

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 30, 2012
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)
UL 1126 Conference Room, IUPUI

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Applegate, Simon Atkinson, Ed Berbari, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Chris Darr, Charles Gallmeier, Don Gjerdingen, Cathy Ludlum Foos, Cassandra Guarino, John Hassell, Michael Kaufmann, Peter Kloosterman, Steve Mannheimer, Michael McRobbie, Laverne Nishihara, Michael Nusbaumber, Marietta Simpson, Jodi Smith, Fran Squires, Herb Terry, Barbara Vance, Frank Wadsworth, Lesley Walker, L. Jack Windsor

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Peter Bushnell, T. Scott Herring, Jim Hollenbeck, Pamela Ironside, Yusuf Nur, Lauren Robel, William Wheeler, Susan Zinner

GUESTS: Tom Gieryn (Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs), Alissa Gossett (EVPURAPP), Jenny Kincaid (Director of Policy Administration, EVPURAPP), Joan Kowolik (Campus Planning, IUPUI), Karen Lee (IFC Coordinator, IUPUI), Anna McDaniel (Research Affairs Committee), Razi Nalim (Export Control Public Policy Taskforce), Stephanie Roberts (Office of Research Compliance)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY12/03.27.12.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY12/04.24.12.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolution for John W. Ryan

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U4-2013.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors Carolyn Calloway-Thomas and L. Jack Windsor, Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U1-2013.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U2-2013.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U3-2013.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

5. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)*

(President McRobbie and Co-Secretaries Calloway-Thomas and Windsor)

6. Financial Conflict of Interest in Research Policy Review (20 minutes)

(Professor Anna McDaniel, Associate Dean, Center for Research and Scholarship) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U5-2013.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY13/TravelDisclosures.pdf>

7. Export Control Policy (20 minutes)

(Professor John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY13/U6-2013.pdf>

8. Academic Policies Migration Update (15 minutes)

(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, IU Bloomington; Jenny Kincaid, Chief of Staff and Director of Policy Administration, Office of the Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy) [DISCUSSION]

9. Student Services Initiative Update (15 minutes)

(Executive Vice President John Applegate; Jim Kennedy, Associate Vice President, University Student Services and Systems) [DISCUSSION]

10. Online Initiatives Update (15 minutes)

(Professor Barbara Bichelmeyer, Associate Vice President for University Academic Planning and Director of Online Education) [DISCUSSION]

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Alright, let's—ladies and gentleman, why don't we get started? Let me just—I'll make some comments in a minute, but let's maybe just go over the first couple of items on—the agenda. I—obviously let me know welcome everybody to this first meeting of the reconstituted or reformed UFC, but let me say a couple of words about that later. Let me move to approval of the minutes, and if I could ask for a motion to approve the minutes, please, from somebody.

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Calloway-Thomas and Windsor should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: So moved.

MCROBBIE: And a seconder?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Second.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion about the minutes from anybody from the last meeting? Okay, there being none, I'll put the motion—all those in favor, signify by saying "aye." [Aye]. Against, same sign? [Silence] The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR JOHN W. RYAN

There's a memorial resolution for the late President John Ryan under agenda item two. I—I'm not certain who's meant to have carriage of this item, but—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I think we [indistinct comment]

DETHLOFF: [indistinct comment] into the minutes.

MCROBBIE: Right. This is the—the resolution that's on the—that's about—that's on the web that people will probably get a chance to see. This—is somebody—do we need for the record to read it into the minutes or something, or do we—or how do we—how do we do that—?

DETHLOFF: [indistinct comment]

MCROBBIE: The—what actually is the resolution? I mean, there's a lot of anecdotes by people in—is that the resolution?

DETHLOFF: Yeah, that's how it came to us.

MCROBBIE: It seems a strange form for a—for a resolution, but—John?

APPLEGATE: Wouldn't we welcome a motion that the UFC expresses its deep appreciation for the life and service of President John Ryan, his many superb contributions to Indiana University over many years of dedicated service?

MCROBBIE: Yeah—I think—I think that would be fine maybe as a preamble to these memorial comments that people have made here, too. Does anybody wish to comment on it because maybe I could—maybe I could assume that's the motion before us, and see if that has a mover, someone would like to—

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: [indistinct comment]

ATKINSON: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay, any discussions or comments on—on this motion for John?

ATKINSON: Usually at IUPUI we reserve a couple minutes of silence out [indistinct comment] resolution.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We do the same at IUB.

MCROBBIE: Okay. You have done that or are you suggesting we do it now?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We normally do have a moment of silence in recognition—

MCROBBIE: —right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —in memory of the—

MCROBBIE: —Okay. Well, I think that’s—I think that’s appropriate, and let me—maybe the way to approach this is let me get—let me put the motion, and then we’ll observe a moment of silence. So if—is there any further discussion or comments on the memorial resolution as amended as it were by John? Okay, there being none, I’ll put that motion. All those in favor, signify by saying “aye.” [Aye] Against? [Silence] That is, I think, carried unanimously. And then, colleagues, maybe I could ask everybody to stand to observe a moment of silence for John Ryan. [All rise] Thank you very much. Okay. Let me then move to agenda item—agenda item three, which is the business of the Executive Committee, and I ask that Carolyn or Jack or both to comment on this.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, first of all, I want to say how thrilling it is to see everyone face to face. I’ve been accustomed to feeling the spirit of individuals without seeing [indistinct comment]. This is really delightful. Since we last met, many exciting things have happened, including the energized discussion of the privatization of parking on the IUB and IUPUI campuses, an issue that members of the IU Board of Trustees discussed on October 11th and 12th at their regular meeting, and although such a course of action, should it occur, will not affect directly campuses other than IUPUI and IUB, I think indirectly such an action could have important consequences for other campuses as well, primarily because universally and basically, the revenue comes from the same sources, including monies from the state legislature. For these reasons, I thought I should begin my comments today with a quick update on the issue of parking privatization since it falls within the purview of university faculty business.

So, I'm going to give you a quick scenario of what happened on the IUB campus, and then my co-Secretary will give an update regarding what happened on the IUPUI campus. And following his update, I will offer additional comments. On October 2nd, the BFC Executive Committee asked members of the Council to poll their units regarding this vital issue, and after we received comments, both written and oral, we looked for common trends and tendencies, which resulted in about three key arguments against privatization, including a potential tradeoff between short-term benefits versus long-term costs. On October 8th, we sent the documents to members of the Board of Trustees for their due consideration, and on Thursday, October 11th, when the idea of privatization came up, Trustee Pat Shoulders said some strikingly surprising things, all in keeping with his intellectual agility and lively temperament.

While discussing the issue, Trustee Shoulders abruptly and unexpectedly asked me what was the faculty stance on the issue despite the fact that his calling was a very early one, my comment on Thursday meant that a bit of agenda jumping occurred prior to my presentation on Friday, the customary day for my co-Secretary Jack and myself to offer comments. In any case, on October 12th, on behalf of the faculty, I made as compelling an argument as I possibly could about our firm views on parking, based solely on the comments that came to the BFC Executive Committee, and since the event, since the discussion, since all the news coverage of parking privatization, I have also received several comments from faculty and staff lauding us for our stance on parking. In terms of the dispensation of the parking issue, at the end of Thursday's session at the meeting of the Board of Trustees, members of the Board decided that they would hire a financial advisor to examine the matter of privatization, but they did not give a date when this will occur.

Some of the members of the Board of Trustees said some of the following things: "the idea still needs lots of thought. Let us see where it takes us. And this idea, this idea of financial advisor, is a tool we can examine." In all candor, I was surprised that members of the Board had no unified, collective response to the issue of privatization, and as a consequence, I left the meeting elevated and buoyed by the fact that members of the board appear to be very open-minded in their thinking on privatization. The Board promised faithfully that faculty will be consulted following their due diligence.

And at this time I will ask my co-Secretary, Jack, if he would comment on the items referring to the IUPUI campus.

WINDSOR: I'm not quite as eloquent as my senior co-Secretary, but IUPUI faculty really await the financial plan for review. IUPUI are more concerned—IUPUI staff are more concerned but they await further communication, we at IUPUI remain open—but are concerned about the direction. We really agree with Trustee Rice in that after the financial plan comes back, we'll get

an independent outside source to look it over that it does not gain financially from the acceptance of the plan, in order to evaluate it very critically. We encourage the administration to remain transparent and communicate openly as we move forward with this process. Thank you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Since the university is operating under heavy financial constraints, as President McRobbie so powerfully noted in his State of the University Address on September 26th, I believe that when making a decision about privatization, it will behoove the faculty to keep in mind this crucial point. And this leads to a second important issue I would like to raise today, and that is the President's State of the University Address, which was both visionary and agenda-setting, and I have made that comment previously, so I'm not currying favor of the President. If you have not listened to or read the speech, I urge you to do so, as it is hugely important. In the speech, the president spoke compellingly and clearly about reducing costs through what he termed, "operational efficiency," and I want to quote from a crucial section of the speech that will surely have a bearing on how we conduct IU business in the future.

Said President McRobbie, "I have spoken in other forums about IU's commitment to greater efficiency. While often viewed with skepticism within the academy, the unavoidable fact that we all have to come to terms with is that without making a serious commitment to becoming more efficient, we cannot add significant resources to the research and educational missions of the university, since every one of our major sources of IU's revenue is under pressure or threat." The president then listed the five major sources of IU's revenue which are under pressure or threat, including the fact that research funding is becoming more scarce, and including the fact that we only can expect, as he said, essentially flat funding from the state in the near future. Undoubtedly, these sources of pressure or threat will, as I indicated, be [indistinct comment] into issues of parking privatization. But I will not recount the entire speech here because of the burdens of time and because frankly, it doesn't make any sense to do that, but I do again encourage you to read the speech.

I will, however, highlight some initiatives that the president mentioned to which faculty should be most attentive. First, the president's idea about approaches to career counseling and career development. All campuses will be asked to make career counseling and development an important element of undergraduate education. Second, the president's notion about transforming Indiana University for the 21st century. The latter point dovetails with the New Academic Directions Committee Report and projects, and includes emphasis on moving from a 19th century model of higher education to meet the cognitive, educational and cultural demands of the 21st century. Those are my words. As examples of our imagining new thoughts and systems and [indistinct comment] to existence, the president singled out, as an example, all

the transformations, the seven IU schools that will have been transformed, merged, et cetera, by the end of the academic year.

Third, the president's comments about IU Online, in the words of the president, this will translate into how IU intends to project itself beyond the walls of the campuses. At the October 23rd meeting of the UFC Executive Committee, we discussed many of these items, and the following are some updates regarding where we stand on such initiatives. First, with regard to financial literacy, next week, on Thursday, November 1st, I will be meeting with MaryFrances McCourt who is the Treasurer, as you know, of Indiana University. And she has begun the work of getting the course off the ground, and we'll just give you a sense of the progress to date that has been made. First of all, Ken Carow who I said that Professor of Finance at IUPUI is developing three to four one credit hour courses based on the curriculum from an existing course titled F260. Second, Ken has engaged with the Kelley faculty, and I understand has engaged with several members on the regional campuses, and may not have connected the [indistinct comment] yet. Third, the courses are scheduled to go through all of the defined academic steps for approval. That is through undergraduate curriculum committees, et cetera, et cetera. And I and members of the UFC Executive Com—Board have been very clear about the important of faculty engagement with regard to that aspect of curriculum development.

Then finally, for the past two months the BFC Executive Committee has worked diligently to increase more faculty engagement in the work of the Council, and toward this end we distributed a best practices sheet to give incoming members an opportunity to see what is necessary in order for us to move individuals toward sustained engagement, and I mention that, although it was a BFC initiative, but I think it extends to the UFC because there are some schools that are involved. Then, members of the BFC Executive Committee also determined that it would be a good idea for us to create linkages between the BFC and the school councils, and toward that end, last week I met with the School of Education Policy Committee, and I want you to know that that was really fascinating, so we're trying to think of mechanisms by which we can keep attention focused on the work of the Council, such that people will be informed about what's going on, and will not at the last minute, come after they've heard some hue and cry about some issue come and say well we didn't have an opportunity for due diligence. And when I read the number of faculty who participated in the export controls policy review survey, I was stunned and I thought that was a compelling example of what we need to do to sustain that—that momentum. As you know, 6,505 faculty were sent the questionnaire, and of that number, only 71, or 1.1% of the people responded. So this is a burden that we continue to carry, and it is one that we hope will be lifted. Thank you. Those are my comments for today.

