

FINAL DRAFT 10/5/06
A REVIEW OF IU'S CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL
OPERATIONS

A Report Commissioned by President Adam Herbert

Advisory Team Members:

Charles F. Bonser, Chairman
Alfred C. Aman Jr.
Gerald L. Bepko
Angela B. McBride
F.C. Richardson
Maynard Thompson
Jack R. Wentworth

September, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary and Recommended Actions	Pg. 2
Introduction	Pg. 8
Findings – System and Core Campus School Operations	Pg. 12
Issues in the Multi-Campus Relationships	Pg. 21
Other Issues Raised in the A Team Interviews	Pg. 24
System Schools and the Regional Campuses	Pg. 27
Conclusions	Pg. 30
Appendix I – Questionnaire Used with Schools	Pg. 33
Appendix II – School of Education Long-Range Planning Report	Pg. 35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June, 2006, President Adam W. Herbert, appointed a committee of former IU senior administrators (referred to as the “A Team”) to conduct a review of the structure and operations of the University’s “system schools” – those that conduct programs on campuses throughout the IU system - and the “core campus” schools that operate only on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The A Team administered a detailed questionnaire to the deans of the affected schools. We also conducted extensive interviews with the deans and their associate deans, and with faculty representatives of several of the programs.

Most of the Bloomington and Indianapolis core campus and system schools (Business, Education, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing, Social Work, and SPEA) have similarities in their operations on those two campuses. They basically function as “one school, two campuses”, albeit often with different student populations and complimentary programs. (Music and Journalism have special issues we discuss in the report.) The system schools on the regional campuses (SPEA, Nursing, Social Work, and Continuing Studies) vary both in their programs and among the campuses in their operations. It is obvious there is no one template that fits all IU system and core campus schools. Nor do we recommend one. Each of the schools has its own culture and method of operation. In some cases these differences are driven by the type of profession the schools serve. In other cases the history and the national prominence of the schools drive the nature of the relationship.

The body of this report discusses how each of the system or core campus schools conducts their intercampus relationships. It also discusses advantages and disadvantages of the multi-campus academic programs. We suggest a number of changes that could be made to facilitate the functioning of these programs, and summarize them here as “Recommended Actions”.

On balance, we believe the IUB / IUPUI relationship, while not without costs, yields significant benefits to both campuses, to our University, and to our constituents. The integration achieved by the core campus professional schools aid both campuses, and the added strengths from the sister campus of a school certainly strengthens its case for a high national ranking. We think there is an opportunity for enhancing Indiana University’s mission accomplishment if the professional schools using this model in Bloomington and in Indianapolis explore ways in which they can become better integrated. However, we also understand that if the relevant parties do not favor integration, we should not force “marriages with a shotgun”

The IU system schools examined in our project that operate on the regional campuses appear to be heading toward more of a federation than a system. Reorganizations are being considered on some of the campuses that could result in a withdrawal of the system schools from the regional campus. If that should occur, school federation councils are a possible alternative for program coordination.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

For The Trustees and the Central Administration

- Reaffirm Board support for the concept of “Core Campus Schools”. Make it clear core and system school IUPUI / Bloomington campus collaborations are highly valued and publicly acknowledged; work with the deans and the campus leadership to identify and eliminate barriers to program integration; and provide incentives for core campus activities.
- Increase investment in two way communications technology that can strengthen and facilitate interactions among all of the core campus programs.
- Examine the possibility of another experiment with an inter-core campus bus transportation system.
- Revisit the possibility of coordinating campus calendars and schedules.
- Direct the System Schools that now function on the regional campuses to work with each of the regional campus chancellors to determine a mutually agreeable course of action, and the nature of any future relationship agreed upon, for the system school programs in each location. We believe the Board should avoid any particular template for these relationships and allow each program to develop – or not - based on its nature, history, and needs of the campus as well as the School and the local constituencies.
- Develop an increased focus on telling the story of the multi-campus professional schools of Indiana University, and their benefits to our constituencies. Provide internal forums, through such programs as the President’s Leadership Development Program (IU Lead) for new administrators, and for current and prospective IU leaders, where the techniques, benefits, and cultures of our multi campus matrix organizations can be explored, analyzed, and debated.

For The Core Campus Schools

- The Deans of the Core Campus schools and their faculties should explore, with the leadership of the two campuses, where impediments to School operations exist, and how further program integration can be facilitated. They should work together to identify and resolve issues such as program direction and the perceived relationship between responsibility and authority.
- The A Team believes the IUPUI / Bloomington operations of Business, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing, Public and Environmental Affairs, and Social Work have proven to be very successful

and have demonstrated sufficient benefits that they should be continued and strengthened wherever possible.

- Education has also been successful on both campuses, but, as described in their long-range planning document (discussed in this report), there continue to be unresolved differences in the integration and direction of the School. We believe the leadership of the School should work with the leadership of the two campuses to remove ambiguities where possible and to clarify expectations, authority, and responsibilities. If the relevant parties conclude the core campus approach for Education should be discontinued, and perhaps replaced with the “federation” model used by the School and the IU regional campus education departments, they should propose their plan for change and its process – including how to deal with programs within the School now closely interrelated on the two campuses - to the President and the Board for their consideration.
- The Jacobs School of Music should discuss the future of the IUPUI music program with the IUPUI Administration. If it is agreed that the relationship with the Jacobs School should be terminated, a mutually agreeable transition to a new departmental format for the IUPUI music programs should be proposed to the President and the Board for their decision.
- The A Team believes that, with new leadership in the School, there are sufficient potential benefits to be had from a core campus IU School of Journalism that it is at least worth another review by the School and the IUPUI / Bloomington Administrations to see if the cooperative core campus program can be continued and strengthened. If the decision is to abandon the core campus school model for Journalism, then a mutually agreeable transition to IUPUI departmental status for Journalism should be proposed to the President and the Board for their decision.
- The Core Campus and System Schools operating in both Bloomington and at IUPUI should work with the Central Administrations to identify and eliminate the practical, everyday barriers (many identified in this report) that stand in the way of cooperation and integration. This will require the deans and their faculties, the academic leadership of the two campuses, and the President to work together to specify the requirements for a successful relationship and to help provide the tools needed.
- Review personnel and teaching policies with a goal of further integration within a core campus school. Strengthen integration, and the School’s research culture, by providing opportunities and incentives for intercampus research collaboration.
- Examine ways in which intercampus course and master calendar scheduling can be improved to provide better options for the students. Work to identify

and eliminate structural barriers for core campus faculty and students. The Deans should consider appointing one of their key staff to be responsible for fostering and implementing core school integration and harmonization.

- Work with the core campus administrations to develop a consistent budgetary policy that encourages budget administration offering enough flexibility so that budgets do not inhibit innovation and program creativity within a core campus school.
- Explore the possibility of such seamless, jointly delivered programs, as distance learning and “blended” academic programs.
- Consider the detailed recommendations listed in the School of Education report in Appendix II of this report. Note particularly the following suggestions from that report:
 - Review the School’s committee structure to assure meaningful participation across the School, and eliminate “token” committee appointments.
 - Develop a core campus faculty recruiting protocol that offers meaningful participation of both campuses.
 - Review all School and IU informational materials to assure explanation of the Core Campus nature of the School, including faculty directories. Make sure cross links of web pages are up to date and functional.

For the Regional Campuses and the System Schools

- The School of Social Work is the only system school we examined that has broad support in all quarters. The importance of the central school to the accreditation of each campus no doubt plays an important part in this support. We recommend no changes for the School of Social Work
- For SPEA, Nursing, and Informatics, the support varies both on the campuses and in the central administrations of the schools. We think the leadership of each of these schools should, as per the above suggested Board of Trustees directive, work with the faculty and each of the regional campus chancellors to define the nature of their future relationship. This should then be codified in a memorandum of agreement that includes transition steps, if needed, and any changes proposed in the manner in which degrees are awarded and designated on each campus. This should then be presented as a recommendation to the President and the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

- We suggest that, in the cases where the system school structure is recommended for discontinuance, the schools and the campus programs should consider establishing a statewide council of faculty, such as that used by the School of Education, to continue links between the programs and to discuss curricular and other common professional interests. We also believe the School of Education's statewide Council of Deans has been a useful mechanism that could be profitably copied.
- The System School Deans and the campus Chancellors should consider the costs associated with any recommended future relationship between each of the System Schools and the Regional Campuses and arrive at a mutually agreeable cost allocation for each School on each campus.

INTRODUCTION

In June, 2006, President Adam W. Herbert, appointed a committee of former IU senior administrators to conduct a review of the structure and operations of the University's "system schools" – those that conduct programs on campuses throughout the IU system - and the "core campus" schools that operate only on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The Chairman of the committee was Charles F. Bonser, former Dean of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Other members of the review team included: Gerald L. Bepko, former Vice-President and IUPUI Chancellor (as well as Interim IU President); F.C. Richardson, former Chancellor of IU Southeast; Maynard Thompson, former Vice-Chancellor, IU Bloomington; Alfred C. Aman Jr., former Dean of the IU School of Law (Bloomington); Angela B. McBride, former Dean of Nursing; and Jack R. Wentworth, former Dean of the Kelley School of Business. We will refer to this group in this report as the Advisory Team ("A Team").

The System Schools of particular interest for this project included: the School of Continuing Studies; the School of Dentistry; the School of Informatics; the School of Nursing; the School of Public and Environmental Affairs; and the School of Social Work. The Core Campus Schools included the Kelley School of Business; the School of Education; the School of Journalism; and the School of Library and Information Science.

Related Reports

Indiana University has undergone several reorganization efforts over the past 50 years. The most relevant to our charge was the 1974 reorganization that established the core campus programs.

