

# Untitled Document

---

Attached are the minutes of November 22.

Minutes

Indiana University

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

IU Foundation Building

October 11, 1994

1:30-4:30 P.M.

Members Present: President Myles Brand; Vice Presidents Gerald Bepko, Kenneth Gros Louis; Elected Faculty Members Barbara Cambridge, Donald Coffin, Ronald Dehnke, Paul Eisenberg, Janet Feldmann, Edwin Fineberg, Edgar Fleenor, Donald Gray, Edwin Greenebaum, Steven Hollander, Elton Jackson, Carlyn Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Eugene Kleinbauer, Peter Kloosterman, Angeline Komenich, Joan Esterline Lafuze, Robert Lehnen, Elizabeth Lion, Christoph Lohmann, Allen Maxwell, Catherine Olmer, Byron Olson, Lloyd Orr, Thomas Osgood, James Pattillo, Curtis Peters, Richard Peterson, Albert Ruesink, Paul Scherer, Myrtle Scott, Martin Spechler, Karen Teeguarden, David Towell, Kathleen Warfel, Karen West, Nanci Yokom; Student Member Jeff Nowak.

Members Absent with Alternates: George Atnip for Chancellor Leon Rand, William Nunez for Chancellor Emita Hill, John Vance for Elected Faculty Member Vannoy Faris, Beverly Ulvel for Faculty Member Ruth Russell, Ben Brabson for Faculty Member James Sherman.

Members Absent without Alternates: Chancellors Daniel Cohen, David Fulton, Hilda Richards, Michael Wartell; Faculty Members Jeanette Clausen, Michael Downs, Kyle Forinash, William Wiggins; Student Members Fetewi Ghaim, Todd Schmidt, Thomas Stilling.

Visitors: P.A. Mack, Jr., Marion Michael (Department of Theatre and Drama, IUB), Jeffery Auer (Professor Emeritus, Speech Communication, IUB), Stuart Davis (Department of Linguistics, IUB), Christian Kloesel (Department of English, IUN), Luis Davis (Chicano-Riqueno Studies, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, IUB), Florence Sawicki (Department of Education, IUN), Shirley Boardman (Affirmative Action, IUB).

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

2. Presiding Officer's Business:

A Major Address to Discuss the State of the University and

Strategic Directions for the Future

(President Myles Brand)

3. Question and Answer Period for President Brand's Address

(President Myles Brand)

4. Agenda Committee Business

(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Kathleen Warfel)

5. Question/Comment Period

(President Myles Brand)

(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Kathleen Warfel)

6. Committee Meetings

EISENBERG: I think that most of you here this afternoon know me already. I am Paul Eisenberg from the Bloomington campus, serving again this year as one of the two co-secretaries of this council. It is my pleasure to turn over the meeting to President Myles Brand, the new presiding officer of the University Faculty Council. In order that he may preside so much the more effectively, I would like to present to him, on behalf of all of us on the council, this gavel. President Brand . . . (applause).

BRAND: Thank you, Paul.

EISENBERG: You're very welcome.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BRAND: Mighty heavy gavel. Let me begin by asking for approval of the minutes. You received three sets. I am asking for approval of the first two. Hearing no objections, they stand approved. By unanimous consent of the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee, we will go into executive session at 2:45 p.m. in order to consider an honorary degree request.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

BRAND: I would like now to speak with you about issues of utmost concern to the university community.

Colleagues and friends, I am glad to have this chance to talk with you, to put before you some initial ideas for the future of Indiana University, and, most importantly, to seek your guidance and counsel. These are not definitive plans, merely ideas to be used as a starting point in working together to plan our future. They have been developed with the advice of some faculty and administrative colleagues and the Trustees, as well as my own understanding of our University. I emphasize that the ideas I am going to discuss with you are not cut in limestone -- let alone granite -- but together they constitute a set of directions in which the University can move into the future, building on our current and very considerable strengths.

Indiana University is a great institution of higher learning. The heart of public higher education in America is in the midwest, and in the public Big Ten universities in particular. American higher education, in turn, leads the world in the quality of research, teaching, and creative activity, and Indiana University is at the forefront of that leadership.