MCRORBIE: Thanks, Carolyn. Jack, do you have anything more to add?

WINDSOR: No, [indistinct comment].

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

MCRORBIE: Okay, thanks. Okay, let me—let me make some comments now under agenda item four, then. When we go to five, that provides an opportunity for questions to be directed to Carolyn or Jack as well as me. Firstly, I do want to congratulate the faculty of the university. I believe I said this in a note some months ago. For the overwhelmingly decisive vote to restructure the UFC to make it a smaller, I think, more responsive body that will enable us, for example, to get a quorum, which I believe we have today without any trouble at all, and that hopefully will provide a better environment to have some maybe some—some franker and more productive discussions on issues of importance, clearly to the faculty of the university and the university more generally. And I do—again, I think—I believe I said this in writing, but I do also want to thank Simon for his efforts. He really did work extremely hard on this over a long period of time with dogged perseverance and determination to really help get this—get this approved and achieve this goal, so—so I think this—this really is a, I mean a great example of the faculty taking upon themselves what was, I think, a pretty serious problem, that is that the UFC just had become fairly unfunctional and addressing it. So we'll see where the future goes, but I think the present structure certainly should be a lot—a lot more effective to provide a forum for ascertaining the view of the faculty on various matters, and to deal with a lot of business that is properly the prerogative of the faculty as well.

Secondly, I—I do—I want to comment just briefly on the State of the University speech, and *inter alia* pick up some things that Carolyn said. Firstly, I want to thank Carolyn and Jack again. They've been very kind in their positive comments about the speech. I would hope that—that people who haven't read it have a chance to read it on the—on the UFC simply because I—I tried to address as forthrightly as I could what I regard as some of the—the key issues in front of us. And—and I—Carolyn did address the issue of funding for the university, and I remain—I remain very, very concerned about our future in that regard. There—if everything—if everything goes in the right direction, there is a—at best—there is only a very modestly optimistic way of—a way forward for us. And if any one of the—anything goes wrong in any one of the major five areas of our revenue, we really are going to face pretty serious problems.

We have been able to deal successfully over the last four years—I think better than many other universities—with the financial problems that we have been faced with. As you know, about four years ago, when the recession started, I said our goal was to continue hiring and to continue building, and we have done both of those things. We've continued to hire faculty, and

we've continued to build. And thanks to the—particular—thanks to the tuition increment that we were able to get approved last time around, this—this has enabled us to carry out a record amount of R & R on all the campuses of the university, and we're far from complete. In fact, I think next year's is at least projected to be even more in terms of the R & R that's going on. And all of that affects all of us in multiple ways; some very obvious in terms of renovation of classrooms; some less obvious—well, less directly obvious in terms of the repair of heating and—heating and cooling lines, and all the infrastructure for the university as well. So—but in spite of that, I went through what I see as the challenges in each one of the different areas of revenue. In tuition, there's the possibility of tuition caps. We have twice fought off tuition caps with—with a lot of effort.

Now, it—it was the case that we did have a fair amount of support there from the governor, and I believe his position will be no different in his new role at Purdue. I would certainly hope it'll be no different. And—but, nevertheless, there still remain members of the legislature who—who believe that the best way to deal with this question of affordability is simply to cap tuition either—either at zero or limit it to, you know, one percent, two percent, CPI, you know, take your pick of a number of different proposals out there, and that's number one. Number two is state appropriation. As I said, and Carolyn quoted, I don't see us as, although I think there may be a little more hope for some—some special increments in focused areas, I don't see there being as much opportunity for a general increase in our state appropriation this year. I think, not in my previous State of the University Address, the one before that, you may remember there I talked about how we're seeing about a percent in real terms—we're seeing about a percent—a biennium reduction in the state appropriations, so that from the legislature, so that by 2020, I expect it'll be down to about ten percent or less from—from the state. That brought some criticism pointing out what is simply, as President Clinton said, you know, just a matter of arithmetic, but nevertheless, we have to face that.

Thirdly, we obviously all wait with enormous trepidation as to what happens with sequestration at the end of this—at the end of this year. I think most of us think that rationality will prevail, and some deal will be done, but it may not be, or the deal that's done may still be highly injurious to federal funding and when you look at our spending from federal sources and support of research is somewhere in the vicinity of about \$450 million in the total amount we received last year from all external sources was in—was the excess of \$500 million. For that to be—to be cut at the level to which the sequestration would apply is—would be devastating to us, to the research enterprise at the university. I was—at the AAU meeting in Washington last week, and both the director of the NIH and both the director of the NSF both obviously are hoping for the best, but are both preparing for the worst, as you would probably expect them to be.

Fourthly, philanthropic revenue. We had the second best year ever for annual giving, but returns, which is ultimately what really matters because it's the returns that—that are funding all the endowed chairs and student fellowships and everything else apart from what we get for one-off gifts for infrastructure, returns—though they are improving—do not look like they're likely to bounce back to historical levels, and as you know, we have been reducing slowly the—the payout figure. It was at 5%, and now it's going to be reduced to 4.75 as well because of—because of the declining average real returns we're getting for the marketplace.

There is—well, and then fourthly—sorry, fifthly, is clinical income, which is so important to the—to the School of Medicine, and the other clinical schools there. The—the impacts of the—of health reform there, could result in a considerable reduction in the reimbursement that comes from the—the federal government to the hospital systems, and that would be IU Health, and if that—if that happens to IU Health, then that has a direct impact on the clinical enterprise of the university since much of that is funded through—through IU Health. So those are the five major areas—99 or 98% of all the income comes from those five areas, and every one of them is under threat, and as you can see, there's the opportunity for a perfect storm there, where every one of those areas could be—could be devastated if we had a bad session of the legislature, if things go completely adrift or more adrift in Washington than they are now, and— and then the question is what do we do? And it's in that context—it's in that context that I believe we simply have to, as I said at the Trustee meeting that Carolyn was at, we have to look at all our options for opportunities to find external funding so that we can continue to develop as a university, otherwise we're going to be facing some kind of implosion, something will have to break very, very seriously, substantially in the university somewhere, and unless we are looking at all the options open to us, so I—I have no—I certainly have no strong views about whether we call it leasing or privatization in any—in any area. It's simply a matter of does it—does it make sense, can we live with it, what are the returns, how can they be used for the betterment of the core academic enterprise, that is, the teaching and research enterprise of—of the university? And for those who would, and I don't mean this critically, but in a kneejerk way react negatively to that, I would ask them, give me some other ideas at a similar level of magnitude. Give me some ideas on a similar level of magnitude. Not just ten million here or five million there, but a hundred million, two hundred million, three hundred million, that's what we're going to need to find if we're—if we're going to continue growing as an institution, especially in the context of these—these devastating possibilities.

So—so that—that, as I try to say all that pretty much as frankly as I just said it to you now in my State of the University speech, I do want to, in that context also, and Carolyn, again, was kind to mention it, and I have—I have said this, God knows, in, you know, a hundred speeches in the last nine months or something, I have said, you know, there are those who think that faculty

are immobile and incapable of changing, and I said we have, as Carolyn said, either closed, moved, transformed, or established seven new schools in the university on both campuses. That doesn't include some of the transformations that have taken place on the regional campuses. And I said seven new schools in eighteen months at IU, I said, I—I would submit that may be a world record for—for that kind of transformation, and they're all good transformations—really first rate. And they were—they were overwhelmingly supported by the faculty of all of those schools, and so I think that all the faculty, and there are a lot involved in all of those—all of that change that's taking place, I mean really ought to be congratulated. I've tried to congratulate them every opportunity I've had. I think it's terrific. I think it's been a great thing for IU. I think it's going to really move us forward, and I think—I don't think people have yet fully appreciated the scale of the change across both campuses that's going to bring about.

I've said—I can say a little bit more about the legislature. They're—I think on the—I mean, I have tried to give you a stark view of the—of the fiscal situation facing the university. I do want to say, on a slightly more positive note, that we have had over what I think about the last month, a meeting with the higher education commission that has a new chair, Marilyn Townsend, and we've had a meeting with the State Budget Committee. It's still under the chairmanship of Representative Jeff Espich, but he's retiring at the end of this year, and I think those two meetings were very strong and very positive meetings. Both were in Bloomington, and within I think—what, two weeks of each other from memory?—and both of them I gave presentations as to what's happening in the university and some of the key things that are going on. Both were very well received, and the general, the general—the general reception to what—what we described to them was very positive. I also—I also think that there is, I'm not certain how this will manifest itself in the session, and it may not go anywhere, but I'm—we're going to work very hard to see if we can take it somewhere. I—I detect that there is a, I think, a growing feeling that—that—that the—the research universities really need to be moved to the center of the attentions of the state again. I think Governor Daniels, or should I say President Daniels, moving to Purdue is going to automatically attract some attention in that regard. I also think that John Lechleiter, the chairman/CEO of Eli Lilly, in making the speech that he did just last week, I think is a very positive thing for us as well, and I'll be meeting with him to follow up on some of that in the next couple of weeks also.

So, with that, let me not go on anymore, and the easiest thing to do would be simply to jump to agenda item five, and entertain any questions from anybody in the audience. Questions for myself or Jack or Carolyn? No questions? Alright, Herb?

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

TERRY: Trustee Rice has been trying to understand this for some time.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Herb?

TERRY: I appreciate that you're the first executive of this university that I can remember listing healthcare reimbursement as one of our revenue sources. And at the last Trustee meeting somebody, I don't remember which one of the Trustees it was, observed that one out of every three revenue dollars that we take in is healthcare reimbursement money.

MCROBBIE: I don't think it's that high, but it's—

TERRY: —[indistinct comment] figure was that we had three billion in revenue, and one billion of it was healthcare reimbursement.

MCROBBIE: It's not that deep, but—

TERRY: —but anyways, it's big—

MCROBBIE: —it's big—

TERRY: —it's very big. And what's been trying to be understood, I think, is how the cross subsidies flow. Yes, changes in federal reimbursement rates might affect the clinical activities of the medical school. Could they affect the entire system? And I ask this because, you know, as I spend a lot of time down near IU Southeast in Louisville, where the interplay between the finances of University Hospital there, the University of Louisville's medical school, and the university as a whole has become apparent because the hospital there was unable to merge, and all the cross subsidies came down, and it looks like the University of Louisville has been subsidizing its—or will have to subsidize its medical school because the hospital is unable to continue to subsidize the medical school. Are we kind of in a similar situation, or is what's really at risk is primarily just the healthcare activities and not everything else?

MCROBBIE: Well, I think—I think that the way to describe it, and of course it's more complicated than this, and I don't want to be alarmist either, but the way to think about it is that we have—we have clinical or we have faculty members, some of whose time is being paid for with clinical income. If—if say—this is unlikely—if say, all our clinical income went away for say, just that faculty member, and they're getting only—I'm just, you know, pulling a figure out, 25% from the base budget of the institution, we're—how does one continue to pay them a salary even if it's not the full 75%, where does that come from? Now, I don't—I'm not proposing any answer to that because we'll hope that situation never comes, but that was one of the reasons that IU Health, previously Clarion, was formed was to at least try to isolate the university, to some degree, from the kinds of major stresses and strains that can happen within a healthcare system. I remember Myles saying that it was the one part of the university, that

that was the hospital system, that we—that was then fully a part of us, it was the one part of the university that could bring the whole university down if it failed. Now, that—but that is still—I mean, it is still problematic for us, for that—for that very reason, I mean, I don't know that that's a secret, I mean, this is all obviously—and that's where the problems lie. And I think the reason that it's probably never got the attention that it deserves to get today is—is that healthcare is just sort of bumbled along under successive presidents or successive administrations, successive congresses, you know, without major overhaul, but the first time in, I don't know, when the last—one could claim was the last major, maybe back when Lyndon Johnson, but the first major overhaul of the healthcare system really is going to stress those kinds of areas because of the effect that's going to have on reimbursements, or could happen to reimbursements. Yes, Ed?