In 1985, President John W. Ryan appointed a Task Force on University Organization to review these changes as well as the structure and operation of the IU system. The Task Force worked 16 months on this project, and “conducted hearings, interviews, and conversations with individuals, councils, senates, committees, and other groups on all campuses in the Indiana University system, as well as selected individuals outside the University.”

The findings of this 1985 Task Force concerning IU’s system schools are instructive. They concluded:¹

The value of the system approach lies in the capability of Indiana University to deliver professional programs leading to degrees of comparable worth, regardless of program location. The system serves to establish, maintain, and enhance quality in curricular and other academic matters, and the system model enables us to bring the experience, prestige, and certain resources of well-established programs on the core campus to other Indiana University campuses, so that these can deliver professional programs much sooner and at a higher level of quality than the present state of campus development might otherwise permit.

Under the system school concept, the Indiana University Medical Sciences program has become a model for delivery of medical education close to the homes of students and at a level of quality comparable to that of the School of Medicine itself in Indianapolis. Many system schools, such as SPEA, rank among the best in the nation, and their renown is an advantage that accrues to all students and faculty associated with the program and not only to those on the core campus, where the administrative seats of system schools are located.

System School Concept Viable

Among the frequent themes heard by the 1985 Task Force in its discussions were the following:

Schools

System programs are a burden on the autonomy of the campuses and schools concerned.

They increase the administrative complexities of campus and system administration.

They encourage conflicting loyalties in faculty members toward the campus on which the individual is assigned and the school of which he/she is a part.

They need to be organized uniformly to alleviate campus heads of the

¹ “Indiana University on the Threshold of the 21st Century”, Report of the Task Force on University Organization, pgs. 23 – 24.

necessity of dealing with a myriad of school organizational models, each with somewhat different policies.

Although we are persuaded that points 1) through 3) have some merit, we are convinced that the substantial benefits accruing to students, the communities served by each campus, the University, and the State outweigh additional burdens associated with system schools. The attendant problems of operating these schools are being solved by deans and campus heads. We have every expectation that their mutual good will can permit continuation of successful system programs on all the campuses until such time that freestanding programs can evolve and be sustained on regional campus at a level of quality comparable to the present norm in system programs. One of the chief problems has been the efficient mediation of differences between campus heads and multi-campus deans over academic issues. The proposed Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will be in an ideal position to structure a negotiating environment for resolution of such issues.

Uniform System School Model Desirable but Difficult

With respect to the fourth point above, it is our sense that the character and mission of system schools are significantly different to discourage recommendation of an arbitrarily uniform model, which would probably result in an organizationally convenient design, but most likely one that would fit none of the schools very well. We do ascribe to the notion, however, that Indiana University should work toward a smaller number of models and more uniform policies in this area, which would tend to maximize standardization of system school administration and minimize subjective factors, which some believe contribute to inconsistencies between schools, is especially important in the administration of budgets, promotion, and tenure.

In the reviews conducted by the “A team” on these issues, we have heard some of the same complaints about the difficulties of managing system schools, and we concur with the conclusions of the 1985 University Reorganization Task Force that “substantial benefits” (discussed below) also have accrued that have outweighed “the burdens associated with system schools”.

On the other hand, over the past 20 years there have obviously been numerous changes in the maturity of the campuses and programs and in the relationships and capacities of the institutions involved. It seems to us a fair question to ask is: have these changes altered the equation to the point where the balance is tipped toward program independence for many of the programs now components of multi campus academic programs?

In 2005 the Mission Differentiation team appointed by President Herbert reported on the system / core campus programs and indicated that the “core campus and system schools concept for terminal degrees should be continued and strengthened.” (pg 16). In reference to the regional campuses, the report stated (pg 11):²

One common theme at each campus conversation centered on the challenge of meeting regional needs related to both new undergraduate and advanced degree

² “Mission Differentiation at Indiana University”, August, 2005

programs. Since many of the chancellors serve on regional economic development councils, additional degree offerings in health care, education and other fields became a hot topic of discussion. The need for master's degrees or applied doctoral degree programs was frequently mentioned. Community leaders in the regional communities consistently viewed the IU regional campuses as trusted sources for providing needed high quality graduate degrees. The responsiveness of other higher education institutions in various regions of the state—including the fast-growing private, for-profit sector—raised serious questions about the willingness of Indiana University to be responsive to regional community needs.

A central question arising from these conversations is the willingness of the Indiana University core and system schools to provide guidance and assistance in meeting the needs of the regional campus communities. There is some desire to consider collaboration with other public institutions to offer degrees in a region if the core (or system) school is not interested in providing a timely response to documented need. This is especially true when other public institutions are in closer proximity to the regional campus than the system or core school. The campus conversations were very clear about a limited, region-specific need for graduate programs, and especially about applied degree offerings.

The history of cooperation and coordination from the system or core schools varied with each regional campus. The regional campuses would like more cooperation and attention to these issues. In some cases, there was a clearly perceived conflict with either Bloomington or Indianapolis over the right to establish and/or grow certain academic initiatives. Simply put, some campuses, especially those geographically furthest from Bloomington and IUPUI, believe their ability to meet community needs is being constrained by the core campuses. At the same time, many spoke of the advantages of core and system schools in the sense that they enable faculty who are not at Bloomington or IUPUI to participate more fully in the life of Indiana University than would otherwise be possible. For example, SPEA faculty at IUN and IUSB value their ability to sit on doctoral dissertation committees of SPEA graduate students at the core campuses. This is viewed as evidence of one university with multiple campuses.

Approach Taken by the A Team in the Review

The A Team used a combination of interviews and data gathering to compile background information for this review. A questionnaire was administered to better understand how the schools handle various aspects of their programs on the several campuses of the University. For example, we compiled information on budgeting, faculty appraisals, alumni relations, and inter-campus activities. A copy of the questionnaire used is included as Appendix I to this report. A chart summarizing the results across all of the schools is included here as Attachment A.

We interviewed each of the school deans, and in many cases the associate deans. We also interviewed faculty representatives of most of the programs, and we interviewed all of the regional campus chancellors (with the exception of Kokomo); Charles Bantz, the IUPUI Chancellor and IU Executive Vice President; and Michael McRobbie, the Interim Provost of the Bloomington campus and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

FINDINGS – SYSTEM AND CORE CAMPUS SCHOOL OPERATIONS

Any review of the state of multi-campus schools must acknowledge a number of achievements, particularly in the development of education for the professions. The School of Medicine is the most complete and integrated of all multi-campus schools, with Centers for Medical Education in Bloomington, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Indianapolis, Lafayette, Muncie, South Bend, and Terre Haute. The School of Nursing, operating on all IU campuses except for IPFW, served as a vehicle for quickly developing and disseminating undergraduate education around the state; regional campuses that are now separately accredited typically received their first accreditation as outreach from the IUPUI campus.

The School of Social Work operates academic programs on six IU campuses, making possible accredited undergraduate and graduate social work education around the state. Working together, the IUB/ IUPUI Kelley School of Business developed the IUPUI initiated “Kelley Direct Program”, which is the highest-ranked MBA Program that has an online delivery system. There are several instances in which the complementarities of the programs developed on the IUB and IUPUI campuses have strengthened the overall reputation of the school nationally. For example, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, which has more than 23000 alumni in the 34th year since it was founded as a system school, has high national rankings for programs unique to the Indianapolis campus as well as for programs unique to Bloomington.

It is also important to state that, as alluded to in the 1985 task force report, it is obvious there is no one template that fits all IU system and core campus schools. Nor do we recommend one. Each of the schools has its own culture and method of operation. In some cases these differences are driven by the nature of the program. For example, professional licensing and program accreditation – or a lack thereof - have a definite effect on how the programs are linked together on the various campuses. In other cases the history and the national prominence of the schools drive the nature of the relationship.

It is fair to say that most of the Bloomington and Indianapolis linkages are more alike between the core campus schools and the system schools than they are for the regional campuses. Business, Education, Informatics, Library and Information Sciences, Nursing, Social Work, and SPEA are all rather similar in how they handle such key management issues on the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses as budgeting, human resource issues (including faculty appraisal and tenure deliberations), alumni relations, and fund development. They all basically operate as “one school, two campuses”. Transferability of courses and credits does not seem to be an issue in any of the core campus or system schools. Although there are some differences from time to time related to leadership

styles and specific functions, they all characterize their Bloomington / IUPUI interactions as “moderate” to “heavy”.

Some of the core campus/ system programs are quite complementary. For example, the Kelley School of Business in Indianapolis has developed joint programs with the Medical School and the School of Engineering that take advantage of the program mix available on that campus. The two campuses also jointly operate the Indiana Business Research Center; the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship; and the Randall L. Tobias Center for Leadership. SPEA in Indianapolis specializes in Criminal Justice, Urban Management and Planning, Not-for-Profit Management, and has developed joint programs and faculty appointments with the Center on Philanthropy and with the Medical School in Health Administration. In Bloomington, SPEA takes advantage of the large science programs on campus in their environmental sciences programs, runs a joint PHD in Public Policy with the large and prominent Political Science Department in Bloomington, and has a very successful joint degree with the Law School. The School of Informatics only offers the M.S. in Health Informatics in Indianapolis. M.S. degrees in Music Informatics and Cybersecurity are being developed in Bloomington and an M.S. degree in Laboratory Informatics is being developed for Indianapolis. These three are currently offered as tracks in existing M.S. Programs (respectively Human Computer Interaction Design for the first two, and Chemical Informatics for the last.)