One question I have been asked often since my arrival at Indiana University just over two months ago is: Does IU meet your expectations? My expectations were very high. I knew of the strength of the faculty in many fields, the advantages of geographically distributed campuses across the state, the beautiful campus settings, the talented staff, and the substantial student body. The search team and all those I contacted last spring were effusive in their praise. Nonetheless, what I found far exceeds even these expectations.

In traveling through the state I have learned of the high esteem in which IU is held by alumni and all Hoosiers. I spent most of my first few weeks meeting with state legislative and community leaders, and I have found great respect for Indiana University. As you know, in many fields IU has developed world-class programs. The faculty are committed to the highest quality in teaching, and to scholarship at the frontiers of knowledge. The staff is outstanding, from our colleagues who keep the grounds beautiful to those who provide service directly to students and the general public.

Indiana University has a grand tradition and a history of excellence. Of course, it is no accident that IU has had a great success. Many, many people have contributed to this high level of achievement over a long period. I mention only two. Chancellor Herman B. Wells led Indiana University during a crucial period of development. He had the foresight to take IU in directions that have redounded to the benefit of generations of Hoosiers. Despite some controversies at the time, his concern for all programs and his focus on key areas, such as music and internationalization, have paid significant dividends. President Thomas Ehrlich also deserves a great deal of credit for advancing the University's academic agenda and safeguarding IU during a period of fiscal stress.

The main constant over these past 175 years, as illustrated by Chancellor Wells and President Ehrlich's leadership, has been a willingness to progress, to change in ways that are not merely responsive to external conditions, but ones that take advantage of new and exciting opportunities.

To play on the words of Heraclitus, you cannot step into the same university twice. The external environment, the needs of our students and the state we serve, and the opportunities presented by the rapidly changing state of knowledge in the disciplines, have all contributed to the inevitable change undergone by Indiana University. Today, as in the past, Indiana University must continue to

meet the challenges we face and develop innovative approaches to build upon our national leadership positions.

American higher education is in the early stages of a significant transitional period. There have been two such transitions in recent times. The first followed World War II and was characterized by federal investment in university research. The decision to focus research in the universities not only changed the direction of many institutions, Indiana University included, but it also resulted in universities becoming the engine that drives our economy.

The second major transition took place during the late 1960s and the early 1970s, when universities became focal points for social change. Students and faculty assumed greater roles in decision making and the curriculum changed, especially general education requirements. Like the earlier one, this transition dramatically reshaped the university.

We are now again in a transitional period, the third since World War II. The pressures that generate it have been building through the 1980s and have crested in the past several years. The driving factor behind the change is continuous fiscal constraint. State leaders and legislatures, including Indiana's, are under pressure from constituents to meet immediate needs in health care, social services, the schools, and the criminal justice system. Higher education is investment in the future -- a capital investment in people. But in the eyes of our legislators, immediate needs, from combatting crime to reforming schools, are taking precedence over long-term investment. The American people, moreover, are not at present inclined to increase taxes to meet immediate needs, not to mention long-term investment. Nationally, higher education has lost its standing as a priority.

We can argue, rightfully, that higher education deserves better. The American economy of the future will depend on a well-educated work force. Manufacturing jobs that require only a high school education are becoming scarce in many industries. Global competition dictates a focus on high-end service and professional businesses, areas that demand a highly educated population.

Despite the force of this reasoning, there remains a reluctance to fully support higher education. I am optimistic about improved support from the Indiana legislature this biennium. The state's economy is stabilizing, and there is recognition of the need to protect prior investment. To this end, a prudent budget proposal has been submitted by Indiana University and other public universities; and it has received initial, favorable response.

But the fact remains that the state revenue needed to match all, or even most of our needs is not, and will not be, available. Nor can we expect the situation to revert to the expansive fiscal times of the past. Under these circumstances, we cannot continue along the same path we have taken, or expect the University to retain its current approaches unaltered and still continue to thrive. Complacency is a losing strategy. Wishful thinking is equally a losing strategy. Avoidance of change is not an option. But we do have the option of building a productive future on the foundation of the University's extraordinary strengths. Indiana University's past successes have resulted from turning challenges into opportunities, and we can do that now: not merely retain -- but significantly enhance -- our pre-eminent position among institutions of higher learning.

Which path, then, should we take, and which paths should we avoid?