BERBARI: In your last two State of the University Addresses, both cases you either reduced some tuition—the summer tuition program, and then the most recent one with the freeze of tuition for certain students on certain paths. In both cases, I think it came as a surprise to everybody that that was happening, so it seemed to be, I mean sort of administratively generated, and I understand the political ramifications of tuition. It's hot button, and I understand that, but in reality, that money generally comes to the schools directly, at least they do here on this campus, and it's never sort of passed through at—to the administration, and so it's all of a sudden we have to live with an issue that was created by the administration without, what I would consider, much consultation with the deans and the respective schools. Will this impact you; how will this impact you, and so on. And so I'm just curious if you give much thought to that other than just it sounds nice for the press, if it—it's a hot button issue, and it's politically—has political ramifications, I understand that, but I'm curious as to—

MCRORBIE: —the university is—will be covering the cost of this initiative for this campus as it will for the regional campuses as well, so there won't be any impact on this campus. Now, remember, I want to stress this because this is important, this is an initiative for two years, and—

BERBARI: —Are you speaking about the summer program or the freezing of the—?

MCRORBIE: —the summer program, I've—I've continued for a further year. I was—I was—it was—it was not as successful as I would have liked, and if it doesn't pick up next year, and I know there's a lot of effort going into trying to pick it up, if it doesn't pick up next year, I think it's future will be in doubt. It's—it's—there's a certain inconsistency, but not inconsistency, but there's sort of an overlap between what it's trying to achieve and what the—the completion scholarships are trying to achieve as well, and so—so I think that—that almost certainly something will be revised there. As to completion scholarships, I stress that that's a two year

experiment. If it has—if it has a significant effect on four-year graduation rates, you know, which as we know, I mean, are not good throughout the university, I mean, and—and I don't think I've met anybody who's prepared to defend them as they stand, but if we don't see a significant uptick there, then that will be revised as well, but—but we have to take, as I tried to argue in the speech, you know, we have to take very seriously the—the vociferousness of the criticism of our practice, as you know, that people aren't graduating at a fast—a faster rate, that they're graduating with too much debt, that tuition increases faster than CPI, that average incomes have fallen in Indiana over the last four years not [indistinct comment] and so on and so on, and all that, you know, we can't ignore these issues collectively as a community, as a university community. Yes, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: Sir, this is sort of a three part questions, and maybe there are easy answers and maybe there are not. The—if we could take the entire university multi-campus infrastructure, the physical plant as it were, and completely level the load, you know, so that any classroom, any square footage was being used, you know, at optimum rates, I mean I'm not sure if it goes Monday to Sunday, but a reasonable work schedule, would there be significant savings or economic advantages? That's part one.

Part two—question number two—if we looked at the total credit hours being generated, but—and I—I hesitate to use the term online education or online classes, but to take a sort of a broader—because that—frankly I think that model is going to be just blown up in the next ten years in all sorts of ways we haven't even begun to anticipate, but if we could increase the—the total number of credit hours—revenue hours being generated by technologically enabled learning experiences, shall we say, you know, ten, fifteen, twenty percent, would that put a huge pile of money in our pockets that we could well use?

And then the third part is, or the third sub-question, are there other opportunities for privatization along with parking, whether it's dormitories and residence halls, et cetera, that you say, here is an obvious—maybe not low hanging fruit, but a target of opportunity and something to think about over the next five years?

MCROBBIE: Well, let me see. I think—the summer tuition discount was an attempt to get—to get at part of what you raised in the first point there. I mean, I, you know, we just have to face the fact that we just have this gigantic—what do we value it at?—seven billion dollar physical plant in the university that just lies—what?—twenty percent utilized over summer, and we still cool those buildings and the—all the staff or most of the staff are still employed over that period, but—but it's—and then it's not as if they're un—well, many of them are maintaining buildings that aren't being used during that period, so clearly, you know, trying to make better use of the buildings over that period and, you know, again, it's—it is a remnant of the agrarian

past. I don't think it's going to be an easy thing for us to change because people are so—so much of what we do is built into the structure that we have at the moment, but I mean, it was—well, I think it was the BFC—but certainly endorsed by this body I believe that has been encouraging us to try to—try to—to move to a more contemporary model of what education should be.

Secondly, I think—there are those, you know, who may, you know, raise dormitories or student residences, I think this is something that—that it's not—it hasn't been raised in any significant way yet. It could become an issue at some point or could become something people think is worth looking at some point. I think that would be something I would expect the faculty to opine on definitely if that happened. I would have real concerns about—about that because of what I—what I feel is—is our duty to provide a sort of a comprehensive educational environment for—for students, and I'm not certain that—that we can do that as well as we do especially in the campuses, Bloomington and this campus to some extent, with substantial residences if we have no control over what—what goes on outside of the hours they're in class, and so on, and there are many other arguments as well, but that hasn't really come up, and—yet anyway. And on the last part of your—

MANNHEIMER: —online [indistinct comment]—

MCROBBIE: —Oh, yeah. Yeah, sure. There's—there—the basic argument here is—is that if you can cut down the cost of providing education with technology, then—then that's a way of dealing with the decline in revenue. That's the—that's the argument. And so, I mean again, I think every faculty member in the university should be very concerned about insuring that if that's done, it doesn't result in any diminution of quality of the education that's provided. I think that's the—that is—that's the biggest and almost unstated issue that you—that you see here in the—in these discussions and debates is—is can you still provide a quality education—as—as good an education if—if it's—if it's a completely online—online course and so on. Now, you know, most—even the most ardent proponent of online education, at least the people who understand it as opposed to the—the sort of—the commentariat out there sort of understands that the—probably the model—the right model is going to be some kind of hybrid model. I mean most of us are working in that kind of environment anyway, some kind of a hybrid model, but yeah, I mean the more that technology can be—can be utilized to reduce the cost of instruction, the more that has an effect on, as they say in business, the bottom line.

MANNHEIMER: And are there emerging models that you're aware of where, you know, if we can deliver seven to ten percent of our credit hours through some non-residential experience—

MCROBBIE: —Oh!—

MANNHEIMER: —or non-in class experience, that’s going to be X number of millions of dollars.

MCROBBIE: Well, I think it’s—I think it is a simple equation. You just reduce it by—reduce the cost by a certain figure that’ll have—that, for any institution, that will result in a certain overall savings, it just depends on the institution and how costs are allocated and so on as well. I do want to say that in that context, I think Barb Bichelmeyer will speak about this later, that in that context, at the AAU meeting last week, we had a—we had a session on this with the—and all the other AAU Presidents were there, and what really struck me was how, although there’s some very—some of the more forceful advocates of this and some of the people who are getting—who’ve got a huge amount of national attention, you know, John Hennessey at Stanford, Rafael Reif at MIT in particular. Both were there at the meeting. I think everybody took the view that this is kind of experimentation that’s going on that, the work with MOOCs and Coursera and so on, and I think that’s reflected in the document that came out, that we put out, you know, announcing IU Online that—that we should see it in this context, you know, can we—is any of this going to work, bearing in mind our fundamental missions of teaching and learning? Does it make—does it make sense for us? Can we still provide a quality education, you know, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And I—I thought that was—that was interesting, and in spite of the hysteria that sometimes one sees in the media, I think most people really do see this as being a very interesting time, but for experimentation, but that could rapidly move into production if something really hits and works, you know. Yeah?

WALKER: Could you say anything about the retirement age? On our campus, that’s a big deal. We’ve got—we’re hiring a chancellor, a vice chancellor, and several deans.

MCROBBIE: Right, right. I—I will be taking to the—to the Trustees a proposal to modify that to increase the retirement age.

WALKER: To 67?

MCROBBIE: Sixty-seven is—is—will be the age I’ll take, yeah.

WALKER: And when would that—

MCROBBIE: —to align it with Social Security.

WALKER: Yeah, and so folks that are being hired this year, would that—?

MCROBBIE: —No, no, I think, for various reasons, we need to start it later, but that’s not determined yet.

WALKER: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Yeah. That's—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —I wanted to say as well that members of the Executive Committee of the UFC also discussed this issue, and there seems to be a keen interest in moving it beyond—

MCROBBIE: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —the age of—

MCROBBIE: —I think that aligns it with Social Security then—

WALKER: —it does, yeah—

MCROBBIE: —and that—and that's a compelling argument.

WALKER: We had a conversation and I think a lot of the faculty wonder why that cap is in place, and is it necessary?

MCROBBIE: Well, it's a—it was a Trustee policy that was approved, I can't remember, twenty years ago or something like that, and—

WALKER: —Is it time to revisit it?—

MCROBBIE: —And the—well, I don't—I think the—I think the—I think the—the views among the Trustees on this will be to maintain the policy, but to adjust it—adjust the age. I mean they will be considering what I bring to them then, and they can make whatever changes they want to make—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Their stance might be at odds with—

MCROBBIE: —Sorry, Carolyn—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —No, I said that the stance of the members of the Board of Trustees might be at odds with the position that members of the BFC executive board is beginning to take with regard to the sixty-five retirement—

MCROBBIE: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —age, but we'll be talking about—

MCROBBIE: —Remember this is just—this is just for a small class of senior administrators. This is not a general age. It's about fifty people or so who are affected by it in the university, plus you're allow—plus extensions can be given and are given pretty regularly.

WALKER: I guess one of the questions about extensions was that then does leave the power of extension-giving in the hands of the president—

MCROBBIE: —yes—

WALKER: —alone and so that does invest you with unusual power. I mean not to say that you're misusing it or we—we don't like what you're doing—

MCROBBIE: —Well, you know, the buck's got to stop with somebody, you know, so—

WALKER: —Right, so we—even if we were—

MCROBBIE: —Yeah—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —So far, I have not received or heard a compelling argument why it should just morph from sixty-five to sixty-seven. Why not have then an open door policy toward retirement, as opposed to just putting—it seems to me that members of the Board of Trustees are going to put a limit on it. They want to move it from sixty-five to sixty-seven, and there's still a ceiling—

MCROBBIE: —I believe so, I don't know yet—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Why not remove the ceiling? Maybe that's the question I should be—

MCROBBIE: —Why not remove the ceiling?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, from sixty-seven to just—

MCROBBIE: —I think they believe that—I will see what happens when they vote. I believe they believe that a—a set limit to which extensions can be given is in the best interest of the institution to—to manage leadership transitions on the various campuses. I think that's probably their view. Now, I don't—I can't confirm that. We'll see what happens when they have the discussion.

WALKER: Just a quick follow up. Do you have a feeling that your recommendation is likely to pass?

MCROBBIE: I think there's—I think most people think that sixty-five is kind of unrealistic in this day and age, and probably—probably needs to be—needs to be adjusted. Yeah, yeah—yes, Herb? I'm—I'm mindful we're way over time, yeah, but last question—

TERRY: A number of political leaders in the Fort Wayne area would like to spin IPFW off as—

MCRORBIE: —Would like to?

MCDANIEL: —spin IPFW off as an independent institution. What do we think of that?

MCRORBIE: Well, IPFW is a—is a Purdue managed and run campus, and I don't want to—I don't want to get into that—into that issue. I do—I do think, though, that—that those—those campuses that have the sort of the dual nomenclature have, I believe, have benefited significantly from that, and—and I think that there are many people who agree with that view up there—I don't—I don't detect there's a huge amount of support for that—for that proposal without wishing to really, you know, sort of enter into it. I think really in the interest of time I really do need to jump to six, which is the financial conflict of interest and research policy review. And Professor McDaniel—

MCDANIEL: —I'm right here. I'm right here.

MCRORBIE: Oh, there you are!

AGENDA ITEM 6: FINANCIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN RESEARCH POLICY REVIEW

MCDANIEL: I—I believe, and I—and I—I hope that we'll be able to catch up on our time because I don't think that we should take—I don't think this will take twenty minutes discussion.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Unless you have surprises waiting for us.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: I should get [indistinct comment] in this.

MCDANIEL: So I am coming to you from the UFC Research Affairs Committee, which is the Indianapolis and Bloomington Research Affairs Committees [indistinct comment], who have been working on this—this issue with the Financial Conflicts of Interest Committees on the two campuses. They've been working and reviewing this, and actually it—there have been of flurry of activity and emails that happen at meteoric speed to get this to you today, actually. We have been working very closely with Eric Swank's office, and with the staff that administer the Conflict of Interest policy.