The School of Education in Indianapolis has strong programs in special education and in leadership and administration, and the faculty members in these areas work quite closely with colleagues on the Bloomington campus. IUPUI’s urban focus also makes it essential that the School of Education at IUPUI focus on urban education – a program that has limited opportunity for the School on the Bloomington campus.

The three smaller programs on the Indianapolis campus – Continuing Studies, Music and Journalism – are less tightly interrelated. Continuing Studies operates on a very decentralized model. **The School of Continuing Studies** only has a state-wide faculty of five, four of whom are in Bloomington, and one in Indianapolis. It is not a true “school”, as in the sense of other system schools. All of its courses are taught in other departments or schools. While its degrees in General Studies are offered on all IU campuses, there is no common organizational structure among the campuses. The SCS also is responsible for Independent Study courses at IU, the IU High School Diploma Program, and the Masters Degree in Adult Education. Although the School controls the General Studies curriculum, the management, budgeting, and human resource control on the campuses are essentially delegated to the local campus administrations. Some believe there is no need to have a coordinating school for non-credit education, which is largely campus based. Non credit education requires enormous commitment to market responsiveness, which argues for bringing authority closer to the market.

The SCS is a unique and specialized program that needs to be dealt with separately from the traditional system wide professional schools. IU recently completed a study of the organization of the SCS which was endorsed by the University Faculty Council. We presume this report will now be implemented in the months ahead.

The Music program at IUPUI was established as a small program in the 1980's to offer non major music education. It grew to include master's degree programs in Music Technology and Music Therapy, neither of which was offered in Bloomington. The Music School does not consider itself either a system or a core campus school. They have what they regard as little effective management authority over the IUPUI program, and very little interaction. **The School of Journalism** likewise has little interaction between the two campuses. A proposal is currently under discussion on the IUPUI campus to relocate both the Music program and the Journalism program to the IUPUI School of Liberal Arts. This would probably eliminate any programmatic links between the Bloomington and the Indianapolis campuses in Music and Journalism.

It should be noted that the recently appointed Dean of the School of Journalism has expressed a willingness to develop a plan for building relationships and interactions with both the Indianapolis campus and the regional campuses, if the IU Administration is interested in moving in this direction. The news media industry is presently undergoing significant changes, as it is impacted by changing newspaper circulation and consolidations, new TV and radio broadcast technologies, and the expanding use of the internet as a means of getting news online. (e.g., Britons aged 15 – 24 say they spend almost 30% less time reading national newspapers once they start using the web.) Given the importance of this industry to our society, it seems to us that before the Bloomington / IUPUI relationship is dissolved, it would be worth another examination of the possibility of strengthening the relationship in Journalism between the two campuses, and possibly even exploring how they might benefit by working more closely with the regional campuses. However, given the accreditation requirements of these programs, as well as needed technological investments and other expenses to be a "player", it is not an uncomplicated matter. Any examination of this possibility could benefit from including industry representation in the deliberations.

For the system schools also operating on the regional campuses, there is a great deal of variety in the level of overall school involvement on the campuses. With the exception of Social Work (see below detail), none of the programs have budgetary responsibility for any of the school's regional campus programs. Neither are they typically involved in fund development on the regional campuses. The system schools usually have an associate dean who spends 15 – 30 % of his or her time on system issues such as academic program changes and personnel evaluation. The School Deans, or their Associate Deans, normally attend such ceremonial functions as commencement exercises or annual alumni functions. Of course it is IU policy that any IU degree from either a system or core campus school states the degree name (for example, a Masters in Public Affairs, from the School of Public and Environmental Affairs) "Awarded at XYZ Campus."

Since its formation in 1972, the **School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA)** has operated as a "system school" on five campuses—Bloomington, Indianapolis, South Bend, Fort Wayne and Northwest. Each of the five historic campuses supports both the undergraduate degree in public affairs (BSPA) and the graduate professional degree, the Master of Public Affairs (MPA). In the early 1980's, other campuses of Indiana

University entered the SPEA system. Kokomo has now emerged as a SPEA Division, and offers the BSPA. It is seeking approval for the Masters in Public Management (a mid-career degree recently initiated at IPFW). Campuses at IU East and IU Southeast have mounted baccalaureate programs in criminal justice; however, there is no distinct SPEA unit on those campuses.

SPEA, the first “system school” in IU, still is actively involved in academic program oversight – academic program changes on all campuses must go through SPEA central review processes. Promotion and tenure decisions in the SPEA programs on the regional campuses pass through SPEA’s central Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as the local campus committees. For the past several years, each SPEA campus MPA (Masters in Public Affairs) program has been accredited separately by the national accrediting authority, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).

With the exception of Regional Campus budgets (the Dean sets the budgets for Bloomington and Indianapolis) and shared hiring decisions, the Dean has substantial responsibility on all other matters of governance, as shaped by the policies and decisions promulgated by three School-wide entities:

- 1) The SPEA Policy Committee—with elected faculty representatives on a proportional basis from across the campuses and with the Dean presiding-- deliberates and acts on questions of a major University-wide policy nature;
- 2) The Council of Administrators-- with membership designated by formal position across the campuses and with either the Dean or a designated campus director presiding-- addresses the School’s administrative issues, especially on curricula and other matters delegated by the Policy Committee;
- (3) The Academic Council--with membership of all the faculty across the campuses and with the Dean convening-- legislates on matters submitted by the Policy Committee and the Council of Administrators via an electronic docket (with extraordinary matters not resolvable by that docket to appear at its Annual Conference or a special meeting) and convenes in person annually on either major matters of policy or innovative ideas and strategies. The use of this “docket” technology has eased the intercampus (and even within campuses) meeting requirements of the School. At the same time, we heard some comments from the regional campuses that there are now fewer opportunities to get acquainted with faculty colleagues on other campuses.

In addition, SPEA has a Board of Visitors whose purview is the entire School across all campuses. There is an effort to appoint members of the Board to reflect the diversity of campus constituencies whether in a geographic sense or from a professional and academic perspective. The Board is advisory to the Dean especially on matters of: outreach to all SPEA constituencies including prospective donors; competitiveness in the

marketplace; contemporary trends in the professional fields germane to academic expertise; and emerging developments in public and environmental affairs.

The University's School of Nursing state wide involvement has evolved over time. Dean Emily Holmquist worked to turn the offerings at IUB and IUPUI into one degree in the 1960's. Development on the regional campuses began in the 1970's. The School is now more like a federation than it is a system. There is one governance structure for the University School, which was reorganized and streamlined last year. This structure is called the University Nursing Faculty (UNF). There are now three committees (executive, curriculum and student affairs) with one representative from each campus. The university faculty as a whole meets once a year during the Culbertson Symposium – a day long faculty development opportunity. The deans and directors of the 8 programs meet in person 3 times a year. The University Dean attends all graduations and visits each campus one additional time each year at the invitation of the dean at that program.

In comparison to the nursing programs on the five regional campuses (IUE, IUK, IUN, IUSB, IUS), each of which is separately accredited, undergraduate education at IUPUC and IUB is closely associated with IUPUI because they are accredited as one unit. The IUPUC faculty report to the chancellor of the Columbus campus and those at IUB report to an assistant dean at IUB. However, the faculty in the BSN program at IUPUC and IUB are assigned to departments at IUPUI (unlike all other campuses). This structure is called “the corridor” (IUPUI, Columbus and Bloomington). Faculty at all three campuses then serve on “corridor committees” for curricula, faculty affairs, etc.

Nursing no longer has centralized tenure consideration of regional campus faculty but tenure-track positions on the regional campuses need the University Dean's opinion for a promotion and/or tenure decision (the Dean is part of the formal process). There is a document that is used by all campuses that describes exemplars of behavior at each professorial level for tenure-track and clinical-track faculty appointments; however the portfolios are not assessed by a central IUSON committee. The University Dean is asked to write a formal letter of recommendation for any tenure track decision/promotion. The University Nursing Faculty's Curriculum Committee and Student Affairs Committee, ensure consistency in undergraduate offerings across campuses so transfer is not a problem, but only “substantive” changes are considered, meaning that each campus has the right to use different books and meet goals in different ways. Individual faculty from each campus who qualify are members of the IUPUI based Graduate Curriculum Committee. Some faculty members from the regional campuses have taught graduate courses offered both on-line and in regular classroom settings. All federally funded researchers in the School of Nursing reside on the IUPUI campus.

The School of Education, under IU's classification, is a Core Campus, not a system school, but it does have relationships on the regional campuses that are codified in a “Constitution for the Governance of Professional Education Programs in Indiana University”, and are helpful to the academic programs and the profession they serve. The School has a legislative body known as the “Education Council”, which is chaired by the University Dean. This academic governance organization is elected state wide and

consists of faculty representatives from each campus. It considers all academic program changes in IU's teacher education programs. Such coordination is helpful to the academic programs and the profession they serve. The University Dean also chairs the Education Deans Council, which is made up of the deans and associate deans from each campus. However, each campus (except for IUB and IUPUI) has its own constitution, tenure and promotion criteria, faculty governance group and each is accredited separately. These rather informal state-wide coordinating relationships seem to work well in connecting the regional campus education programs with those in Bloomington and Indianapolis, and no modification of the "federation" seems to be sought by either the campuses or the School.

There has been some discussion of the possibility of discontinuing the core campus relationship between Bloomington and Indianapolis and replacing it with the federation activities now on-going between the Bloomington campus and the regional campuses. This has been precipitated to some extent by different views in the campus administrations about the operation and direction of the programs. For some of the departments in the School, separation would be a non-issue, as the relationships are weak in any case. For other academic areas within the School – such as the leadership and administration group – termination of the core campus relationship could create a real problem, as the programs of the two campuses are very much interrelated.