Over the past decade, the primary response of universities to diminishing state funds has been to pass these costs to students. There is a limit, which is rapidly being approached, to this course of action. When public universities increase their tuition so it is only within the reach of prosperous families, we help create a permanent underclass that cannot add value to the economy of the future. We can ameliorate the problem by developing a more coherent set of tuition and financial aid policies, but we cannot eliminate it. If public universities are to continue as the major avenue for class mobility by remaining accessible to a broad range of persons, we will have to restrain tuition increases.

In addition to diminishing state funds, universities have become subject to criticism from foes and friends alike. Although the vast majority of the faculty care deeply about teaching and do it enthusiastically and extremely well, the perception is that research has become our main preoccupation. Our supposed lack of attention to teaching is a prime focus of criticism -- but nationally, universities are criticized in other areas too, from misuse of indirect costs to scientific misconduct to promoting political correctness.

These criticisms are closely tied to a widespread call for increased accountability. Along with fiscal constraints, public insistence on accountability is one of the defining characteristics of the present transitional period, and it too will shape our future.

In this climate, one approach we are beginning to see among public universities is a strategy to renew their solvency and independence by separating as much as possible from their states, becoming semi-private or even eventually private institutions. This strategy is being followed by the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, and quite possibly UCLA. It was the strategy used by the University of Oregon while I served as president.

To provide a sense of this approach, let me say something about the situation in Oregon. In November 1990, the state of Oregon passed a property tax reduction called Measure 5, which resembled California's Proposition 13. As a result, all state agencies experienced dramatic cuts in revenue, with higher education most adversely affected. The University was told by the governor's office to make a base budget cut of 10% and to do so within three weeks. Difficult decisions were made. Cuts were not across-the-board, but rather selective. A college was closed, two dozen programs were eliminated or severely downsized, including Ph.D. programs. The University released over two hundred non-tenured faculty and lost two thousand students.

Worse, Measure 5 came in three installments, with each being progressively more drastic, and this was only the first phase. It was clear that the state of Oregon would no longer support higher education to the degree that it had in the past. Prior to Measure 5, 38% of the University's budget came from the state -- considerably more than the 24% that Indiana University receives through State operating appropriations. At Oregon, when the third stage of appropriations cuts is completed, 10% or less of the University's budget will come from state sources.

Faced with a problem of this magnitude, the University negotiated separation from the state with respect to tuition revenues. The non-resident student population was more than doubled to over 50%, while tuition increased dramatically. The University of Oregon came to resemble a private university in its sources of revenue and in its relationship with the state. It was a successful strategy in that after the first round of cuts the budget actually increased, and in fact increased each successive year despite decreased state support. But the cost of this successful strategy was a major alteration in the mission of the University, with far less emphasis on the traditional public responsibilities of a state University. That was a sound strategy for Oregon.

But I am convinced that this privatizing approach, this separation from the state, is dead wrong for Indiana University. Indeed, it is 180 degrees off the mark. Why the difference? First, the severity of the problem is not as great in Indiana. In good times we may not fare as well as higher education institutions do in other states, but also we do not suffer as drastically in bad times, in the way that Oregon did. One reason is that the people of Indiana, including our elected officials, continue to support higher education and to value their universities. Secondly, the tradition of Indiana University is deeply rooted in the state, more indelible than many other institutions, including Oregon. Third, Indiana University has consciously maintained close ties to the state, and has taken seriously and acted vigorously upon the service responsibility of a publicly assisted university.

For these and other reasons, it is my firm conviction that for Indiana University to be successful in the future, we must become not more private, but more public. I am convinced that the most successful public universities of the future -- Indiana University foremost -- will be those that strengthen their ties to the state while simultaneously accommodating to fiscal realities and renewed calls for accountability.

Indiana University's tradition and history, its core values and its sound position in the state, all point toward one right course -- to embrace and renew the University's public commitment. Change is unavoidable, but we must change in the most productive way, one that will enable us to continue to play a leadership role as the public university of the future.

Indiana University's future success will be best achieved, therefore, by becoming more integral to the state of Indiana and its citizenry. In reshaping the University, we will build on, not abandon, past successes, enhancing our state role, enhancing our partnerships with the corporate sector, enhancing our cooperative and collaborative relationships with other constituencies. We will become a national leader in responding to the challenges we face by exemplifying the best traditions of public higher education, reconfigured appropriately for the contemporary environment. Indiana University can become America's New Public University.