The problem that was addressed is that the Financial Conflict of Interest policy as written was consistent—was consistent, although perhaps more stringent, than the change of policy from the Public Health Service or PHS investigators, and it was a burden to faculty as well as the administrative staff that are trying to monitor this and track this. There was not quite the level at the time, I don't know about now, and Stephanie's here to correct me if anything I say is wrong, but at the time, there was not the technological infrastructure in place, and in fact, I think that's still true that would allow for really, really easy tracking of these conflict of interest

declarations, and what—what the problem was is that sometimes with just-in-time information. The Financial Conflict of Interest office had to produce results that these—that the conflict of interest had all been filed. So they've been examining the burden that this placed on faculty, as well as on the administrative staff, and lo and behold, the federal government actually eased up their restriction as well, and now have set \$5,000 cumulative [indistinct comment] year as the travel—as when travel—travel reimbursement has to be declared.

So, given that fact, we have before you in the circular U5-2013, on page three, you can see the red-lined revisions that we're bringing forward that would allow us or allow the policy to sort of float within whatever the minimum level of—of the law or the policy at the federal level is. So that's what that first one is. It's subject to the *de minimis* threshold set forth by federal regulations. So those two—two phrases have been inserted in the policy, and while there may be other issues that need to be addressed in the future related to the declaration and the monitoring of financial conflict of interest, this is what we felt needs to come before and be acted upon so that—and—so that we can, you know, if something changes in the federal government, we don't have to come back to you and ask for yet another change in policy. That it's more or less of a floating kind of issue. So that's what we have. Stephanie Roberts from the Financial Conflicts of Interest office in Bloomington is here to answer any kind of additional question you might have. I believe you had—what was distributed to you was a little letter from—this was distributed with the agendas yesterday. I won't read it to you. I gave you the five second [indistinct comment]. I gave you the overview of this, and I—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —So we'll be voting today on, “subject to the *de minimis* thresholds...,” and then the second one that's underlined, that's the only two items that need concern us.

MCDANIEL: That's correct.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: This comes a motion?

MCDANIEL: It comes from the—the joint committees and it comes as a motion from the committees so I think it does at least [indistinct comment].

MCROBBIE: I'm concerned it doesn't need a seconder, right?

MCDANIEL: Right.

MCROBBIE: So that's a motion in front of the UFC. Any discussion, comments, questions? [Indistinct comment]? Who has questions? Okay. In that case, I'll put the motion, and I guess the motion is to adopt this as a policy, the Financial Conflict of Interest document. Is that correct?

MCDANIEL: That's right.

MCROBBIE: Right.

MCDANIEL: [Indistinct comment]. The addition of a [indistinct comment] in two places.

MCROBBIE: Okay, let me put the motion. All those in favor signify by saying aye. [Aye] Against? [Silence]. That's—

MCDANIEL: —thank you—

MCROBBIE: —that's carried. Thank you very much.

MCDANIEL: Told you we [indistinct comment]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That was very efficient.

MCROBBIE: We're not quite back on time, yet.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: [indistinct comment]

MCROBBIE: No, no, no. John's going to be equally quick. Export Control policy, John?

AGENDA ITEM 7: EXPORT CONTROL POLICY

APPLEGATE: Since I took the worst possible seat for making eye contact, I'll just sort of stand in the corner here. Gee, I was hoping to languish. This is actually—I see this as kind of an opportunity to test drive the—the new UFC organization because this is a—would be a major policy change proposed, and it does raise the possibility of creating the kind of ad hoc committee that the new Constitution talks about for—for addressing major items. The Export Controls policy is maybe not the best description of it. It's really about publication restrictions. IU has a policy that has two parts to it. One is a—that the university itself will not accept classified research, and the other is that it will not accept research that is—a publication of which is substantial restricted in—for various reasons. Minor restrictions are fine, and that's described in the policy, but what's happened over time is that as federal research dollars are not increasing hugely, and the number of opportunities in areas called “export control,” which is actually one part of it, but as those opportunities are increased, the effect of this policy has been increasing, so that there are substantial opportunities that at least some researchers feel they could take advantage of that are precluded by this policy.

A task force considered this. It was chaired or co-chaired by Razi Nalim and—and Steve Martin, and they did an exceptionally thorough job of considering all of the issues relating to changing

this policy, and you have before you there, again, exceptionally thorough review of the issues, and what they recommend be done is to—to develop an exceptions process. Which, again is in the—in the material you have, which takes into account, I think, a very impressive and thoughtful—me [indistinct comment] thoughtful set of considerations for when you would want to undertake your search, even though the publication of it is in some ways restricted, and obviously what you're looking at is some kind of tradeoff between our basic commitment and our general commitment to the publication and dissemination of our work, which is basic to who we are as scholars. On the other hand, here is the opportunity to engage in meaningful and important work, which for various reasons, most notably national security, has some restrictions on—on it, for publication restrictions and other kinds of restrictions. This is not the same thing as classified research. Classified research is separately dealt with in that policy. That's the first sense of the policy, and that's really not what we're talking about at all. This is the export control, which is a separate tier of issues.

So I'm really bringing it part because I asked Razi and Steve to get together and work with their colleagues in the Office of Research and on UFC to do it, but also because, again, I think this is a great opportunity to start working with the new process—or the new structure we have for the UFC to create the appropriate committee to consider this, and—and then report back to the UFC for adoption or not, as seems to be indicated.

MCROBBIE: This is a first reading, so this is for discussion. Discussion? Herb?

TERRY: John, I have kind of a question. Is page eight of this essentially what you or your task force would like the UFC ultimately to endorse? The rest of it is simply a report on which I assume the recommendation [indistinct comment].

APPLEGATE: [Indistinct comment]. Yeah, though the—the—it's—the Appendix 5 is the [indistinct comment]—

TERRY: —that's where I was going with my question, because page eight references page eight references Appendix 5. So it's ultimately we would hope, if the process works right, the UFC endorses page eight and Appendix 5, basically?

APPLEGATE: Right.

TERRY: Then I have a question about Appendix 5. This is a complex [indistinct comment]. Did we invent Appendix 5 or is it based on the experience of some comparable research intensive university that has provided something of a model for how you write this?

APPLEGATE: I don't want to speak for the taskforce, which I was not on, but I think that the taskforce did a number of things to prepare this. The—the Office of Research, or Research Administration, that was working with Steve Martin, I think they're very in touch with what other institutions are doing—have done. I think the—they also did not only consulting with faculty who were very interested in this issue and especially interested in doing this kind of research, and then they—and then they did a survey of faculty to tease out some of the—some of the issues. So, I don't know whether they—that they modeled this on—on other institutions' approaches to this or not, but given the composition of the committee, I think they're pretty in touch with what's going on in other institutions, and indeed much of the motivation for a policy or for a policy change is a concern that we're losing our competitive edge against—with other institutions, which permit this kind of research, but certainly that would be something that a committee could investigate further or ask Steve or Razi if they've done that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So do you have any specific evidence that we are losing our competitive control or is this anecdotally driven or what?

APPLEGATE: The—the most directly affected school is the School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI, and I think they feel very strongly that they are [indistinct comment]—

BERBARI: —Well, just to give you an example, down the street is Rolls-Royce and its British-owned company. Because it's a foreign owned company, if you don't have certain export controls in place, then you can't necessarily work with a company like that on not necessarily a defense issue or something, but any technological issue that might be considered advanced, and because of those kinds of restrictions, you know, it's not like, you know, you could think in terms of old cold war things where people, and, you know, spies, and so on, but it's just that there's an ever increasing concern about US technology and how it gets positioned into other entities, whether it's a foreign-owned subsidiary of a company, let's say like Rolls-Royce down the street, or if you have international students working in your labs there are concerns that can take place that the export controls will tend to address; how do you deal with those kinds of things. So even if you're doing ordinary research, and you have an international student working in your lab, sometimes that can be infringed on if you don't have proper controls. So—

ATKINSON: So to be very specific—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —[Indistinct comment]—

ATKINSON: —So for faculty in the School of Engineering, are unable to take on projects where their colleagues in the corresponding departments at Purdue are able to take on, and so we're losing a lot of research where in many cases the expertise in Indianapolis is better than the expertise in Purdue, simply because of the—of the—these restrictions that faculty here are—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So you can actually count, quantitatively speaking, the number of professors who might have taken advantage of this were the policy different?

BERBARI: I think there have been more than just a few examples.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay.

BERBARI: Okay?

MCROBBIE: There's somebody at the back...yeah.

NALIM: President McRobbie, Razi Nalim. I think there's both specific instances. I have my own experience where [indistinct comment] Purdue University facilitated research that would be better handled over there rather than over here, but there's also the fact, as Ed pointed out, that if you—if you are not able to do this at all, then you lose not only research that is actually controlled, but a lot of other things that you could do if you could work with a partner like Rolls-Royce, and Rolls-Royce is a good example because they will often put restrictions on something that is beyond what the government would put just because they want to make sure that they do their job being a foreign owned company to protect US interests properly, and so there are many other opportunities that we might not even sometimes be aware of because we're not having, developing those relationships that other universities like Purdue University and others do.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? Yeah, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: Just the first part of a talk about not worrying about exemptions or exceptions in the case of service activities. It is—I mean, here at IUPUI of course, we've been talking for decades about the overlap between research and service, research and teaching, et cetera, et cetera, are there are mechanisms in place that comfortably handle some of those overlapping or fall between the cracks sorts of projects? Or is there an arbitration board per se or do we just sort of trust people to say, 'This is a service activity. Don't worry about it.'

MCROBBIE: Who's—is that a question to—

MANNHEIMER: —I'm not sure—

MCROBBIE: —to John? Who would like to answer to answer that question? [Laughter]

APPLEGATE: I think you want to empanel an ad hoc commission. [Laughter] Actually—actually, I do think that that's what should—the thing to do. I think that the new structure anticipates that

there, you know, the stripped down number of standing committees, and then for major issues, and I think this is a major issue, you empanel an ad hoc committee. You have the advantage that—this committee has the advantage of some really excellent work being done already on it, but there are some questions that have come up from this group, but you're absolutely what should happen, and so I would—I would suggest that you could probably do it with a relatively small committee, given the amount of work that's gone into it already, but I would—I would suggest that that's the—the action amount of it rather than the adoption or not of the policy.

ATKINSON: Could I make a—make a motion that the Council charge the Executive Committee with—with appointing an ad hoc committee to consider revisions or—or bring this back to the Council for adoption?

MCROBBIE: Um, okay. That's a motion. Seconded?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I second—

MCROBBIE: Seconded. Any discussion on that motion?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Is there a time table for this?

ATKINSON: Just brought back to the Council in the spring semester.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

ATKINSON: It'll take a while for whoever is on this committee to get up to speed with it because it's very complicated.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, I think that's a good motion. Yes, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: May I just offer maybe a friendly amendment, such as appropriate that—I think my question earlier about service and research is most acute in terms of the Medical School where a lot of activities, at least that pass through the P & T process, get described as service, but—in many instances could be in the sense considered implied research, and people from the Med School have a much sharper handle on when those occasions might arise and when there may be needs for controls or not. I mean, I'm going to be speaking—I am speaking out of my depth, but I just question that as a—as a sort of a target of concern.

MCROBBIE: Well, I think—I think the Executive Committee can take into account that—that comment, Steve. Okay, there's a motion in front of us. Any more discussion on it at all? With the motion—all those in favor, signify by saying "aye." [Aye] Against? [Silence] It's carried. Is that—that's that—anything else on this issue, John, or is that basically done?

APPLEGATE: No, I think that's—that's something.

AGENDA ITEM 8: ACADEMIC POLICIES MIGRATION UPDATE

MCROBBIE: Academic policies migration, Tom Gieryn.

GIERYN: Thank you, Michael. I'm just going to briefly set the table on, and then turn it over to Jenny Kincaid and Alyssa Gossett will present some very pretty pictures. Up until not long ago, our policies at the university level were scattered on many different websites, maintained by many different offices, and assuming a style that was not at all consistent. Under the leadership of John Applegate's office, an effort is well underway to gather up all university policies into a single site, and to present them with a common template. I think it goes without saying that this initiative will result in greater accessibility to these policies, and also greater clarity of these policies. The effort includes all domains of university policy, so we've got in there on this new site you'll see in a minute, not just administrative policies or travel policies or research, procurement, all of that, but also academic policies, and that's why I'm here.