In our discussions with members of the School, it seems there is considerable support for continuing and even strengthening the core campus relationship. The reasons for this support are discussed in the School's 2004 Long-Range Planning Committee Report cited below. But it is also clear that there continue to be unresolved differences in the integration and direction of the School. We believe the leadership of the School should work with the leadership of the two campuses to remove ambiguity where possible and to clarify expectations, authority, and responsibilities. If the relevant parties conclude the core campus approach for Education should be discontinued, and perhaps replaced with the "federation" model used by the School and the IU regional campus education departments, they should propose their plan for change and its process – including how to deal with programs within the School now closely interrelated on the two campuses - to the President and the Board for their consideration.

The School of Informatics is still developing. In theory it is a system school, but in practice it operates more like a core campus school, with undergraduate and graduate programs at IUB and IUPUI. The graduate programs are largely complementary, but there is some overlap. Also, undergraduate programs in informatics are being offered, or are under development, at IUSB (through the Department of Computer Science), IUK, and IUS with the assistance of the School. The last two just began this fall and are still under development. But there is no common governance or management system that applies to these entities, though there are regular "core meetings" of key leaders via video conferencing several times a semester. The School approves the courses and the core requirements for the major. The core requirements are the same from campus to campus, but there is some variation in the "cognate requirement" (15 -21 courses outside the core in what amounts to a domain specialty). Courses are transferable among the five campuses where the school has an Informatics Bachelors of Science. The School works

closely with the programs on all 5 campuses to develop websites and promotional/informational materials with a common content/message.

The School of Informatics offers some graduate degrees on both the IUB and IUPUI campuses. The Ph.D. is offered on both campuses, as are the M.S. degrees in Bioinformatics, Chemical Informatics, and Human Computer Interaction, though they have different emphases (in general more focused on health issues and other applications in Indianapolis.) Directors for these multi-campus programs oversee both campuses – currently the Director of Bioinformatics is on the IUPUI campus, and the Directors of Chemical Informatics and Human Computer Interaction are on the Bloomington campus, with corresponding Associate Directors then on the other campus.

Since the School is fairly new, some processes are still being developed. For example, a School Constitution has just been completed for the faculty at IUB and IUPUI. Policy Committees and P & T Committees consisting of faculty from both large campuses are working well, in spite of normal “start up” problems. Research collaboration among faculty on different campuses is being developed, but not much is yet in place. There are some joint grants in bioinformatics and some joint research in human-computer interactions.

The leadership of the School on the two campuses works very well together, and important functions like marketing and student recruiting are well coordinated. The IUPUI Informatics leadership is very supportive of the core campus relationship. They work together on many initiatives with their Bloomington campus colleagues. They think the outside world sees the two campus School as an “aggregate” that is indeed greater than the sum of its parts. Even the PHD, that had a difficult birth, is thriving and oversubscribed at IUPUI and also flourishing at IUB. The IUPUI doctoral work has also positively influenced the Bloomington program through being able to bring a measure of pragmatic reality to the program.

The School of Social Work operates very effectively as a multi-campus school located on the IUN, IUSB, IUB, IUE, IPFW, and IUPUI campuses. In fact, in terms of integration of programming and cohesiveness, the School of Social Work, aside from the School of Medicine, is the most complete system school in IU. Social Work seems to have all of the ingredients that allow for efficient operation, economies of scale, little or no dissension, and seemingly uniform support among students, faculty, and alumni. The organizational structure of the School allows joint coordination with the campuses on issues such as curricula, faculty hiring and development, program admission requirements, budgeting, program accreditation, and program evaluation. It is of particular interest that the MSW at IPFW is a form of outsourcing for the campus. At IPFW the IU School of Social Work, based at IUPUI, manages the budget (including State appropriation and tuition) for the program, but operates it in a collaborative manner with the IPFW campus. Moreover, the students, wherever located, earn the same degree from the Indiana University School of Social Work, although the campus where the studies were completed is shown on the degree. The IUPUI, IPFW, and the Bloomington

campus programs are all on the same budget. IUE, IUN, and IUSB each have their own budgets. The Dean charges campuses a fee for providing accreditation and other services.

Although there has been a multi-campus dimension of the School for many years (IUB and IUPUI) the high level of integration and success in Social Work has been accomplished largely because of the administrative leadership at the School of Social Work. Dean Patchner and his Executive Directors have been aided in their efforts to integrate the programs by accreditation rules that would make it very difficult for any of the other campuses (other than IUB) to create a graduate level program in social work of their own. Therefore, the accreditation of programs offered at the regional campuses depends on the system school.

Another incentive has been the need for MSW programs in the cities and population centers around the State. Gary, South Bend, and Fort Wayne represent population centers that need an MSW program. Political support for the offering of these programs is strong and the School's willingness to move forward in the current arrangement may have encouraged the Indiana Commission for Higher Education support for the PhD program in Social Work now offered at IUPUI.

The integrated school gives the Dean, and his leadership team, an opportunity to look at the State's social work needs and to address them on a statewide basis. That those needs are present is absolutely clear from the high levels of enrollments based at all of the locations of the program that have been offered at these smaller campuses. In fact, at Fort Wayne, the School has enrolled one cohort for a three year MSW program and has 35 people on a waiting list for a second cohort of the program that will not begin for 2 years.

There are also research and teaching opportunities that have bound various parts of the School together. Special multi-campus activities may be found in areas such as child welfare. Research in this and other areas is possible on a statewide basis through the campuses and the IU School of Social Work faculty.

Prior to 1974, **The Kelley School of Business** was only a Bloomington-based school, although it did operate an evening part time MBA program in Indianapolis for many years prior to the establishment of IUPUI. This program was still in operation when the 1974 reorganization establishing the core campus programs took place. The undergraduate programs were separate and did not necessarily have the same curriculum. The School decided to become one school with two locations in 1974, and this model has continued to this day. This integrated structure allows for the customization of services and fiscal cost savings.

The Dean of the Kelley School, with the support of an Executive Associate Dean for Indianapolis, is responsible for both campuses. The research mission of both campuses is the same and the expectation is that faculty will strive to achieve national and international recognition for their scholarly work. The academic program mission of the Kelley-Indianapolis campus focuses on serving central Indiana, whereas the Bloomington

delivered programs serve a national and global audience and are represented in the various national media rankings. While each campus handles student advising and undergraduate student placement, for many functions the School operates as a “single, integrated entity”. There is a single personnel review committee for promotion and tenure decisions, and an integrated Academic Council that coordinates the curriculum and School policies. The distance learning graduate degree program, “Kelley Direct”, is collectively taught by the two campuses (approximately 60% Bloomington and 40% Indianapolis). Faculty members from both campuses serve on a variety of policy and other committees of the School.

Further integration of the two locations was fostered in 1997 when the School was named in recognition of a significant gift from alumnus E.W. Kelley. The renaming of the School has had a dramatic effect on the IUPUI campus. Faculty and students at IUPUI no longer have to explain the two-campus model to colleagues and employers across the country, as the Kelley name has made clear to all that the School is one entity. The Kelley School leadership and faculty have strongly endorsed the core campus model. They state they do so because:

- 1) The Kelly School can do *more* as a two campus school than it can as a single campus – for example, it can serve different groups of students, and it has more resources for such programs as Kelley Direct, an initiative set-forth by then Kelley School Dean, Dan Dalton, and is led by a Kelley professor who holds a joint appointment between the two campuses. At its inception, Kelley Direct leveraged the distributed education model used on the Indianapolis campus.
- 2) The Kelley School can do things *better* as a two campus location – for example programs like the Tobias Center and the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship gain strength from the two campus locations.
- 3) Each Kelley campus *benefits from the other* in both resources and joint funding of special initiatives. For example, the evening MBA program is marketed jointly with Kelley Direct and the Bloomington in-residence program in the Indianapolis market.

Those leading the Kelley School are proud of the progress they have made over the past 30 years building the two campus core program. They realize there is still work to be done to achieve what they see as their potential, but they are optimistic about their future. Both the leaders and the Kelley faculty we were able to interview, strongly support this model and would oppose separating the two campus of the Kelley School of Business.

The School of Library and Information Science (SLIS) has had an interesting history and is currently evolving as a core-campus school. At one time SLIS and its faculty were located almost exclusively on the Bloomington campus and offered the Master’s degree in Library Science (MLS) out of that base. Today, the Bloomington campus also offers a Master’s Degree in Information Science, or MIS, a Ph.D. in Information Science and a wide variety of certificates and dual and joint degree programs.

In the 1980's, the School listened carefully to expressions of need around the State for advanced learning in library and information science fields and the School committed to taking the MLS program across the State. In cooperation with other IU campuses, and supported by the travels of resident faculty from Bloomington, SLIS offered course work leading to the MLS in a number of different places. By the 1990's this program became unworkable because of the stress and travel requirements for faculty and concerns expressed by the national accrediting body (American Library Association). Moreover, the enrollments in Bloomington and at IUPUI had increased to the point where faculty were needed in those home campuses (Bloomington and IUPUI). Faculty were more than fully occupied in addressing those resident enrollments on the two largest campuses.

The result was that SLIS pulled back from the other campuses, with the exception of IUPUI. In this period it became a core-campus school with SLIS programs offered only at Bloomington and IUPUI. Each campus has its own web site, but this does not seem to have caused confusion or any other difficulty. The web sites are interlinked; all faculty members are now listed on both sites.

There has been some residual unhappiness on the campuses where MLS studies were offered in the past, particularly in the northern tier cities of Gary, South Bend, and Fort Wayne. Those prospective students in the northern tier, who were unhappy when SLIS faculty stopped riding the circuit, continued to press the case for the need for this type of advanced education. That need is now being met through a combination of electronically mediated distance education and the involvement of faculty from the IUPUI campus, at least at Gary, South Bend, and Fort Wayne.