This vision of our dynamic future results from the University's strengths. It is not a perspective imposed from the outside. It is, importantly, a reaffirmation of our grand history and tradition. As we implement this strategy, we will set the pace for others to follow. We will become the university for others to emulate.

Our task will require innovation as well as careful planning. I propose now that we begin a creative process, involving faculty and others throughout the University, through which we can develop the

most productive strategic directions. The University Faculty Council and other faculty bodies will have an important role in contributing to that process.

Today marks the beginning of the first stage, in which with your participation the key strategic issues are initially identified and widely discussed throughout the university. By the end of this semester, a group of task forces will be appointed, with responsibility to address future directions of the University -- at present there are eight such directions, and I will outline them for you shortly. As the work of the task forces proceeds, discussion and new ideas can and should reshape these directions. When the work of the task forces is completed, the process will then involve all the campuses and schools in review of the result and in implementation that is consistent with their individual strengths and missions.

I hope for completion of planning and the start of implementation within the next two years. This timetable is ambitious; but I believe it is essential now to prepare IU to remain productive, indeed to become more productive, within the fiscal constraints we will encounter in the 1995-97 biennium and beyond.

What will the new American public university look like? Let me begin by proposing -- for our consideration -- some major strategic directions for the future. I emphasize again that this discussion is intended to be preliminary. We will need to be flexible in both the substance and mode of our planning, rather than try to specify the structure and the outcomes precisely in advance. Again also, I underscore that the strategic directions identified at present -- eight in number -- may change over time, as discussion sharpens the focus. Correspondingly, the number of task forces that will be considering these strategic directions will remain flexible and open to change as a result of discussion and consultation.

(1) The first strategic direction is to redefine our mission and operating principles so that we can take still greater advantage of being a statewide, geographically distributed university. We must find new ways to simultaneously satisfy two key objectives: one, we must encourage and facilitate creative and entrepreneurial approaches by the campuses in order to meet the needs of their local and national communities and constituencies; and, two, we must continue to unify the University in terms of our commitment to academic integrity and outstanding education and research, and also in our approach to building public and legislative support. By encouraging campuses to take perspectives appropriate to their goals and location, while taking full advantage of the resources and reputation of the entire university, we maximize our capacity to be effective.

Additionally, we need to reassess the role that two-year degree programs play in our overall mission. It may be that we will need more, or fewer, or a different set of two-year programs. Recent advantages in communications enable us to deliver educational services off-site, as well as supporting on-campus instruction in new ways. We will need to take new modes of delivery into account in assessing our educational mission. Indeed, we are already making great strides in developing programs that will make highly creative use of that technology in educational outreach throughout the state.

(2) The second strategic direction is to integrate ourselves more effectively with the public and private sectors. I refer in particular to state and local government, the corporate and industrial sector, the schools, the state's two-year institutions, and the federal agencies and Congress. This integration should enable IU to contribute still more strongly to economic development and advances in the quality of life throughout the state and the nation.

By way of illustration, let me suggest one possible avenue for further integration with the schools. As is well known, Indiana has a low percentage of students who pursue a four-year baccalaureate degree. A recent study by the Lilly Endowment, "High Hopes, Long Odds," concluded that most students enter high school with high aspirations, but become discouraged about their options during the high school years. We can improve this low success rate by building new bridges to the high schools. We might, for example, increase the availability of college courses to high school students, so that a broader range of those students could enroll in a variety of designated college courses. All our campuses already have "Bridge-to-College" type programs that help newly enrolled students learn how to study and to plan their work in college. If we were to make courses of this kind available to high school juniors or even sophomores, the transition to college could become more natural and less threatening, with the expectation that more students would enroll and do well in higher education institutions. These are the kinds of new directions we must consider, discuss, and explore.

(3) As the third strategic direction, we must focus on excellence in both teaching and research. I underscore that these two activities are compatible and mutually supporting. It has become fashionable among our critics, and even some of our friends, to point to a presumed conflict between research and education -- undergraduate education in particular. But as you are all well aware, this criticism overlooks the fact that when properly aligned, serious research and undergraduate education are not only consistent, but mutually complementary.