Our office historically in Bloomington, the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs office, has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining, on behalf of the university, our academic policies, which, until recently, took the form of this print Academic Handbook and is now online as the Academic Handbook. We are, as part of this initiative then, engaged in a process to take all of the policies from the Academic Handbook, move them to the university policy site, and to refashion them, if you will, following the template that has been adopted for the style, in a sense, of all university policies.

We have working on this not just Jenny and Alyssa, but also Craig Dethloff as a working group, people from my office, Indermohan Virk, as well as Susan McCammon to provide oversight and continuity as we go through a process of—of looking at the Handbook to see how we can make this migration possible.

It involves really two steps. First step, if you—if you take a look at the Academic Handbook, as a handbook, it contains a lot of information that is not strictly speaking policy. The first step is for us to separate out the genuine policies that came from this body or the Board of Trustees, or other sources from information that you could say is not really a policy. For example, the Handbook begins with a history of the university, which is not really a policy. It ends with, if I can just flip to the last chapter, descriptions of such things as Emeriti House on the Bloomington campus, dual career networks, and so forth. Again, this is information, but not policy. So what we—what we've begun to do is split off the information that is not policy. We've put that in a kind of temporary archive just to keep track of it to make sure that when we move the actual policies into the new site that we don't lose any of this information. In other words, we will

check carefully to make sure that all of the information that's not a policy appears somewhere in the university's webpages. In many cases, in updated form from what it is even in the online version of the existing Academic Handbook.

The second step, then, is to unbundle the academic policies. I think, and this goes back at least twenty-five years when the handbook idea was conceived, the objective was to present it as a kind of narrative, broken down into very few chapters. The policies are—sure, they're segmented by sub-headings, and headings, and so forth, but they aren't enumerated, they aren't given discrete numbers and letters that would allow us to extract topically and unbundle the topics of policy so that they could be inserted into the new University Policies homepage. That's the second part of this process, and I want to provide all assurances that none of what I've described represents a loss of any policies from the Academic Handbook, nor does it represent a—a rewriting of any policies. We're simply reformatting and reorganizing university academic policies. So, in a certain sense, when this process is finished, there will no more—no longer exist an Academic Handbook as such. There will be a site that, Jenny, if you want to move to it, that you'll see that will be a site for genuine university-wide academic policies. The information will be found on other sites throughout the university's pages.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Do we need the lights down?

GIERYN: Just wait and see.

KINCAID: Might have to point it—there we go. Thanks for having us. We're happy to be able to show off our several year project. This is our policy page that we launched in March of this past year. It's still a really work in progress. We have nearly three hundred policies now entered in the online database. HR will add a few hundred more. They're actually in the database, but not published yet. They're still sort of tweaking their organization, and we have some added functions for HR in order for people to be able to search by their particular role at the university.

As you can see, there's some useful links. On the front page, there's ability to send us feedback and contact the appropriate person depending on the policy. We have a few improvements coming along. We meet regularly with creative services who's worked with us on this. One is an improved search function where they've sort of changed this again, but it's a new Google—new, improved Google search function. It also gives us some Google analytics, and that'll really help, I think, with any particular policy in any area it tells us how people got there, how long they stayed, whether they went to a related area, and we're able to give that back to the individual policy offices.

As you can see, you have to have a smiling picture in order to be on our website. [Laughter] But—then this is—I thought I would show you at least in the financial area that’s sort of the most filled out one really at this point because they already had categories, but we have used a code sort of here, a three digit, depending on the broader category then on down, so it’s financial, then accounting, then there’s financial treasury, financial budget, things like that. Those are pretty flexible depending on the area, and, like Tom said, we hope we’ll help organize it. We also have a little info button here, so you can on any list just pull down and it gives you a one sentence summary of the policy.

Within the policy, as Tom said, we have a template that really we’ve been using now close to four years, and we just really transferred that into the database. From up here, you have navigation, tools, you can jump back to the bottom, or to the top. You have a direct contact over here. It lists the responsible office, the responsible administrator, and it can get you right in touch with the person that you need to if you have any questions. It gives us the ability to put related information or related forms on this side, and that could be a statute, it could be an—another policy that applies, or external information.

And as we go on down, different policies have different categories. Not all of them will contain every one. Not all of them will have procedures. Not all will have definitions, but the ability is there. Sanctions is another one. Some do, some don’t. And, finally, a history section that will allow us to reference any prior versions, and then we have, on our main page, an archives section, so we’re really not losing any—any previous version. That really does become important both sort of for legal reasons, and historic reasons if you want to—to go back in time.

One thing at the top that we have coming soon, which I think will be of benefit, is an improved print function. Shortly this will allow you to create a .pdf that you can send around, and if you’re in the review, editing process, it’ll allow you to make comments using the Adobe function. So that’s another improvement that’s coming soon. We also—there’s a number of ways to search for policies. There’s a “what’s new” function, where you can look at policies under review or new and recently revised policies. So, overall, we just—we hope that for all the policies, as well as the academic—as Tom said, we have improved access, improved searchability, consistency, so we all look the same, the ability to cross-reference to other policies, to organize into certain categories depending, and I think once everyone can see their policies, which has happened, it is much easier to say that—that would fit better there, and improve, revise, and make needed changes.

And also with this improved communication understanding, it really gives us a leg up on compliance as well. It just—it just increases our chances for somebody knowing about a policy, asking questions if they have any, and hopefully raises our compliance level. And, as Tom said,

the governance for policy really remains the same. The different policies in the database, people have permissions for, so say financial policies, their people have access—direct access so they can go in. We see the traffic. We see the flow, but they have the ability to make the changes directly, and that would be true to going forward with academic policies. So I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody might have.

GIERYN: If I could say one more thing. We were keeping scrupulous track of all the changes that we're making, and we'll expose those to your review when we finish the project. I want to thank Jenny and Alyssa and their team for some fabulous work that will benefit us all.

KINCAID: And we have, too, an example, too, if Alyssa—we put up to show you, and can show—do this very quickly. This is a—a policy in the wiki and then how it will look—

GIERYN: —that's the present version.

KINCAID: Correct. And this is in the web test, how it will look in the new database.

GOSSETT: Sorry, let me jump back down to the policy here. So as an example, we've chosen the review procedures for core school deans, which you can see on—up here is currently in the Academic Handbook wiki form. We've transferred it over into our template, which you can see here. And you'll notice that the language has not changed. We've simply just taken it and put it into the appropriate section in our policy template. So, for example, this starts with the scope. This language came directly from this area here that discusses who was affected by this policy, who actually is subject to these reviews. Moving through the policy, we have a policy statement, these two—two sentences were taken specifically from this part of the policy where it says that they are required to—subject to review on a regular basis. Moving down, we have the reason for the policy. These three paragraphs are directly from these first three here over in Academic Handbook that state the—why this is important, why the reviews are necessary. Finally, moving from point three on here, we did do some renumbering. Starts with point one and the procedures, and this goes through the procedures of how the reviews will be conducted, but again, all of this language is the same as the Academic Handbook wiki just moved over into the appropriate section of the template.

If you move down to the bottom in the history section, you'll notice this doesn't have sanctions or definitions or anything added that wasn't already in the policy in the wiki. We have the date that this was passed in the history section. This section could also be used to list any updates that happen in the future to this policy. And jumping back up—oops!—to the top here, we have all this information in the sidebar that, John, you pointed out earlier the effective date, responsible office, administrator, a policy contact email address and, as an example, we threw

in some related policies that could be related to this one that they can easily jump to to see review procedures for chancellors and provosts, as an example.

WINDSOR: This is more of a question for Tom, since the schools have just been recently combined, SLIS and Informatics, how do we handle policies like this where it lists them individually? Do you go back and correct that, or does the university need to do that?

GIERYN: Yeah, if—if there are changes to be made, the responsibility for making the change falls to our office as it always has been. We will consult with the appropriate body, but in this case, the UFC, to make sure that the changes are simply of an administrative nature and there's no substantive consequence. We keep track of all those, Jack, and report to the UFC.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: When will this be finished? Do you know?

GIERYN: Eh—[Laughter]

KINCAID: Million dollar question. We have really a good chunk of them in there, and what we're doing is gradually every sort of large chunk, we're meeting with Tom and his group and Craig and just sort of reviewing any placement of where things were put in what category, tracking what those changes were, so I think we're scheduled to do it—our next big chunk in the next two weeks, so hopefully by the spring at the latest, I think can get—

GIERYN: We'll put alongside the wiki version, we'll put up this version so you can compare for yourselves, as well as the information that we've extracted from the Handbook and intend to cut out of policy statements.

MCROBBIE: Steve, then Laverne.

MANNHEIMER: Thank you. Coming from a Talmudic background, I'm curious as to the potential or the possibility in the future of incorporating the commentaries as it were that the iterations of these policies that various schools and departments and campuses have—have—have created over the decades. You know, I know certainly at IUPUI, we have campus policies, particularly in terms of P & T that are referenced, you know, only when each school doesn't quite know what to do with its own policy. Is there a mechanism or could we consider a mechanism wherein every policy by any sub-unit administrative or academic of the entire university could somehow be attached to this, you know, almost as like the Talmudic commentary upon, you know, chapter and verse, here we are, here's how it worked out at IU, you know, Bloomington, IUPUI, IU Fort Wayne, et cetera, et cetera.

GIERYN: Possibly. I think the way it's going to work is that once we get these policies in place, the campus faculty councils will re-examine their own campus-specific policies and link to

these. I know in Bloomington, the Bloomington Academic Guide, a substantial portion of it is simply a restatement of these policies. It'll be much easier then to link to this from the campus specific sites, and then indicate where there are policies that connect to these that offer a campus interpretation—a campus-specific interpretation.

MCROBBIE: Steve, let me just comment before calling on Laverne. I'm—I would also say, though, that—I would hope that one of the goals of—of the UFC because certainly a complaint I hear from faculty all the time would be to try and simplify the policies and eliminate policies [indistinct comment]—

MANNHEIMER: I agree with you, sir, and it's a question of sometimes departments operate in ignorance, shall we say. And they say, 'Oh, my gosh! We just enacted a policy that doesn't quite jive with this,' and sometimes people just forget to check.

MCROBBIE: Sure.

MANNHEIMER: They don't know where to find it. Now, obviously finding is going to be immensely easier, but nonetheless, the cultural migration towards a simplification and a homogenization of policy is a goal—

MCROBBIE: —Right—

MANNHEIMER: —logical—

MCROBBIE: —Sure. Laverne?

NISHIHARA: Yes, considering the importance of this site, is there a way to make it extremely conspicuous, very accessible so that no one has to go searching for this site. Are there plans for that?

KINCAID: That's a good question. I mean, it's linked on the front page of our site. It's really the—you see the web test URL, but it's really policy.iu.edu or policies plural, so either way, that's how you can get to just with that simple word, and I think off any of the homepages of any of the campuses of IU, especially with our new Google search function on some of those pages, it should pull up very easily. But we're happy to link it anywhere that you can think of that—that would be helpful.

NISHIHARA: So we can put it up on our campus homepages—

KINCAID: —yes, sure, absolutely.

MCROBBIE: That's the right way to do it. Other questions or comments?

TERRY: Mine is purely an observation. It's actually about this page. I would urge caution about putting a link to IU Foundation policies as an IU resource. Under the state's public records laws and other sorts of things—

KINCAID: —They're actually behind authentication, I believe, if—if—if that's—

TERRY: —Well, my concern is that we work in many efforts to try to maintain the Foundation as separate from the university for reasons related to the confidentiality of donors and that sort of thing—

KINCAID: —That's an important—I have to say that was a request from the Foundation to put that link up there, so—but I think we have—that—we have run up against that concern. I think it's a valid one.

TERRY: Just think about that.

KINCAID: No, I appreciate that.

MCROBBIE: If the Foundation's general counsel believes it's okay, well I [indistinct comment] especially if it's behind authentication, but you might just double-check that—

KINCAID: I'll ask [indistinct comment] about that—

MCROBBIE: —that has Philippa's blessing—

KINCAID: —Okay.

HASSELL: Changes at the Foundation [indistinct comment]—I said we had a recent change—

MCROBBIE: —Yeah, the general counsel—

TERRY: —It's kind of a legal question.

MCROBBIE: Right, yeah. Other questions? Yes?