Dean Blaise Cronin suggested in his responses to our questionnaire that the current arrangement between Bloomington and IUPUI, operating as a core-campus school, is at least an acceptable way and may sometimes be a very good way of operating. On balance there are more advantages than disadvantages. The primary advantage is that in this core campus configuration the School is able to cultivate two areas of strength. The 15 or so full-time faculty members resident in Bloomington have fewer teaching responsibilities and more responsibility for conducting research. At IUPUI, faculty (six tenure related and four visiting) have more responsibility for shepherding students through programs. Scholarly production is thus enhanced in Bloomington - a primary reason why the School shows up so well in national rankings. At the same time faculty at IUPUI, who shoulder a larger teaching responsibility, have been able to address some of the educational needs of the State and have also given SLIS a dimension that is very important for purposes of accreditation. It is likely that the most recent accreditation, which went very smoothly, would not have gone nearly as well had it not been for the complementary strengths of the SLIS program at IUPUI.

The success of the School, in which all faculty members share, has been responsible for some degree of collective enthusiasm. SLIS is ranked in the Top 10 nationwide (US News & World Report, 2006), and just behind Harvard in a recent (2006) study of

research productivity and impact. At the same time it has expanding enrollments and an increasing positive impact on the State of Indiana. It is not likely that these broad gauged accomplishments would have been possible within the current resource base in any form of organization other than the current core-campus school.

There is also some concern about the size of the academic unit. Those in SLIS believe their national ranking would be substantially diminished if they were incorporated as a department in another school. Such compartmentalization could also inhibit the multi-campus activities of SLIS. There are also the unusual reporting line issues that are apart of any multi-campus school. For example, the SLIS Executive Associate Dean in Indianapolis has a dual reporting line to the campus administration and the dean of the School in Bloomington. From time to time questions of how reviews are conducted and what role is played by faculty members on the IUPUI campus in the review of the Dean in Bloomington are likely to enter into the consciousness of people within the School.. None of these, however, is a problem that has not been readily addressed by the good working relationships between the deans and central administrations in Bloomington and IUPUI.

ISSUES IN THE MULTI CAMPUS RELATIONSHIPS

In order to consider issues and problems in the inter-campus relationships, we think it is useful to separate the Core Campus Schools from the Regional Campus programs, as we found the problems and potential solutions to be very different We will therefore first focus on the Core Campus issues, then move on to the Regional Campuses.

THE CORE CAMPUS: THE INDIANAPOLIS / BLOOMINGTON AXIS

In 2004, the School of Education Long Range Planning Committee, chaired by Barbara Wilcox, then Executive Associate Dean of Education at IUPUI, and Gary Ingersoll, former Executive Associate Dean of the Bloomington campus, conducted an analysis of the core campus arrangement as it worked in that school. As part of that report, they reviewed what they saw as advantages and disadvantages of the core campus concept. We believe many of the advantages and disadvantages they cited are generic to all core campus programs. We therefore excerpt them from that report for inclusion here:³

ADVANTAGES OF A CORE CAMPUS ARRANGEMENT: “IT’S A GREAT IDEA...”

In concept, the core campus offers impressive benefits for students, faculty, and the unit as a whole. The more obvious of these are briefly presented below.

FOR STUDENTS:

- Those who live in the metropolitan area have access to an advanced graduate program without having to relocate to Bloomington.

³ “Report of the Long Range Planning Committee”, School of Education, April 20, 2004, pgs. 1 – 3.

- The core campus arrangement provides an opportunity to combine experiences at a traditional Research I institution *and* at an urban research university.
- Having two campus locations increases opportunities for financial support and offers a larger pool of faculty from which to select an academic advisor and research mentors.
- Students interested in urban education issues have access to an urban center for research and practicum.
- A coordinated schedule of classes across the core increases the range and availability of courses.
- There is access to an expanded range of colloquia, visiting scholars, and other extracurricular events to enrich the overall educational experience.

FOR FACULTY:

- A base in Indianapolis draws the student population of the capitol and largest city in the state into graduate and advanced graduate programs.
- The core campus arrangement provides access to an urban center as well as to small town and rural communities for research and development activities.
- The core campus provides an expanded group of colleagues.
- There is access to an expanded range of colloquia, visiting scholars, and other extracurricular opportunities/events.
- There is an opportunity to create “communities of practice” for research, teaching, and service activities that include colleagues who work in significantly different settings.

FOR THE IU SCHOOL:

- The core campus enhances the image of the School as inclusive and responsive to the full range of issues/challenges facing education today.
- Combined data from the core campus yields better numbers concerning enrollments, external funding, and philanthropy than would either campus alone.
- The core campus arrangement can improve recruiting of both faculty and graduate students by offering expanded employment or educational opportunities for spouses/partners and an urban as well as a small city living environment.

BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING A CORE CAMPUS: “It’s a great idea ...BUT...”

Despite the potential of the core campus ideal, there is a bi-campus reality that results in nontrivial problems. Some of the challenges facing students, faculty, and the unit are briefly presented below.

FOR STUDENTS:

- Many find it difficult to travel between IUB and IUPUI. International students may not have any transportation and other students may have undependable vehicles.
- Despite the feasibility of on-line courses and courses using interactive video technology, students can still be required to attend in person while others find that on-line courses are not acceptable in meeting program requirements.
- Students who are enrolled at both campuses in the same semester are charged student fees on each campus.
- There are frequent problems securing course authorizations away from the home campus.
- There is significant ambiguity about IRB protocols when students work across the core campus (for example, when the student's home campus is different from the campus of the research advisor). It is unclear where the human subjects requests should be filed or whether a student must clear two IRBs.
- The class schedules are different in Indianapolis and Bloomington. The Fall semester begins on different dates.
- Students typically lack information about the interests and skills of faculty on "the other" campus.
- Students may not be encouraged to consider coursework, practicum opportunities, or a research advisor beyond the home campus.

FOR FACULTY:

- Like students, faculty may find it difficult to travel between IUPUI and IUB. Younger faculty may have limited transportation and untenured faculty may be loath to devote 3+ hours to the round trip given the demands of the tenure process.
- Separate budgets result in different sa

- There is a widespread perception of time wasted on committees that deal with single campus issues. Though distance technology does facilitate participation from both IUB and IUPUI, committee members at IUPUI frequently do not receive committee documents in a timely fashion [or at all] and many committees do not make the effort to use the technology to the fullest (e.g., making sure that the speaker is always visible on camera, shifting the camera to track conversation, and the like).
- There is a lack of incentives to devote time and energy to building a core campus environment. There is widespread perception that collaborative work is not valued by the School's reward structures, particularly at IUB.
- There are a variety of "sins of omission" in which appropriate individuals on one campus are overlooked by their counterparts on the other. As a result information goes unshared across the core and opportunities are lost/collaborations foregone.

FOR THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

- The reality of a 55+ mile distance and the nearly 3 hour round trip between IUB and IUPUI represents a significant disincentive to collaboration.
- Distance education technology helps to reduce the barrier of separation but distance education is expected to solve too much. "Soft technologies" of personal contact remain important.
- The concept of "core campus" is seen differently in different departments and certainly from IUPUI. Many faculty and staff claim little or no understanding of the arrangement. Some programs and committees underscored the importance of the core campus arrangement to their mission while others are silent on the issue.
- Independent of the faculty in Education, the cultures of the two campus environments are very different. (For example, there is a strong tendency to be collaborative and interdisciplinary at IUPUI with a similarly strong tendency for an individual and departmental focus at IUB. At IUB, the field experience office does much of the work with school sites while at IUPUI faculty do those negotiations directly.)
- Often there is a "campus tokenism" that mandates representation from both campuses rather than opportunities to collaborate on authentic work of the unit or discipline.
- While the core campus image is arguably good for the School of Education, it is difficult to realize benefits to individual faculty/programs on a consistent basis. Realizing the full benefits of the core campus idea would require a significant time commitment from already stressed faculty members at each location.

OTHER ISSUES RAISED IN THE A TEAM INTERVIEWS

We concur with the School of Education report on most of the advantages and disadvantages they cite. We think attention by the central administration of the

University to trying to eliminate the practical, everyday sorts of barriers that stand in the way of cooperation and integration would yield great benefits. For example, while some schools, like Education, have excellent two way communications technology that is useful for intercampus meetings and joint classes, this capability is by no means easily available to all.

The difficulties cited in the report that students and faculty face in trying to work between the campuses seem not to be insurmountable. While incentives for participation can and should be developed within the schools, we need to move beyond such palliatives as committee participation solely for the purpose of representation. It may be appropriate to revisit the campus scheduling issue. If there are disparities in work loads and salaries within some of the core campus schools, why do they exist and why can't they be rectified or at least be better explained? We also wonder whether there is any possibility of experimenting again with an inter-core campus bus transportation system, which may attract more riders today because of the higher cost of gasoline and more development along the routes between the two cities.

The School of Education report referred to above also had several practical suggestions to make the core campus relationship function more smoothly. These are included here as Appendix II.

We encountered other views and issues concerning the structure and relationships that warrant mention.

From the Standpoint of the Central Administration of the Schools

Some of the deans discussed the lack of budgetary flexibility that derives from the two campuses being separately budgeted under the RCM system. There is the view that the Dean is not able to shift funds within the two locations of the core campus school, in the best interests of the School overall, which they believe discourages creativity and innovation. There is a related concern that, in some cases, the main campus of the school involved is not adequately reimbursed (or in some cases not at all) for the leadership and management oversight of the sister campus.