In research, we want to support new initiatives that will continue to keep Indiana University in the forefront as a research-intensive institution. Obviously, we will have to be selective in our investments. Trying to be everything to everybody is a formula for mediocrity. Note that it will not be the purpose of the task force dealing with this issue to identify specific research areas for emphasis, but rather to develop principles and guidelines for the individual schools and campuses to use in their decision making.

In teaching, we will need to continue to find ways to reward and encourage excellence. A good start on this issue has been made by the Joint (Trustee and Faculty) Committee on Learning: Teaching and Scholarship. We will need to develop further innovative mechanisms of support for excellence in the classroom for all faculty and instructors. A prerequisite to rewarding excellent teaching is assessing it well, and we should also refine our efforts in teaching evaluation.

(4) The fourth strategic direction is to face the accountability issue squarely. Good progress is already being made in regard to instructional responsibilities. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences in Bloomington is beginning to implement a teaching-capacity model. On this approach, each department has the responsibility for teaching a specific number of sections, calculated on the basis of a discipline's full teaching load, minus specifically justified reductions. As a result of this

effort, the College expects an increase of 10-15% in the number of faculty-taught sections. A similar model is being adopted by the School of Business, and I expect most other schools to put in place suitably modified versions of this model.

However, in terms of accountability, input measures such as teaching loads are not the best measures of instructional productivity. We must also use output measures. The three primary output measures of instructional productivity are graduation rates and average time to degree, both of which can be measured quantitatively, and a set of quality indicators that does not fully yield to quantification. Quality indicators include performance on standardized post-baccalaureate tests such as the GRE and LSAT, and rate of passage on licensure exams; but they also include student satisfaction, ability to obtain appropriate employment, improvement in one's habits of mind and quality of life over the long term, and so on. The combination of these latter items provides a good sense of the comparative quality of an IU education, even if a single specific number cannot be attached. In total, output measures tell us about the quality of our performance, including how we compare to relatively similar institutions.

There is not a one-to-one correlation between input and output measures, though of course they are related. Universities should be open to assessment and evaluation, but let's use the right measures. An over-reliance on input measures can well be misleading. For several years now universities have been making the case strongly that faculty work hard and well at their teaching, but we have failed to persuade many with this line of argument. I suggest that it may be time for a dramatically different approach, one that would make it absolutely clear that we take output measures seriously. If we do not change the public conversation about how to measure our performance, we will continue to be subject to unfair criticism and inappropriate pressure for increased teaching loads.

(5) The fifth strategic direction will be to focus on marketing. I know that the word 'marketing' raises concerns among some in the academic community. In this context, 'marketing' means several things. It refers to an aggressive program to improve the visibility of Indiana University -- not just in the state, but across the country and beyond. This effort should have as its goal making the quality of our university better known. We have a tremendous success story to tell, and we must ensure that we are being heard.

Marketing also explicitly includes student recruitment. We must step up our efforts to recruit students who are most able to take advantage of the tremendous offerings at IU. I mean to include all our campuses in this effort to enhance student recruitment.

(6) This last point leads naturally to the sixth strategic direction: student retention. Obviously it is not sufficient to bring students to campus; they must also be encouraged and enabled to persist to graduation. To some extent student retention is a curriculum matter, in terms of both general education and major requirements. As always, the curriculum is primarily within the purview of the faculty; the task force may recommend potential areas for review by appropriate faculty committees.

To a considerable extent, retention is also an extra-curricular matter. Issues affecting student life play a crucial role. Recent studies confirm what many have believed for some time, that retention is highly correlated with the connectedness a student develops with the institution, especially early in the college experience. Assisting students in developing cultural and social ties during the first year can have significant positive effects on all our campuses, especially on the Bloomington residential campus. It is crucial, moreover, to design and implement programs most suitable for the non-residential campuses, including those that help students to feel part of these campus communities.

(7) The seventh strategic direction is to enhance minority attainment. The task force charged with this element should review our success in recruiting and especially retaining students of color, and make recommendations for improvement. I would also expect this group to take up issues concerning the recruitment and retention of minority faculty. Recently the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses have had noteworthy success in minority faculty recruitment. The task force should consider how that success can be expanded to the other campuses. Additionally, this task force should review IU's success in recruiting and retaining women faculty and students in underrepresented areas.