SQUIRES: Is our students able to access this?

GOSSETT: Yes.

MCROBBIE: Sure, it's completely open. Other questions, comments? Alright. Good, thanks so much. Let's—let's move on, John?

AGENDA ITEM 9: STUDENT SERVICES INITIATIVE UPDATE

APPLEGATE: I'll just briefly begin, sort of a warm up act in this—in this [indistinct comment] for Jim Kennedy. I was asked to talk about the Student Services Initiative, and it really flows from President McRobbie's remarks earlier about the—the need to look for efficiencies where we can. The—you all probably remember the benchmarking activities that have gone on and actually continue in various parts of the administration of the university in a number of different areas. In our case, it had to do with the—the cluster of functions of student records or registrar, student financials, bursar, financial aid, admissions and advising, and the idea was to look for opportunities where we could simplify and—and bring together the back office processes.

What's interesting about student services as an area to look for efficiencies, is there are kind of two layers. One layer is the—as we call them, the back office operations. They're built on the same basic infrastructure which is the Student Information System or PeopleSoft to its friends and enemies, and—and when we initially deployed PeopleSoft, we deployed it in a way that had that basic software infrastructure in place, but then it was elaborated in basically seven different ways across seven different campuses. And so what we're trying to do is take those parts of it which are common to all campuses, that is, again, this back office idea, and merge those in a shared services environment, but of course leaving a number of these functions to be varied among campuses. My favorite example there is admissions. Admissions, there's a lot of back office work that goes into admissions, and supporting admissions decisions and policies, but the actual policies are very much campus-specific policies. So that's the division of—of labor that we've been trying to—to work on, and—and clarify and focus on the—the places where we can gain efficiencies through—in the back office.

The process has been a three-stage process. The first one was to make an initial division, really an estimate of the division between what needs to be done locally and what can be done centrally. So understand where those dividing lines are, and how much and what was on each side of that line.

The second phase was to get feedback on that. Our view, even though the structure that's been put in place to undertake this involves all the campuses and personnel from all the campuses very intensely, our view was that this was an estimate and we needed to refine it, so phase two was a lengthy process of getting feedback to those initial estimates. That is complete, and we are now in phase three. That's what Jim's going to talk about, and that is the phase where we take the actual business processes is the term of art in this area, the business processes, how you generate a transcript, for example, and boil that down to a single—single process that gets from a request for a transcript to providing the transcript in one way instead of seven ways, so that that can be shared. The handout that Jim is giving you is—describes that phase three

process. It gives you a timeline for them. It shows you—so where we are in the timeline, and also gives you a sense of the large number of different areas—functional areas that need to be addressed, so, Jim?

KENNEDY: Great. Thanks, John. In your timeline there, you can see the business processes that we're working through [indistinct comment] 185 of those that we had to get through this year, and I'm happy to announce we have about 20 left that we're trying to get through here before the end of December. We've had really good cooperation from all the campuses as we've worked through these business processes. Let me give you an example of one as we work through it. So, a couple weeks ago, we had one on veteran's affairs, and we know how important that group of students is to the university, so we get all the campus representatives together that work on veteran's affairs, all the experts, and we look at the model we have right now, we see how we do the business right now. And it's a very interesting process because everybody has a different spin on how to do the paperwork, how to get you in the system, how to process those students, and we want to make sure it's right for compliance. They have aid, they have veteran's affairs, and benefits. What's the best way to do that, and get them in the system, and maintain those students as they—as they move forward. So we map out the current process, and then we say, 'Okay, now that we have that, what's a better way to do this?' you know, 'What's the feedback here?' And then we map up that—that process using the technology that we have in place, and then we also propose other ways—the same things we might need to actually improve the service, and I think people are starting to see that this a really good process, looking at these business processes, we should continue to do even after this project, on a rolling basis to continue to look at these, refine these, and see, and the bottom line is really how we can improve this service to our students. That's what we're looking at with this—this process.

So I think we're on track, as John said. We have about twenty left for this year to complete. Then we've been putting together our plan as we move forward, looking at all the different business processes. Like I said, we've had great feedback from the campuses. We have quite a few people involved in the project, really from all the different campuses, different leadership groups that have helped us to this point. So with that, I can entertain any questions.

MCROBBIE: Questions? Yes, Ed?

BERBARI: Is there any sense that it's with some of the campus representatives you're working with that they feel there's a loss of autonomy and, you know if, in fact, this centralization process, you know, makes them lose, let's say contact with the students, and questions have to go down to an office that isn't next door to them for—either approval or advice or something? In other words, it sounds good from a business practices standpoint, and the—and the

second—so, that’s the first question. Second question is my understanding that the primary motivation for this wasn’t to improve services, but was to decrease costs, and so I’m kind of curious if you’re keeping track of that, and if the centralization does decrease costs or it increases costs because to me bureaucracies tend to cost more than decentralized functions.

KENNEDY: Sure, good questions. We—we’re definitely look at each business process to see what should be local, and what could be in the shared service, so we’ve already determined a lot of the front facing with the student contact pieces would remain at the campuses. So that’s something we don’t want to lose because we feel that’s very important, but with that being said, we are looking at technology, if there’s better ways we can route documents and do things in the front end, we feel that if we could automate some of these business processes, there would be less face-to-face contact needed, that may free up resources to do other things as well. So that’s one thing we’re really carefully looking at. I mean, obviously we’re looking for efficiencies. I mean I think that’s part of the FTE piece we’re looking at with these processes as well, but we would hate to diminish the service that we have worked so hard to get to this point. So I think—

BERBARI: —If it costs more, would we have failed?

KENNEDY: It won’t cost more.

BERBARI: Okay. I’m just curious because that to me was my understanding of what one of the primary motivations for these shared services was—

MCROBBIE: —[indistinct comment] was one of them.

APPLEGATE: Yeah, exactly. And you’ll recall that the initial estimate in the benchmarking process was savings of \$21 million. That was—that was not actual benchmarked estimate. That was what companies or enterprises that do this kind of thing generally achieve. So one of the goals of the first two phases was to get a better estimate, and we worked with Accenture who had developed the estimate in the first place, and we believe that the actual savings is going to be more. \$7 million, we feel very confident about, but \$4 million might be achieved if we can get more harmonization of more policies across campuses, but that is a longer process because some of the harmonization involves fairly minor details of different ways or different academic policies, but some of them are significant differences among academic policies, and so that obviously would require a much more thorough investigation, and if we started getting into serious academic policies, clearly that would involve either this group or—or campus faculty groups. Yes?

VANCE: Could you speak to the loss of—possible loss of jobs, and if it's going to be done through attrition, does this possibly affect availability, for example, of—of employment for students?

APPLEGATE: I don't know about employment for students in particular, but the idea is—is indeed to reduce the number of people who need to be doing it. That's where the savings is. Now, we're already from not even really trying at about—what?—half of the savings in terms of FTE that—that we were aiming for, and that's without trying. That is no, we don't have formal policies in place, like you saw in some other areas about hiring freezes and so on, so, and we've tried to be pretty flexible because individual offices have immediate needs that they need to—they need to fill. So I feel, given the timeline horizon on this, which is—what?—it goes up 'til 2014, that—that we will be able to achieve that in a reasonably—in a pretty—pretty painless way. And remember, the other possibility is these savings—we don't—I don't collect these savings, unfortunately. The savings go where the expense is, which is largely on the campuses, and the campuses then have the opportunity to use the freed up resources in—in more productive ways. So, for example, if a campus sees savings in this from—of some amount, the same people who are now pushing paper from one place to another, could be working directly with students, either in advising or in a—a more one-stop approach to student services. So to try to avoid the problem of students bouncing from bursar to financial aid to the registrar. So we could really—and that's one of the ways that we can improve service, so we're—we're not about where those savings go. That really is the—the entity that saves the money which is the campus.

VANCE: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other questions for John? Alright. Thanks, John. And the last agenda item is—is on the online initiatives that Barb Bichelmeyer is responsible for. And Barb is going to give the presentation. Barb?

AGENDA ITEM 10: ONLINE INITIATIVES UPDATE

BICHELMAYER: Thank you. I'll follow John's cue and I'll stand back here. It's my pleasure to talk with you today about the IU Online initiative, and about the IU Office of Online Education as well. So what I'd like to do is go back and give you just a bit of history that's led us to this. I know that there's been a recent announcement in early September about the IU Online initiative that makes it look we're doing something that we haven't done before, but I think it's important to understand the context of how we got to that announcement, and where we can go forward. So, you may or may not be aware, depending on how long you've been here, that over about the past twelve years IU has had seven different strategic taskforce—taskforces to

identify strategic plans for online education, and over the years, many of those reports have said similar things, but for whatever reason we have not been able to organize to move those forward.

About two and a half years ago, President McRobbie tasked Bobby Schnabel to be basically a one man task force to look at those task forces to look at the status quo of where we are at Indiana University to look at—at external efforts and initiatives and to see how we compare to that, and Bobby wrote that report, presented it to the Trustees, I guess that would have been in spring of 2011, and had one recommendation in that report, which was to create a university-wide office of online education that would serve several functions. What it would provide: strategic oversight around online education at IU, it would help coordinate across campuses, and it would also help to foster innovation and finally to give a unified front door so to speak to online education at IU. And President McRobbie accepted that recommendation, and in April 2011, chartered the IU Office of Online Education, and asked me to serve as the founding director, which seemed to be somewhat of a natural flow out of the work that I do in John Applegate's office as Associate Vice President for University Academic Planning and Policy, and also my professorship is on the Bloomington campus in instructional systems technology. So, I've been doing research and work in online education for quite some time.

So, over the last year, that office has quietly been working to do another round of needs analysis around all the IU campuses, all the major academic units. We've talked to the centers for teaching and learning directors. We've talked to bursars. We've talked to registrars. We've talked to about over a hundred and fifty people across the university to find out where we are with online education in detail, what programs, what courses we have, what area academic units ideas would be for how they would move forward or how they'd like to move forward [indistinct comment] space of online education, and also what are some of the barriers and what are some of the issues that they've overcome.

One thing we learned that I think is really important to know is that while we've been organizing at the university level with many taskforces over the years, as a grassroots efforts, there have been over eighty online credit-bearing programs that have developed out of academic units, so we have a strong presence in online education. Unfortunately, because we don't have a university-wide or haven't had a university-wide brand around that, even our own Trustees would often ask where are we with online education and why aren't we moving forward. So some of the first things that—that we were able to do, and some the key priorities that we took from both Bobby's report and the president's charge were, number one, to put together an IU-wide portal for online education. And you've seen that released as a starting point under the IU online brand. And there we list all of the programs that we have online

across all the campuses of Indiana University. It is a place for somebody who says, you know, I'm interested in online education. I'd like to go to IU. They're not people who recognize well, I should go to Bloomington campus for this program or I should go over to the South Bend campus for this program, they just know that they value the IU brand, and want to look at online, so our website is primarily a portal to bring people in by searching on those terms, and then move them out where they need to go on a campus-by-campus basis.

Other things that—that we were chartered with, that we've been addressing—or addressed in that past year in a needs analysis had to do with things like the question of strategic oversight in policy, and what does that mean. One of the things that we learned in terms of looking at policy is that there are many policies that we are, as a traditional institution of higher education bricks-and-mortar, place-based and a multi-campus institution that's organized by regional service areas, not really well organized for it in terms of the online space. So, for example, you may have read from *The Chronicle of Higher Education* over the last year about federal emphasis on getting state-wide authorizations to offer online programs in other states, and as it turns out, because we haven't had a university-wide office or university-wide initiative, we are—we have been, until recently, non-compliant in any state. So, technically, we don't have the approval of any state to offer online programs to students from those states. One of the charges of the Office of Online Education is to quickly move us forward in that—and that is a herculean task that we have a compliance officer to deal with. Our best comparison for what that—that kind of work costs, is the Penn State University global campus. They pay about \$750,000 a year across all states for state authorizations in all fifty states, and those vary tremendously on a state-by-state basis depending on things like how protective that state is of their own online students, and how much of a presence they have. So, as you might imagine, UMass online is very protective of their Massachusetts students. They have high fees. So, one of the things the Office of Online Education is chartered to do is to get us through that process so that any of our programs can be offered by any of our campuses.