It is, however, relatively easy to move funds for specific purposes from one campus to another. For example, part of the costs associated with the SPEA central administration is born by the Indianapolis campus budget. Likewise, in the Kelley School of Business, the budget of the Indianapolis campus program supports a sizable proportion of the key administrators located on the Bloomington campus, as well as the costs of several other functions and programs in the Bloomington budget. On the other hand, in some cases, none of the costs of the central administration are shared with the sister campus program.

It seems to us that a consistent budgetary policy among schools is worth considering and that it should be one that encourages budget administration that offers enough flexibility so that budgets do not inhibit innovation and program creativity within a core campus school. If we do, in fact, expect the core campus schools to function as "one school, two

locations”, one can make a logical case that, as much as possible, the budgets of the schools should also be “one budget, two locations.” It is important that the costs of multi-campus operations be recognized and equitable funding arrangements be agreed. Furthermore, it seems to us that the personnel and teaching policies of the two-campus core schools should be reviewed with a goal of additional integration. We encourage the deans of the affected schools, with the input of the appropriate faculty policy committees, to work with the campus Chancellors to review these matters to see if it is possible to develop an approach agreeable to both the campuses and the Schools.

Effects of the Core Campus Schools on the IUPUI and the IUB campuses

One of the difficulties associated with system and core campus schools is the relationship between the school and the campus on which it is housed. For professional graduate programs, this is less of an issue because these programs are typically free standing. Undergraduate programs, on the other hand, are normally fully integrated with particularly the arts, sciences, and humanities on a campus. The core campus schools and their faculty members, of course, also try to be good neighbors and good citizens on their home campus. But there does exist, from time to time, the tension of campus versus school loyalties. Of course most of our professionals are mature enough to understand the dangers of going down this path, and take steps to avoid finding themselves in conflict situations.

There is also the issue of those who are understandably trying to further develop their home campus as a “player “in national and international circles. They naturally are concerned with the “brand” of their campus, and want to do all they can to enhance and publicize that brand and identity. Sometimes the core campus school identity seems to conflict with that objective. In those cases, we believe the IUB / IUPUI record so far has shown a general willingness to compromise and to work out differences on a pragmatic basis. We believe the IUB / IUPUI relationship yields significant benefits to both campuses, to our University, and to our constituents. It helps compensate for the shortcomings of both campuses that result from the historical program mix of both IUB and IUPUI. The integration achieved by the core campus professional schools aid both campuses, and the added strengths from the sister campus of a school certainly strengthens its case for a high national ranking.

Reflections on the Core Campus School Model

Obviously there are both benefits and costs associated with the everyday functioning of the core campus schools. It is encouraging to note, however, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of operating such complex matrix organized institutions, we heard strong support from those directly involved for the value of the core campus professional schools and the desire to make them work. Given today’s communications capabilities - unimaginable when these programs were established over 30 years ago – it should be even easier and more productive to function as a core campus program. The “end of distance” proclaimed by some pundits with the advent of the new millennium may not be here yet, but it is certainly closer than it was 10 years ago, and will be much

closer in the next decade. While electronics will never replace the importance of face to face human interactions so important in building a faculty, with the enhanced potential for joint campus program delivery of such programs as distance learning and “blended” programs (those utilizing both distance learning and on site classes) there are expanded opportunities for intercampus seamless program delivery. If we are to meet the competition developing from other universities and private enterprises, we doubt if IU has any choice but to take full advantage of our available resources on both campuses.

The A Team would add here that we believe there are definite benefits that accrue to the cities and citizens of Central Indiana, and to the State as a whole, from the operation of the “core campus professional schools”. Both IUPUI and IUB have schools that, over many years, have built national strength and reputations in their respective fields. The core campus approach has brought both campuses capabilities and professional standing for programs like Business, Medicine, Nursing, Public Affairs, Social Work, Library and Information Science, Informatics, and Education, that would take years and a huge financial investment to achieve if each campus were left to build and operate its own independent programs from scratch.

We believe the professional school core campus approach utilized by IU in Bloomington and Indianapolis has been invaluable to Indiana University, our constituents, and our multiple higher education missions. Rather than loosen these intercampus ties, we think there is even greater opportunity for Indiana University’s mission accomplishment if the professional schools, that choose to continue using this model, explore ways in which they can become even more integrated than they are today. To accomplish this goal, however, it is essential that the central administrations of both campuses be fully supportive of the core campus concept and work closely with the dean, as the chief academic officer of the School.

We also understand, however, that in spite of the perceived benefits of the core campus schools, there may be cases where the relevant parties between the two campuses may simply not be able to achieve a common perspective on the direction of the program and efforts to continue as a single school become dysfunctional. Should that occur, we believe a dissolution of the program as a core campus school should be permitted. If the relevant parties do not favor integration, we should not force “marriages with a shotgun”.

SYSTEM SCHOOLS AND THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Once again, those IU schools examined in our project that operate on the regional campuses as “System Schools,” include SPEA, Social Work, Nursing, Informatics, and Continuing Studies. While Education was established as a “Core Campus School” rather than a System School, it does have intercampus activities.

In the course of our review, as noted earlier in this report, we interviewed all of the regional campus Chancellors, with the exception of Kokomo. We earlier reported on the nature of the relationship of these schools with the campuses. For the most part, we found a general acceptance on the campuses of the professional school interrelationships. There

were no significant complaints about the reality of the relationships. Most recognized the value of an IU professional school “brand” to the campus and their students.

The closest to a negative comment we received from a regional campus chancellor, was: “We at IU (---) neither have a burning desire to secede nor a similar desire to build the multi-campus schools. We are living with the current arrangement and can continue to do so if needed. ..(but) except for the branding provided by multi-campus school membership and a few points related to individual units, the multi-campus school structure does not do that much for us and in some cases constrains us.” They did, however, go on to extol the benefits the campus receives from its affiliation with SPEA, Nursing, and Social Work. Another chancellor commented: “We have two areas of concern: selection of a director for the program, and decisions about promotion and tenure of faculty. While oversight for level of quality is appropriate, insistence on control of these decisions is inappropriate. Tenure is campus specific.”

There are current issues on the South Bend (and possibly other) campus about future relationships with some of the system schools that are relevant here. It was reported that “Generally there is growing sentiment that the system-schools are ineffective. The South Bend SPEA and Nursing programs have expressed interest in being independent of the system schools. Social Work functions well as a system school and would strongly opt to remain so (accreditation would not be possible if Social Work became independent.)” The campus is currently reviewing organizational changes that would discontinue SPEA as a separate school in South Bend with a dean, and would break off and house the SPEA program in health administration along with Nursing and Social Work in a new college of health professions. If that were to happen, it is unlikely that SPEA would agree to the use of its degree by whatever programs survived.

A sample of system faculty members on the regional campuses (not meant here to be representative) commented they are disappointed that the faculty interactions of earlier years have declined, and that younger faculty members are not being involved in school wide matters. But they were still very committed to the system school and thought losing the system connection would hurt both faculty and student recruiting. “It would also diminish our prestige on campus.” Another commented: “We would hate to see our program lose the system connection – that is one of the reasons I came here.”

One the other side of this issue, another regional campus faculty member suggested that “in the last five years, the benefits of the system school have diminished, partially as a result of the decentralization of the tenure process. Furthermore, cooperative research between the campuses is a myth.” Another contributing factor for the devaluation of the system concept was the movement to campus accreditation of the programs, rather than accreditation as part of the system school. Other comments included: “New faculty members have a hard time conceptualizing what it means to be part of a system school.” “It doesn’t help recruit students - most of our graduate students are not going to leave this area anyway.” .. “The system is almost gone. We would have more integrity if we said it worked for 30 years, but it is time to end it.” They do see value, however, in a continued association of some kind with the school.

The attitude of the system school deans vary. As noted earlier, Social Work is doing quite well as an integrated system school, and the Dean seems to support this arrangement. SPEA and Nursing do very well on some campuses, and have issues and problems on other campuses. It is fair to say that there is increasing frustration with the demands of the regional campus involvement, and the opportunity costs associated with this stewardship. There is also frustration that they seemingly have some responsibility for these programs, but limited authority. There is also discontent on the main campuses that there are very real system school costs – both actual and opportunity costs – that are un-reimbursed by the regional campuses. If the regional campus relationship is to continue on these campuses, it would be worthwhile to clarify, via a memorandum of understanding, the particulars of the relationship between the deans and the campus chancellors involved, and who should cover what system costs.

The SPEA Dean and Associate Deans are of the view that if the program was starting now from scratch, they would support just focusing on Bloomington and Indianapolis. The Dean has the ability to align human and financial resources as needed on these two campuses but not on the other three campuses. They were sympathetic to the idea of instituting a state wide faculty forum of public affairs programs similar to the School of Education's Council, and perhaps a Deans Council, as a means of discussing common issues and opportunities. Their summary opinion is: "The School will do whatever the University wants, but maintaining the cross subsidies is getting harder, with the University budgetary situation."

If the system schools like SPEA, Informatics, and Nursing were to disengage from the regional campuses, they would probably insist that the brands of the schools, as incorporated in the degrees offered, should be discontinued. Therefore, for example, rather than a SPEA student at IUN receiving an "MPA from the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs, awarded at IUN"; the student would receive an MPA from IUN. A Nursing student would similarly receive a BSN from IUSB, rather than from the Indiana University School of Nursing.

It is obviously difficult to generalize about the future relationships between the IU professional system schools and the regional campuses. To some extent, indeed, the long term relationship of these schools will be dictated by the evolution of the regional campuses themselves. We have no crystal ball that tells us where that evolution will take us. In many ways, since SPEA's establishment as IU's first system school 34 years ago, the schools and the regional campuses have "grown up together." It is not unreasonable to expect them to evolve in different directions.