(8) The eighth and final strategic direction focusses on the balance sheet -- both sides of the balance sheet. I have already discussed the fiscal constraints that characterize our environment. Our best laid plans will be for naught unless we can provide the needed resources.

Looking at the expenditure side, this university has practiced cost containment for a number of years. Everyone would rejoice if I were able to report that it is no longer necessary to contain costs. That, alas, is far from the truth. We will need to continue our efforts to assure ourselves -- and others -- that we are prudent in our expenditures. But it is time to expand our thinking about cost containment. There is a great deal of experience in the corporate sector about structuring organizations to become more efficient and more effective. Indiana University has already borrowed from this sector, for example, in developing its new financial information system. That system provides additional support that will help refine Responsibility Center Management, a valuable tool that we have also borrowed from industry.

We should continue to review these approaches with an eye toward becoming a high-performance organization. We should never adopt any approach, no matter how highly touted, that reduces our capability for excellence in instruction and research; but we should be open to conducting our business, especially our non-academic business, in ways that take advantage of the best available models.

Simultaneously, we must seek to enhance the revenue side of the balance sheet. The state of Indiana will continue to provide support for IU, and we will certainly work to increase the state's investment. You have my personal pledge that I will untiringly pursue every avenue in order to enhance state funding. But realistically speaking, we will need to become more creative and more aggressive in generating revenue.

Competitively won grants and contracts have been increasing at a superb rate for the past several years, averaging a 15% annual increase over the past four years. We should work to continue this

growth rate. Our fund-raising efforts have also been highly successful. We now rank third nationally among public universities in total support from gifts and grants. The Medical School aims to complete its \$130 million campaign next year, and the Bloomington campus is taking the initial steps towards its own major campaign. In both research administration and fund-raising, we are fortunate to have excellent leadership.

Also as a revenue source, we need to review opportunities, especially at Bloomington, for increasing non-resident student enrollment. We should, under all circumstances, continue to admit Indiana students who meet our qualifications. Let me make this absolutely clear: Indiana students will always remain our first priority. I do not advocate the influx of non-residents that characterizes the strategy adopted by some other universities. Rather, I am suggesting that the task force examine opportunities for admitting some additional qualified non-resident students whose paid tuition can be used to support excellence, once the resident population is fully accommodated.

Additionally, we need to look for appropriate opportunities to partner with the private sector in technology transfer and in other ventures, and to promote and deliver new educational services, through distance education and other means.

There are several areas that any adequate plan for IU's future must cover that are not included in these strategic initiatives, the key ones being medical education and the hospitals, international programs, and university facilities (both maintenance and new buildings). Those items fall within the purview of several strategic areas and they should be discussed by relevant task forces.

Again, I emphasize that this discussion and early planning stage are intended to be preliminary, and that we must remain flexible and able to respond readily to new information and ideas that arise. This strategic planning effort is not intended to cover every possible area of interest to the university community, nor is it intended to proliferate into a large array of initiatives. It is purposefully selective, focussing on the critical issues that will determine IU's success in this transitional period and beyond. Essentially these critical issues fall into three categories that any agenda for the future needs to include: a strategic plan, a financial plan, and a marketing plan. These three categories are another way to look at the strategic directions in our preliminary planning.

Let me now return briefly to process. Having discussed these conceptual ideas with the Board of Trustees, I intend that the task forces will be appointed for approval at the December Trustees' meeting, and will commence their work at the beginning of the Spring semester. Each task force will contain Trustees, faculty members appointed in consultation with the University Faculty Council, students, staff, and external constituent members. The size of the task forces will vary depending on their charge. The selection of the task forces will be carried out by a steering committee, which will also coordinate their work. The membership of this committee will be announced shortly.

The second stage of the process begins in January. The task forces are to think creatively about preparing the University for the future in the areas with which they are concerned. They are to develop strategic directions and guidelines, rather than specific implementation plans. They should complete their work by the end of spring semester, and the steering committee will then compile the recommendations. The goal is to have a draft document of strategic directions by the beginning

of the fall semester, 1995. This draft will be discussed by faculty governance groups and others during the fall semester. The final stage begins when the campuses, colleges, and schools undertake implementation of these strategic directions within their own context.