Another aspect of the charter was strategic oversight, and that's an—that's an interesting question. What does that mean? One of the things I heard as I went out to all the campuses to visit, and all the academic units over and over again when I asked them what would you like, how could an Office of Online Education support you, was something of the version of the statement, 'Well, you can support me by letting me do whatever I'd like to do, and protecting me from what everybody else does.' It's a really critically important point because at Indiana University, I'm a faculty member. I strongly believe in faculty governance, academic freedom. I understand the importance of that, but when we have eight different faculty on eight different campuses, offering a Bachelor of Science in basket weaving, for example, and everybody tells me that they want to get to do whatever they want to do, and they want me to protect them

from everybody else, you know there's a problem there. And we have to be very careful and concerned about our—our students and the potential market we have, because it would be a problem if we have one website with eight different Bachelor of Science in basket weaving on there, and said there all the same, pretty much choose when you want to go. And we know from market analysis and from talking with students, they say that seems awfully complex. So we are an institution that's been organized based on geography and based on physical place, and that's just one example of how online changes our historical focus, the way that we do business, and what our policies need to be. So a good part of what we've been doing over the last year is to figure out how we organize to not only support our on-campus programs, but our online programs in a way that's good for all. And that takes an unprecedented level of coordination across academic programs. We're very—we've done a very good job of coordinating and administration and staffing in other ways, but academic affairs is not something where we've had to be tightly coordinated with historically, because Northwest knows they have their four counties up in that corner of the state, and Southeast knows they have their counties down here. And it didn't matter previously, and now all the sudden it matters.

So, as a result of the needs analysis, of the work that we've done, of all the conversations we've had, recognizing the grassroots efforts, recognizing that—that online is a space that's highly competitive, but we need to be very innovative. In moving forward, we tried—I tried to imagine what are some of the few key principles that we need to have to guide us, and I would call these general guidelines. I've presented these along with an organization strategy to President McRobbie and to the Trustees last summer. They accepted that report. They encouraged us to move forward, and the IU Online initiative came out of that report in part, and—along with a number of other things that we're doing as you read the *Chronicle* and you hear about MOOCs and badges and the space of innovation and what Harvard's done, so you put together where the competition is, and what's being tried and innovated on at other institutions, and looking at our particular infrastructure, and how we move forward, and that led us to the IU Online initiative that you see today.

I want to talk a little bit about some of those organizing principles, and then I'll spell out particularly what the IU Online initiative encourages, and where the funding came from, and how the funding is—is being used, and then I'm happy to answer any questions. But it's important to talk about these—these general guidelines because I know they are a matter of concern, and I—and I want to address any questions you had about them because I've heard any number of different questions and comments about them over time. But I do think, again, it's important to recognize we have to think about online from the IU perspective, from a— from a multi-campus organizational perspective, and recognize that there's huge competition

out there, and we have students who are interested in taking programs from us if we can organize well and we can grow the pie, and we have students who will not come to us if we are not student-centric in what we create because that's one of the hallmarks of online education is its convenience.

So the general principles that—that emerged out of this document were first of all no competition. And what no competition means is no competition from an—between an on-campus and an online program meaning—and that's something about a tuition issue. You can't undercut your on-campus program so much with your online programs that nobody wants to show up on campus anymore. That's a real concern. But we also want to make sure there's no competition across campuses because we can't have one campus saying we're an IU diploma, but we're the lowest cost IU diploma while IU diploma, so everybody should come here because that again is not a message we want to communicate to the market. Fortunately, we do have really two tuition tiers at Indiana University, but they serve very different purposes. They generally serve very different audiences, and so I'll come back to that point in a minute, but we know we have to do something so that online is a rising tide that lifts all boats, but doesn't prop up one part of the university at the expense of another.

The second general principle is something to the effect of no duplication without distinction. Back to the seven or eight different Bachelor of Science in basket weaving degrees, okay? It's a hard sell to a student audience to say, why would we have seven different of the same thing. It's a very hard sell to the Commission for Higher Education. It's a very hard sell to our Trustees about the economies of scale behind that. Now, that point no duplication without distinction is there may be great reason to have a couple of degrees in the same area if one specializes in underwater basket weaving and the other specializes in reed-based basket weaving or whatever the case may be, but we have to be able to sell that difference to the audience. We have to be able to explain to students what one program would do over another.

The third area, and that's a general principle, is that we have to look for opportunities for cooperation and collaboration in terms of—in the ability to establish economies of scale. And that is the—that is the new feature. That is the feature that we're most wrestling with around online because we haven't had to coordinate and cooperate across campuses. In fact, in my role as associate vice president, I'm well aware that at Indiana University historically, we have done a much better job of vetting courses than we have programs, because we know we have a master course inventory. We know that Basket Weaving 101 has to have the same hundred—hundred-word bulletin description, and has to have roughly the same kind of experience on any campus, but we haven't had to have that kind of coordination across campuses. We lose many opportunities without that cooperation and collaboration. We—we lose opportunities for

faculty to work with each other across campuses. We lose opportunities for the centers for teaching and learning directors to create one really robust faculty development series for online education, instead of having seven of the same exact courses on every single one of our campuses. So there's so many ways we could do more—do better if we could cooperate, and so a big part of what this office has been involved in in the last year is putting together university-wide, across campus collaborative groups to come into conversation, to talk about how we could work together to do more and better than we've been able to do in the past.

The fourth point has to do with trying to address that competition and duplication issue, and—and I preface this by saying this is a general principle, and I already know places where this general principle will not abide, but it should be the starting point as we think how we move forward on—in an ongoing basis in this space of online education. And that general guideline is a horizontal market segmentation that says that generally the core campuses should first be looking at growing graduate-level programs online because primarily that's where they have the resources, and that's what gets a national and international reputation. Primarily, the regional campuses should be thinking about growing undergraduate programs online. There are more than 650,000 students in the state of Indiana who have some IU credit and haven't finished the degree. There's a huge workforce development need in Indiana.

There are many opportunities that we have. As Ivy Tech moves in and gets comfortable with what they're doing, there are opportunities for Associates completers, as Ivy Tech gets those to come over and finish third and fourth year in degree completion programs. There are many opportunities for us to grow everybody's pot, not just a particular regional service area by thinking about that. A good, strong IU Online brand at the undergraduate level in Indiana also gets us southwestern Indiana, where we don't have a presence. It gets us West Lafayette and Purdue areas. It gets us any number of areas where we can't venture now or just simply with physical programs or on-campus programs. So, again, that horizontal segment—market segmentation idea, I understand that there are places where the regional campuses would need to do some professional development at the graduate level. That might be nursing, that might be education, that might be places like that. There are places where Bloomington and Indianapolis are very strong in areas that at the undergraduate level that could make a huge significant impact. The new School of Global and International Studies is an example there, information technologies and health-related information technologies at IUPUI are examples there. So, it's not a hard and fast rule, but it's a guiding point that allows us to get to the last general principle, and that is we really need to think about developing new programs with a—I hate to use this word because I know it's a problematic word for many, but with the business sense.

And that business sense means we have to answer three questions, really. The first question is: what do we do that's distinct at Indiana University; what do we do that's distinct on our campus? We're the liberal and professional education institution in the state of Indiana. We have programs that have great reputations. What are we doing with those programs? And secondly, once we talk about how are we moving our areas of distinction out, we need to think about who's the competition in those areas of distinction, and we have to place ourselves in relationship because students are trying to identify the difference in the market. We have to say how we're different, how we're better, how we're unique, because as you all know, if you read *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, for-profits spend 35% of all the revenues they generate on marketing and recruitment, and it's not good enough to just say we're IU anymore. We have to know what our case is and we have to sell it to students. And then the third area, finally, in addition to thinking about where's our area of distinction and what's our competition, is that we have to be considering where it is that we can establish economies of scale, where it is that we can work together, and how we actually think about what that presence looks like and our organization for that in the marketplace. So, when we think about that, again, distinction, competition, and then that last question, where we situate ourselves in that and how we best create the most robust program we can possibly create.

So, that idea of—of what I would call market analysis is not the way that we historically have developed programs academically. We've, you know—and I'm the faculty member, we've had some good ideas. We've said we think we can get an audience, okay, but—but now we need to know we can get an audience. Now we need to know what we're putting into that. We have to look for opportunities to—to reach those audiences in ways where we reach across—across campuses to the extent possible. So with that in mind, out of those general principles, and again out of what's been going on in external contexts in nationally and internationally, President McRobbie and others convened over the summer to consider all of that and come up with the IU Online initiative where they focused on four key areas. And the first area is graduate-level programs at the regional campuses, particularly in the professional disciplines, and President McRobbie's challenge to us is that each professional school on the core campuses would be looking at how they make sure they have a professional graduate program, either start with certificate, move towards the degree, or degree online to serve students as soon as possible, but within the next year to eighteen months to get something up and running. The good news for us is many of our professional schools already have programs online. So, now we need to look at can we grow those, how do we move those forward, and do we have—is there more that we can be doing there.

The second area is for, at the undergraduate level, for the regional campuses to come together and look for opportunities to do joint undergraduate programs. Now one thing I want to say

about that is there are many pre-conceptions around that. “Joint,” can—can mean many things, and we have many precedents for joint programs already at Indiana University. We have a joint program that’s an RN to BSN. That’s a university-wide consortium. That fits one organizational model. We have other joint programs in social work that are another organizational strategy. We have joint programs with some campuses, such as South Bend and Southeast where they—they work together and share faculty to teach German. So one of the things we need to look at with joint undergraduate programming is where can we provide programs that are significant to the state, that can help workforce development, that can get the kind of jobs we want to get in this state, but that any regional campus might not be able to offer all on their own. You could imagine things in bio and life sciences or, you know, where there’s a small faculty otherwise because those aren’t highly demand programs, but if we pull faculty, we could have enough to actually do some programs and grow out resources there.

So, we’re looking at what those are and, again, let me just say on those two particularly that I’m not making these decisions about what those programs will be, and your academic administrators aren’t making those decisions alone what those programs are—will be. Right now, for the IUPUI campus, Nasser Paydar has gone out to each academic unit or school and asked them to consider what their priorities would be and bring those to the table, and on the Bloomington campus, Venkat is representing Provost Robel to ask the academic units to do the same thing. And on the regional campuses, we’re in conversation with the chancellors to understand—to create a memo—a statement of understanding and guiding principles, and then we’ll work with the vice chancellors and with the blueprint joint academic programming committee to ask what the priorities are, and we’ll bring those forward. My expectation is there will be so much possibly that we can do there that we’ll have more than we can do in one year, two years, or three years, and we’ll prioritize those, and we’ll move as quickly and with all haste to make those happen.

The last two areas of focus, one is particularly important, I think, in terms of other things that are going on in the state of Indiana right now, and that has to do with looking for opportunities university-wide for all campuses to put some important, what I would call a gateway, maybe general education, maybe freshman level courses, not general education, but gateway courses online in order for us to be able to establish our presence, to be able to be as strategic as possible in how we help and support freshmen. Some of the variables that we’re thinking about in determining what those gateway courses should be are as you may or may not know in the state of Indiana, the high school diploma that’s a Core 40 with academic honors has a requirement that students take at least six hours of dual-credit or Advanced Placement. The—the Department of Education has identified ten priority courses in that area. We lose enrollments in some of those areas to all institutions, not just Ivy Tech, as students are picking

those up in high school and going through other schools, so—so we can potentially have a presence there. There's a core transfer library that has seventy courses listed, about ten of which are the most popular, and again we see our enrollment patterns, our students taking those courses from other places and transferring those in, as well as the new state-wide transfer general education core that will be coming online. So we'll be looking at a few key areas to say what courses do we really need to make available, and have a presence there so that we can encourage students to take those courses when they need to take those courses. That also ties into our heavily waitlisted, our highly subscribed courses, so instead of a student having to wait and slowing down their academic process, how do we make an online version available there. So, that's the third area of focus, and the last area of focus is with innovative technologies. We need to try out MOOCs, we need to try out badges, we need to see what they can do for us. We need to be very careful, and very limited in our—in our—our exploration there because there's no real financial models to those yet. I can imagine how those are going to work, but we need to try them out, and see what happens with that. So again, the IU Online initiative core campus graduate programs, regional campus, joint undergraduate programs, gateway courses, and MOOCs/badges and innovation space.