CONCLUSIONS

President Herbert, in his charge to the A Team, asked us to review the multi campus academic programs with regard to their continuing effectiveness. Along with the need for a general review of these programs and their operations, he asked the following questions:

Does this structure continue to offer the most effective approach to deliver high quality academic programs?

We think the answer to this question is clearly yes for the majority of the Schools, particularly as they function on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. However, there may be, from time to time, cases in which campus based considerations, as opposed to multi-campus school considerations, are believed to be predominant. In such cases there should be a dilution or dissolution of the multi-campus organization. As we note in the report, if the relevant parties do not favor integration, we should not force “marriages with a shotgun”. If there should be a dilution or dissolution of the multi-campus organization, it must be understood that the degrees will no longer bear the name of the school. In such cases the campus would award a degree with no mention of the highly regarded school name.

Does it foster a strong and mission appropriate research culture on each campus?

This is not a matter that we explored in great detail. But we think the Core Campus and the System Schools have generally had a positive effect on the research culture of the campuses on which they function. They do this by linking the campuses to programs of national prominence, and by the professional standards the Schools use in their faculty evaluation processes. However, it is clear that there is not as much research collaboration, with particularly the regional campuses, as one would hope. Obviously, the distances involved affect this dimension of the programs, as well as different research interests fueled by the needs and characteristics of the program location and the audiences they are trying to reach.

Does it have strong support on each of our campuses?

As discussed in the body of our report, it is difficult to generalize about the schools and their functioning on the several campuses of the University. We think separating for examination the IUB / IUPUI relationship from the functioning of the Schools on the Regional Campuses is also worthwhile. We have done that in this report. Within the Core Campus schools there may be more of an opportunity to utilize the multi-campus school approach since the orientation and work of the IUPUI and Bloomington campuses are closer than may be true for other combinations of campuses. This should be kept in mind as a factor in any analysis of multi-campus school issues, without delineating a particular template for their further development.

We conclude that the Core Campus Schools, with a few exceptions that we discussed, are doing remarkably well and have general support on the campuses, particularly among the faculty of the Schools involved. The record with regard to the regional campuses is more tenuous. With the exception of Social Work, it appears that the other System Schools we reviewed may be, at best, evolving into more of a federation than an integrated system school.

There is some reason to believe that the scope and nature of multi-campus schools may not be thoroughly understood outside or even within the Indiana University family. Accordingly, there should be a period of increased focus on telling the multi-campus school story. Also, there should be a program of some kind for faculty and staff devoted to an examination of multi-campus schools. This could also be included in the IU Leadership Development Program (IU LeaD) initiated by President Herbert in 2006. In this forum some of the most highly integrated or successful units could be described and analyzed by their leaders. Through this kind of program the notion and value of multi-campus organization within academic disciplines might be better understood, leading to encouragement to create or strengthen multi-campus activities.

Is there a need for modifications in the manner in which the schools operate and are governed?”

The A-Team concluded that it should not recommend any dramatic changes in existing policies and practices for multi-campus schools. In general, there are neither sufficient reasons to warrant wholesale dilution or dissolution of multi-campus relationships, nor are there sufficient reasons for concluding that there should be a new era of increased structural uniformity within the multi-campus schools. We argue instead that the IU experience suggests there should be no rigid template for managing multi-campus academic programs. Instead, there should be some general operating principles, framed as irreducible minima, and encouragement for creating something greater than the sum of the parts by working across campus boundaries within the same discipline.

In many professional disciplines, as we have noted, we believe there has been a greater level of academic quality achieved at a faster pace through use of “system” or “core campus” schools. The advantages of this kind of multi-campus organization include various efficiencies; synergies; enhanced recruitment of faculty; research collaborations; statewide visions for meeting professional needs; better curriculum development, in general; better mobility for students across the state; and intellectual stimulation that comes from a larger pool of colleagues. These advantages suggest that it should continue to be University policy to encourage the growth and development of these multi-campus schools.

Whether these advantages are worth the extra effort and costs sometimes associated with multi-campus schools may depend on a variety of circumstances. Those circumstances include the degree of development of campus programs, local demands that are made by communities, the competition created by other universities, accreditation issues, the types of burdens that are placed on home campus school programs, the importance of having a

nationally recognized school degree offered through a regional campus, the visions of the school deans and chancellors, and University wide notions of how to organize for long term success. Any of these characteristics could affect the wisdom of proceeding to create, enhance, or sustain a particular multi-campus arrangement. These factors also make it clear why academic programs may be different in different professional fields at different places and at different times.

We have learned from this review that the system is evolving as the campuses mature and as the environment changes in other ways. Among the Schools, there are many examples of "the whole being greater than the sum of its parts," but the details vary considerably from one school to another. Increased efforts to standardize the relationships or to manage the changes may not be productive, and in fact may impede desirable changes.

As we discuss in the body of this report, issues like "responsibility without authority," "barriers to collaboration", and "un-reimbursed administrative costs" can be resolved, at least in part, through discussions between deans, chancellor's, and the Executive Vice President. Problems have been solved in the past, and we cannot hope to anticipate all the new issues that will arise in the next decade. We do believe that if the Trustees and IU Central Administration strongly support the concept of the Core Campus and / or the System School approach, that fact should be made clear in their policies and in the charge they give those administrators and faculty responsible for making these relationships work, and in their evaluations of program leadership. By the same token, the administrators and the faculty of the programs need to have the tools and policies that make the management of a successful multi campus program possible. This will require the deans and their faculties, the chancellors and the President to work together to specify the requirements for a successful relationship and to help provide the tools needed. We hope this report will be helpful in that regard.

In conclusion, we believe the evidence we have gathered in this project has shown that the system that looked like a good idea in 1974 and in 1985, still seems to have many virtues. Those aspects of the IU System that no longer contribute "value added" have tended to disappear naturally over time, and we expect that will also happen in the future.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE: MULTI CAMPUS UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS

I. Using your School as an example or model, how would you define the expression "system school" at Indiana University? If you do not consider your school to be a "system school," how do you describe its multi-campus dimensions? Is it a "core campus" (just Bloomington and Indianapolis) school? Or are the multi-campus dimensions a part of a collaborative effort within IU?

II. What are the campuses on which your school conducts academic programs?

On those IU campuses where your school does not have a presence, how are academic programs in your field organized? (e.g., independent unit or included as part of a larger campus unit?)

III. What involvement does your School have in the following activities in your programs on the other campuses?

A. Curriculum (both graduate and undergraduate)

B. Faculty Appointments and Advancement (please specify whether there are differences between tenure track, clinical, and adjunct appointments.)

C. New Degree Programs

D. Graduation of Students, including Ceremonies

E. Alumni Affairs and Development

F. Accreditation

G. Budget Development

H. Setting Faculty Salaries

I. Faculty Development

J. Program Evaluation

K. State wide Representation of the Discipline

L. Fund Raising

IV. Do you have any involvement in these functions on campuses where the program is not affiliated with your School?

V. We are interested in the extent of interaction among your faculty on the campuses in which you operate programs. Is there : considerable, moderate, little, or no joint efforts in research and / or service projects? What suggestions do you have, if any, to increase this interaction?

VI. Are courses in your academic program transferable among those campuses where your school has a presence? Are courses in your field transferable among those campuses where your school does not have a presence?

VII. Are admission requirements relatively similar among the campuses in which you manage academic programs?

VIII. Are there activities which would move your school toward its academic goals that are facilitated (or impeded) by the multi-campus nature of your school? If so, what are they?

IX.. How much involvement have you had with the Chancellor, and other officers, on those campuses where your multi-campus school has a presence? How would you describe the relationships that have resulted?

X. How much of your time and your staff's time is consumed in multi-campus matters? How much in the way of financial resources has been devoted to these multi-campus matters? Were any compensating resources provided to the school at any time to pay these costs?

XI. From the standpoint of Indiana University, what are the advantages and disadvantages of multi-campus schools? From the standpoint of your School, what are the advantages and disadvantages?

XII. How would you change the current arrangements and practices to improve the multi-campus schools and their impact?

XIII. Are you aware of other universities that have multi-campus schools similar to yours? Have you been in contact with them to identify best practices or improvement strategies?

XIV. What do you believe to be the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with the multi-campus nature of your school?

APPENDIX II

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (2004 LONG-RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

LRPC Recommendations

Given that there is a broad sense that “The core campus concept is a good idea but...” the faculty and administration of the school must decide whether to engage in a concentrated initiative to (a) remove barriers, and (b) increase incentives to prompt its implementation.

The LRPC takes the position that (1) there should be both effort and resources focused to remove barriers and reap more benefits of a core campus for both students and faculty, and that (2) the results of this investment should be reviewed after a designated period (e.g., 2 years).

We recognize that leadership will be particularly important in this context. Leadership can create an environment in which

- the concept of core campus is established as a priority
- core campus thinking is modeled continuously
- core campus collaborations are clearly valued and publicly acknowledged
- incentives are provided for core campus activities
- there is attention to communication and community building among faculty of the core campus

IF the decision is to pursue the ideal/to realize the potential of a core campus arrangement, THEN the LRP offers a limited number of specific recommendations that we deem vital to this end. This is followed by a longer list of possible activities that might also move toward more authentic and effective operation of the core campus.

1. The dean should designate an individual whose prime responsibility is to foster and implement the core campus ideal.
 - a. This should not be a permanent position, but one with a limited term, after which its efficacy should be evaluated.
 - b. There should be significant released time associated with the position.
 - c. There should be some resources associated with the position so that he/she can support the building of effective core campus functioning.
 - d. This person should oversee the implementation of the short list of recommendations (2-8 below) and, as time permits, foster the secondary recommendations of the committee (see Table 1).
2. Begin to eliminate structural barriers of the core campus for students.