Indiana University has a grand history and we are ready to embrace our dynamic future. The University has reached greatness because of the creativity, insight, and hard work of many persons. Our tradition of commitment in service to the state of Indiana, and of international leadership in public education and path-breaking research form an unparalleled foundation. We have extraordinary resources for building on that foundation -- resources of creativity and innovation in our superb faculty, in the leadership of campuses and schools, in our dedicated staff and talented students.

Together, the future is ours. We have every strength we need. We have only to plan and act forthrightly to forge those strengths into the shape of America's New Public University. Thank you. (Applause.)

### AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR PRESIDENT BRAND'S ADDRESS

BRAND: I'm more than happy to discuss these ideas with you and get your reactions, please.

SPECHLER: Among the many points that we ought to welcome in this speech was the point that there is a great deal of experience, and I'm quoting, in the corporate sector about structuring organizations to become more efficient and more effective. I was glad to see that, because that experience has recently been summarized in the Wall Street Journal just Monday and applied to America's public universities, in particular Northeastern University. Now, I think it is fair to summarize that experience to say that, like the corporate world, we need to improve and diversify our products, increase our productivity (correctly measured), and to cut unnecessary costs. Now, speaking about the campus that I know best, Indianapolis, I think we have diversified and improved our product, though we could do more. We have definitely, like our colleagues in Bloomington, increased our productivity, measured properly. We are teaching many more successful students than we did ten or twenty years ago. But on the question of cutting costs and economizing costs, my own opinion is that we still have far to go. Corporate economizing in the last five years notoriously has meant a cutting down of the number of middle managers in some of America's most illustrious corporations, such as IBM. And yet the record on our campus and other campuses will show that the number of middle managers and the amount of money spent on their offices and their proceedings, however worthwhile, has increased rather than decreased. These people are meeting many of the disparate needs of our students, it is true. But perhaps we could look at whether all of these functions are really necessary and being done in an efficient way. I'd like to ask you, President Brand, whether you are prepared for a dispassionate, disinterested task force to look at whether we can halt the increase in unnecessary bureaucracy and middle management and perhaps affect some economies in this way.

BRAND: I would hope that our task forces in various ways would look at that issue as well as many others, Professor Spechler. I believe that is an important set of issues. I think there are other aspects to a high performance organization as well, but you certainly point to one that has been taken up by

the corporate sector in terms of efficiency. Some would argue that, at least in part of the corporate sector, this has gone too far. But leaving that aside, I think it is important that we look at, and I'm agreeing with you, that issue as well as many others. We have no choice about it, and I'm sure you will agree. We do not enjoy the luxury of being able to be imprudent with our funds. We need to serve our students extremely well and do what is necessary to do that. We must continue with our path-breaking research, which I believe is wholly complementary to our teaching, about which I am sure you will agree as well. A dispassionate and aggressive look you can count on.

Anyone else have a reaction or a question? Do we need to ask the folks to come to the microphone? This is so the people on the other campuses can hear you. I know we can hear each other in the room; but if you have a question or response, please come to the microphone. Did that frighten everyone? (Laughter.)

SCHERER: I represent the South Bend campus; and there is some concern there about the emphasis in some of your material, including the speech today, about the speed of graduation of students, particularly since most of our students work full-time and we sometimes question if some of them are not trying to graduate too rapidly rather than too slowly. So we have serious questions about whether that is a reasonable basis of judgment, particularly for campuses such as ours.

BRAND: No, that's a fair question. Don't misunderstand me. I am talking about full-time equivalence enrollment. Indeed, many of our students on the smaller campuses are part-time students and students with family and work obligations. But in terms of full-time accumulated equivalence, we want to make it as easy as possible for our students to graduate when they want to graduate. Now some students, appropriately so, will want to take longer. They will want to explore -- they may want double or triple majors -- and I encourage that, because I think that is part of a liberal education. However, if a student wants to graduate within a certain specified period of time, we should do everything we can to make that possible on a full-time, equivalent basis.

Anyone else?

MAXWELL: I want to pick up on Paul's point on part-time students and regional campuses. You may be aware that state aid does not fund part-time students. It has been approved, but it has never been funded. And when we talk about retention on the regional campuses, when we force students to take 12 hours in order to get state aid, we are almost insuring some of their failures. Can we put more pressure on getting that part-time student aid funded?

