a non-traditional student. That is often defined as a student at a particular age. I would like to put forward a suggestion that students may be non-traditional even at the age of 18. Coming from a campus where the majority of our students are first-generation college we have students coming at the age of 18 who already have families who put themselves through college working full-time and going to school full-time. Those are not traditional situations and these kinds of programs are very important. Pushing the quality, pushing updating the delivery, those are very important for you to keep in mind. I just want to mention I have real concerns if this particular program were to move into serving Indiana students because we do not have a mature community college situation here. We do not have a community college arrangement where anywhere near the majority, it’s a small percentage of the faculty would be PhD-prepared.

CALLISON: That’s also the reason why fortunately, or unfortunately, the headline read that somehow we were taking Indiana out of IU. The question that was posed to me was, can this program work with Ivy Tech and my response in the interview was no. They are under 6 percent PhD, they don’t have the range of courses to consider. It also states, I think in the second article, that at least they seem to be satisfied with the 2+2 articulations that are being developed, the Star took that to mean that an Indiana resident cannot work through a program that essentially evolves into 90 credit hours from another discipline, another school, and then the higher 30 from the program within IU. That’s done at the individual campuses with the continuing studies programs and that’s their territory to deal with. Again, out of 1500 graduates each year, 90 percent of them are Indiana residents. I think they are well served and most of them stay here in the state of Indiana.

HERBERT: I might just share with you that from a senior-level administrative perspective there are some concerns. We’ve been engaged in those conversations with the dean and Rosann the issue that you have just raised is one of those. There are also in-state and out-of-state tuition issues and those sorts of things that I think we have to address. Let me also say that the observation that Danny made with regard to the role of the dean does not work. It’s not a tenable model and so I am going to speak to this in my comments to the Board of Trustees. We have now reached the bewitching hour. Thank you so much for this first conversation. There will be others. As you can see this topic is one of great interest to the UFC and I guess there’s no need to ask if there are any questions or comments. We stand adjourned. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31pm.