The way we're going to fund this is this is an \$8 million initiative over three years. The president, who I appreciate, put \$4 million from the President's fund. It was matched—excuse me—by \$1.5 million from the Bloomington campus, \$1 million from the Indianapolis campus. The regionals collectively went in and put in \$750,000, and UITS put up \$750,000 of cash, not of in-kind resources. So I appreciate that contribution in recognition of the importance of this.

The way that money will be spent over three years is roughly in quarters. The first quarter has to do with setting aside money just to come into compliance, and to provide resources that will allow us to do some of the baseline things we need to do. So, for example, not only will that—will those funds allow us to do state authorization in compliance there, there are federal regulations about verification of student identity. We're looking into purchasing proctoring services that would be available in any state where a student can go for midterms and for finals. We may even be able to do something state-wide or partner with Ball State and with Purdue and Indiana State there as publics to get a better deal, but that would be something that would be available to all faculty if nothing else what that allows you to do is to have a student come in at the beginning of the semester, fold up their driver's license and have a smiling picture of themselves, and have somebody verify who they are. And that's becoming increasingly important because I had a call from the FBI a couple weeks ago asking what are we doing to verify that our students are actually our students.

Other areas that those fees might help out are where—not only are we asking you to think about a business case, we’re looking at how we provide market analysis support services, and how we grow our institution’s knowledge base and capacity to do market analysis for academic programming, so we’re looking at seeding some funds to get that process up and running, and things like—you may have seen the IU Online advertising that went in that first week when that announcement came out. We got over a thousand hits that first week on the website, which I think Purdue, in no small part to the press release, but also to some targeted advertising we did. Overtime, we looked for those opportunities to do very strategic advertising, and we can provide some funds in that regard as well.

So, a quarter in fees, another less than a quarter, but roughly a quarter goes to the Office of Online Education. For quite some time it was me, and fortunately over time we’ve been able to establish five positions, a compliance officer who focuses on all these compliance issues, a data manager who helps us collect data. We’ve had to do quite a bit of work to just set clear definitions about what online education is, so that we can track and manage and grow. We have a client services manager who manages that web portal, and student issues and complaints. That’s part of a federal regulation as well that we have a—a mechanism where students can actually hear a voice when they call a number, or get an immediate response to the web if they have a question about an online program. So we have that as well, and then we have a couple of other academic administrators who are supporting the work of bringing the campuses together to help us collaborate and coordinate on that.

Another twenty-five percent is going back to UITS to hire a professional cadre of instructional designers and instructional technologists so that as we identify the programs of priority, we can do a quick hit and get the resources we need to get those programs online and not drag that out one faculty member at a time or a year for one course, and they are working on organizing that resource right now. That’ll, when it’s eventually up to scale, be twelve bodies that will compliment and work closely with the centers for teaching and learning staff across all campuses, but they’ll be able to do content development, high quality video, help facilitate interactions which will be key to what we’re doing.

And then the last quarter goes back to all of campuses as targeted incentives as we figure out what the priorities will be that will help us get you some resources that you need, help us to buy some of your time as content experts to put these things in place. So, again, it’s a three-year initiative. Hopefully what we’re doing is seeding a new way of thinking about online education and moving that forward over time and that after three years we will have made online be part of the normal operation a key way, one core way, that we offer academic programming across Indiana University. We will always be primarily place-based institutions,

but we have to have a presence and a strong one that represents the IU brand and the quality that people have come to know from IU, and this effort is to help bring that process in place, bring that structure in place so that these two ways of offering academic programs will compliment and work with each other. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

MCROBBIE: Questions for Barb? Yes?

NISHIHARA: Just yesterday at IU East, a colleague asked me to—for an update of what you were going to say seeing this item on the UFC agenda. And I heard you deliver this report in a somewhat different version, you know, elsewhere. If you have this report in writing, you know, I'm not sure you have the report in writing, would it be possible for you to disseminate it?

BICHELMAYER: The report's on the IU Online website under the tab that says "About Us," and it's under some information—key information about the office, but if you don't find it there, just email me and we'll send you a copy.

NISHIHARA: I will look for it. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Laverne, without wishing to make work for Barb, I mean she does travel around all the campuses a lot, maybe there's an opportunity for her to—

NISHIHARA: —I did hear a different version of the report when Barb was at East.

BICHELMAYER: That's correct.

NISHIHARA: So thank you.

MCROBBIE: So someone over here, I don't—yes?

HASELL: So this concept of no duplication without distinction has enormous ramifications for [indistinct comment], so while you were looking at two, for instance, so Nasser was very good at IU East at staking out this—at this space, so IU East has a criminal justice major, and a degree in criminal justice. I suspect they're doing that with two faculty members and maybe an adjunct faculty member because it can't be huge. If SPEA wanted to get in that space because SPEA has a huge criminal justice focus especially with the health sciences people [indistinct comment] School of Public Health. What does duplication without distinction mean, and SPEA being on the Bloomington IU campuses, this segmentation says they shouldn't be doing this degree, or if they do, they have to do something different or special. So, who's choosing winners and losers here? That's—that's the bottom line for me.

BICHELMAYER: Great—great answer. There's a couple things to think about in this, and—and this is not—this does make as much common sense as you might think, and—and again we

have precedent around any number of programs at IU for how this plays out. One thing to think about that—this coordination effort is we really have a two-tiered tuition at Indiana University. The core campuses have a very different tuition rate than the regional campuses have. Now, interestingly, if you look at the School of Nursing as an example there, they have a university-wide RN to BSN that's coordinated with the council of—of nursing faculty from—from all campuses, and they've been able to offer the same degree program across all campuses, and interestingly Indianapolis hasn't suffered much from the fact that Kokomo is less than an hour north of them and charges almost half of what they charge because there are some things that are available, and—and the students choose that. They make those decisions about what they want, but what that requires is a coordinated effort, so back to your question about who chooses and who decides, that point that I made about we've been better at vetting courses than we have academic programs, who's going to decide is the faculty of those academic units are going to decide, and one of the things I'm also very mindful of is we set these—these structures in place and we want the normal operations of the university to work as best as possible to—to address the things that we need to address online. So over the last year, under John's guidance, working with Provost Robel and Chancellor Bantz, the Academic Leadership Council has reconstituted some of their—their mission with—with the guidance of President McRobbie, they've established—we're establishing new processes for how we actually take academic programs through common forms. Just some things that are business operation type of things.

One of the things that we expect to do with online programs is we'll use that normal academic approval process, but like with graduate programs, where there's a gate that says if it's a graduate program, it needs to be vetted in a certain way, and with international programs, there's a gate there that says if it's an international program we have to vet it with International Affairs, make sure that we do what we need to do there. We'll have an online gate that will be basically a vetting process, and we will say, we'll just put it out there and say, hey, 'We've got this program, any other campus, any other faculty from any other campus, do you want to be part of this program; are you concerned that they're going to have this program; do you want to be in some relationship about this program?' and what will the memo of understanding be to do that. And that's basically how nursing and how other academic units have done that. So—so what we're going to force is something that has not happened at Indiana University before, and that is we're going to ask faculty from like academic units from each campus to say it's okay with me if this—if this campus offers that program or it's not okay with them if they offer that program, and we'll facilitate and negotiate the process of coming into agreement with what that looks like. So—so that's very much what it's going to be, a vetting and remonstrance process.

HASELL: So, first mover wins.

BICHELMAYER: ...

HASELL: No, you just told me first mover wins because—

BICHELMAYER: —That’s not what I just said—

HASELL: —no, no, no, so, IU East has a business degree online—

BICHELMAYER: —Right.

HASELL: If—if South Bend wants to—to offer a business degree, and IU East already has a business degree and IU East doesn’t want IU South Bend to have a business degree, then that remonstrance process or the description that you said makes that very difficult for the South Bend faculty to go forward and develop a good program.

BICHELMAYER: No. I think that mean—what I interpret that meaning is if South Bend wants in, then we have to talk to East and say what’s the memo of understanding so that everybody can be—and—and a really important point here is that historically, we think about all of our programs—we think about online programs just as we think about our existing programs and that those four counties or those seven counties that South Bend serves is all that’s there, and back to your point about how many faculty members are there and how many adjuncts are needed, if we can coordinate, we can say there is a much greater audience that any campus alone has previously served, and we want to make sure that we have the right resources, faculty, instructors, and everything to support that, but it’s a coordinated effort. So that’s one reason why we have the regional chancellors in meetings to talk about memos of understanding, what will we do, how do we move forward. East can’t lose in this mix, but South Bend can’t lose either. And the really—and the real challenge here is that we have to find win-win solutions because that’s what’s good for the entire—the entirety of Indiana University, and—and we have to remember we’re all trading on the Indiana University brand. So—

MCROBBIE: —Herb? Herb—sorry—Herb?

TERRY: That’s okay. Just my question is a little forward looking beyond that. Do we have an insight as these become bigger components of our campus activities as to how accrediting bodies like the Higher Learning Commission and this sort of thing will look at them, how they’ll factor them into our accreditations [indistinct comment]?

BICHELMAYER: Perfect timing because as soon as I’m finished here, I’m heading to Chicago, and I’m—and I’m meeting with the Higher Learning Commission, and I’m going through their new

accrediting process. We had a representative on the Higher Learning Commission down to talk to the Academic Leadership Council at their retreat in August I guess now that was, but to talk about some of these issues. As you may know, the Higher Learning Commission has entirely redesigned their accreditation process, and it's effective January 1st, and—and it is a very data based and evidence based process, and drastically different than what they've ever had before. Along with that, they are recognizing they have some pressure from the federal government as the entity that is responsible for monitoring some of those federal regulations that they need to look at online in a different way, and we've asked the question about how does online work at a multi-campus institution, and what does that do? So—so we're engaging those conversations with them to try and find an answer so thank you for asking.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Yes, Herb again?

TERRY: How are we working with our other state institutions? You talked about an international and national model. The same day we presented our budget presentation to the Higher—to the Commission for Higher Education, Southern Indiana State—Indiana State didn't do well last year under the formulas and that sort of thing, I think they had enrollment drops and this sort of thing. Essentially the president of Indiana State said we're going to have all of our Gen Ed core online. It will be a way for people to take it all without ever showing up at the Indiana State campus. We'll claim the credit hours. That's where we're going to get our extra revenue. It'll transfer to any institution in the state. He was very overt about that model. Does this threaten both perhaps our finances and our academic integrity? How are we negotiating with our state partners?

BICHELMAYER: There are several things we're doing regarding that. One is I meet on a bimonthly basis with the directors of online education from all the public institutions to compare notes, as I also do with all of the CIC directors of online education. IU actually took the lead and convened all the CIC directors and created a new CIC [indistinct comment] group. As you may know, the CIC has historically had a course share program, which hasn't maybe been as powerful as it might otherwise be, and CIC institutions are interested in looking at that. The Commission as well as the other institutions of higher education are trying to figure out what does it mean to be in right relationship, and how do we protect our space, but also look for opportunities to grow. Again, I would—I would feel much more threatened, particularly the undergraduate level if it weren't for the fact that Indiana is forty-fourth in the country in terms of our completion rates, and that we have 650,000 students who we're not even reaching right now who have some IU credit. There is great room to grow here, but you're exactly right to think about targets and to think about who's going after what model. We're—we're doing studies of how—of how other states have addressed the fact that community colleges have

taken the first and second year, or that high school—our education round table, as President McRobbie can tell you sitting on that, has a very overt and very clear strategy that they want the first thirty hours in college to be done in high school. So—so what does it mean for us if we would lose the first year, and how do we move for that, so we are looking at those things and trying to figure out. I guess the good news and the bad news, Vice President Applegate has coined a term called is it fast-forward—?

APPLEGATE: —follower—

BICHELMAYER: —We're a fast follower. Fortunately for us, most every other state is probably ahead of us in one way or another, and we're learning quite a bit from what they're doing, but we're—we're trying to learn the pain—we're trying to avoid the painful lessons, and take the valuable lessons and move forward by just being a little bit behind, but—but strategically making sense of that. So it's a good point, Herb, and we are looking at that.

MCRABBIE: Other questions? Questions? Questions? No questions? Questions

BICHELMAYER: Thank you.

MCRABBIE: With that, thank you, Barb. We've beautifully completed just on four o'clock, so I think with that we are adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 4:02PM