- a. Work to bring resolution to the current ambiguity concerning human subjects protocols, and communicate the resulting policy to all faculty, departments, and offices working with graduate education.
 - b. Devise and implement a mechanism to eliminate payment of double fees by students enrolled on multiple campuses during a single semester.
 - c. Convene a meeting of relevant staff and faculty to develop a protocol for facilitating cross-campus course authorizations.
 - d. Clarify residency requirements and establish whether there are expectation for specific campus residency beyond the “core”
3. Begin to eliminate structural barriers of the core campus for faculty.
 - a. In all discussions about promotion and tenure, highlight the composition of “primary committees” so that all candidates understand that their primary committee is likely to include members from both Bloomington and Indianapolis. (See <http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/primarycommitteemembership.html>).
 - b. Modify the promotion and tenure process to better reflect different campus cultures and the reality that tenure is campus specific. One solution would be for IUPUI to have its own “unit committee” (which would also result in a Bloomington-only unit committee for candidates based at IUB). See comments from Promotion, Tenure, and Contracts Committee.
4. Develop a strategy to foster inter campus collaboration of staff from the Deans’ suites. Staff from the Dean’s offices in Bloomington and Indianapolis should meet regularly in person to coordinate (a) a master calendar [IUPUI + IUB], (b) search & screen activities (see 5 below), (c) promotion and tenure activities, and (d) general communication and coordination.
5. Revisit the composition of key and ancillary committees. Token representation on committees is not constructive when the committee agenda pertains to a single campus.
 - a. Review the mandate for IUPUI membership to consider different mechanisms for input/more authentic participation. For example, each committee could be expected to have a core campus element *or* parallel committees might function on each campus with periodic communication between chairs (along the lines of IUB’s Teacher Education Council and IUPUI’s Committee on Teacher Education.).
 - b. It may be appropriate to expand membership on some committees that do not currently have participants for both IUB *and* IUPUI.
 - c. It is vital to orient both chairs and ex officio members (and GA recorders or secretarial staff) about the importance of developing sensitivity to the core campus. (Additional recommendations for more effective committee functioning are included in #3 in Table 1 below).
6. Develop a core campus recruitment protocol. Many respondents indicated that visiting both campuses during their initial interview played a crucial role in helping

them develop a “core campus mindset” and to understand that there were colleagues, students, and opportunities in two very different locations. (And, naturally, they also learned early some of the challenges that accompany the opportunities!) Since the recruitment and selection of new colleagues is a central aspect of faculty work, it is important to “make the core campus work” during the search and screen process.

- a. At a minimum, it is important to assure that both campuses are utilized in the recruitment process.
 - b. We should establish expectations regarding visits to both campuses.
7. Review all School, departmental, and committee list serves to assure full representation across the core campus.
- a. All IUPUI faculty members should be on the departmental distribution lists/list serves of the relevant IUB department.
 - b. Each IUB chair (and other faculty members as they may express interest) should be included on IUPUI distribution list/listservs.
8. Review informational materials to assure mutual recognition and discussion of both common and unique opportunities.
- a. It is vital to cross-reference faculty directories
 - b. Web pages should build relevant links beyond each campus’ SOE “home page”

While these 8 items are key, interviews and the survey identified a larger list of possible activities that might be undertaken to improve the status quo and move closer to realizing the full range of benefits of a core campus. These are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Additional Activities to Improve Core Campus Operation	
1.	Develop a school-wide staff infrastructure (moving beyond the Deans’ offices to include departmental secretaries and administrative offices) to support an effective “core campus” <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Arrange for key staff to visit their counterparts on the sister campus• Have annual planning/review/update meeting to ensure consistency of message
2.	Design and disseminate protocol for committee meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prioritize agenda items (common vs. campus-specific items and begin with those that pertain to the core)• Establish a practice that committees will meet in person at least once on each campus (or perhaps alternate meeting locations, depending on the nature of the year’s work)• Ensure that pertinent materials get to all members <u>before</u> the meeting to allow informed participation.
3.	Convene regular meetings of Center Directors, Teacher Education staffs, technology staffs, and faculty teaching the same courses across the core campus. Individuals filling the same functions on the two campuses would benefit from improved communication and learn from other’s experiences.
4.	Devise and implement mechanisms to inform all faculty/students of opportunities of interest on

- the other campus (guest speakers, special programs, colloquia) and undertake mechanisms to ensure access (carpools, broadcast via distance technology). An important step in this direction may be as simple as adding an IUPUI member to the Lectures & Seminars Committee.
5. Use the school-wide retreat to begin/continue substantive collaboration across the core campus.
 - Coordinate the date within the Deans' offices to eliminate "retreat competition" and maximize attendance.
 - Consider using buses to eliminate the transportation barrier.
 - Alternate the location of the retreat or use a location equidistant between Indianapolis and Bloomington.
 - Devote a substantial part of the agenda to community building/establishing communities of practice.
 6. Provide incentives for broader use of "study groups" or the development of "communities of practice." It is noteworthy that items related to "communities of practice" were rated as the most significant potential benefit of the core campus configuration. Alas, it is similarly worthy of note that these items were as rated the least realized in daily practice. Faculty in Language Education have on their own chosen to meet regularly away from either campus to collaborate on research and writing projects. Their study group model combines business with pleasure in the form of dinner and exemplifies the kind of activity that would strengthen a core campus arrangement.
 7. Provide mechanisms and incentives to encourage faculty to teach across the core campus (perhaps semester exchanges). Because of the timelines for building the schedule of classes, this will require considerable lead-time and coordination around a number of challenges (sabbatical schedules, etc.).
 8. Design and implement mechanisms in each department to ensure that graduate students have an opportunity to meet/get to know faculty whose tenure line appointments are at IUPUI.
 9. Encourage students to consider committee members beyond their campus of attendance both through word and deed.
 10. Convene a school wide forum to develop a consensus about distance education opportunities for students (should on-line versions of courses be universally acceptable?)
 11. Ensure that the next revision of the Graduate Bulletin (to begin Summer 2004) addresses both the opportunities available through the core campus and the differences at each campus. This is an authentic task that provides an opportunity for faculty and staff to learn about and from one another.
 12. Review schedule of course offerings at the graduate level to coordinate for faculty AND to maximize course availability for students. Some programs—notably Educational Leadership in ELPS—routinely plan teaching schedules across the core campus to make best use of faculty and to ensure that required courses are offered on a predictable schedule.
 13. Re-think the IUB E300/M300 urban field experience to make it more authentic, perhaps inviting collaboration with students at IUPUI's PDS sites.
 14. Work with relevant departmental secretaries to ensure that course evaluation summaries for faculty teaching away from their tenure-campus get to the relevant department chairs in time for use in annual/merit review.
 15. Take some issues to a higher level
 - Transportation. Many individuals both in and beyond the SOE—along with campus

mail and library materials—travel between campuses each day. It would be nice to find some institutional will to devise at least some partial solution to this transportation problem. If we can put a person on the moon...

- Schedule of classes. Differences in Fall start dates create difficulties for students and faculty. Trustees should be encouraged to approve a single schedule for IUB/IUPUI at the earliest possible date.

Alternative Courses of Action

The LRPC takes the position that (1) there should be both effort and resources focused to remove barriers and reap more benefits of a core campus for both students and faculty, and (2) the results of this investment should be reviewed after a designated period (e.g., 2 years).

However, if the faculty and leadership of the School conclude that there should *not* be a serious effort to move toward a core campus ideal, they must decide which among various positions should be advocated.

- Do nothing. That is, continue the status quo where governance goes unexamined and where any collaboration exists solely as a function of individual faculty or programs. This ignores the real difficulties experienced by students, and creates a particular burden on faculty at IUPUI since their number is smaller and since they are typically expected to come to IUB.
- Separate the two schools of education. IUPUI might become like IUSB, for example: still part of Indiana University but more loosely coupled to policies and practices of IUB.
- Develop some new hybrid. We received repeated comments that many of the benefits of collaboration can be realized independent of the core campus arrangement.

Afterword

Recommendations are not—and cannot be—made or implemented in a vacuum. As we submit this report, there are a number of factors that may influence how the School of Education responds to recommendations to improve the functioning of its core campus.

- There will be some reorganization within the IUB portion of the SOE to accommodate the new “Learning Sciences” program.
- The new President of Indiana University has put an emphasis on “mission differentiation” across 7 IU campuses. This may—or may not—impede an effort to improve collaboration and communication between elements of the SOE core campus.

- The status of the University Graduate School is uncertain. If there is radical change, then both academic units and campuses may have additional powers and responsibilities.
- Faculty in the School of Education at IUPUI have aspirations to develop a doctoral program that would build bridges to other schools at IUPUI (Nursing, Social Work, SPEA, and Liberal Arts) and invite the participation of Education faculty based at IUB, and bring an interdisciplinary focus to the study of the complex needs of children, families, schools, and communities in the urban environment.
- ...and we have not even mentioned IUPUC and the faculty and programs there that report through the Chancellor at IUPUI.

Ultimately, the LRPC must re-emphasize that there is a generalized perception that “The core campus is a good idea but...” There is broad agreement that the core campus has the potential to enhance opportunities for engagement, collaboration, and professional growth among faculty and graduate students in the School of Education, but a variety of practical and structural barriers interfere with its full implementation. If the School of Education elects to move toward implementation of a true core campus, we must make a conscious commitment and begin a reassessment of policy, practice, and incentives.