BRAND: I think that is a well-taken point. I agree with you. We don't want students taking courses just to receive financial aid. Those are the wrong reasons. [I] have in mind and other people on your campus and the other campuses as well. We need to support all of our students, and that includes our non-traditional (meaning over 25) students who tend to be part-time.

Anyone else?

LOHMANN: I'm Chris Lohmann from the Bloomington campus. You spoke in one part of your speech about the connections between the public schools and the University, and I think all of us have over the years realized how important an issue that is. I think, from my perspective, a lot of our resources

are put into what used to be called "remedial education". We don't call it that anymore, we have new euphemisms. What that means to me is that the University could be much more efficient in doing the job that needs to be done at a university if the education of the students at the pre-university level were to be improved. Not necessarily only towards university education, but also in general. What measures do you see that the University can take in improving pre-university education in the state?

BRAND: Professor Lohmann, you are absolutely on target with that. We would do a better job of educating our students if we did not have to put as many resources into remediation. We will always need to put some, particularly as a public university; we will want to provide a wide range of opportunities independent of income class. But we are having to do too much of that, you are absolutely right. The University, I believe, can influence the process directly by supporting the efforts in the state, particularly by the Higher Education Commission for Core 40. Core 40 is the first concrete step in some time that is being taken within the state to raise the quality of standards and expectations in secondary school for all students, even though they may not want to go on to post-secondary education. And so I think we need to do that both institutionally and within our own councils. Once having accomplished that, then we should be prepared to take the next steps. But I am encouraged by the Core 40 process, being advocated both by the governor's office and the Commissioner for Higher Education, Clyde Engel, strongly. So I would recommend and will support that effort, but I see that as a first and not a final step. You are absolutely right. We need to influence the education of those students before they arrive on campus. I believe, and I expect you will agree, that it is a single educational network, a single web; and we need to cooperate with secondary schools and indeed even primary school students so that their aspirations, abilities, and the quality of their learning is very high when they come through our doors.

Anyone else? Thank you very much. I appreciate your questions. As you see, we are at the beginning of the process, and it will occupy our attention for some time. I would now like to call on Professors Paul Eisenberg and Kathleen Warfel for agenda business.

#### AGENDA ITEM #4: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

EISENBERG: I've just been asked that all guests today sign the attendance roster on the clipboard and have also been urged by Ellen Pettay just now to ask all of you who are actual members of the University Faculty Council to check off your names on the roster as it comes around to you.

President Brand spoke a moment ago about the report from Kathy Warfel and me. We tossed a coin, so to speak, a few minutes ago, and I was the lucky one who is privileged to engage single-handedly in this next item of business -- namely, a quick reporting to all of you of various other items which have come to the attention of the UFC's Agenda Committee as in need of consideration by us or by our standing committees in the course of this academic year. A list which I think is not indeed complete but represents most of the things that we ourselves have been talking about on the Agenda Committee in recent minutes and recent weeks would involve the following items.

We have received very recently from the Joint Committee on Learning a recommendation concerning policy with regard both to Associate Instructors and to part-time or adjunct faculty,

sometimes denominated Associate Faculty. The latter recommendation, but probably also the former, is going to need to be reviewed by this council and appropriate standing committees thereof.

Something that has been holding over for some time now that needs to be taken up in the course of this year is the general question of access to institutional data. What information will be available to the public or to specific interested persons concerning us who are the faculty members of this institution? And perhaps also: What information will be available in similar computer files and other sources concerning our students?

The matter of domestic partners which was dealt with in one way by the Trustees at their last meeting of the last academic year is one which, nonetheless, we on the Agenda Committee on this council think should come before this council in the course of the year for our consideration and debate.

All of us presumably know that we have been mandated by the Northcentral Accrediting Agency to produce an overall assessment plan with regard to general education, and that initiative from the outside has in effect been matched by initiatives generated from within for us on our various campuses to engage in various sorts of assessment, including but not confined to the assessment of general education and its effectiveness. We would like to hear an appropriate report on that subject about the progress and problems that that assessment initiative or set of initiatives has encountered heretofore, even if it be true that most of the actual work of developing assessment strategies and implementing them will turn out to be campus-specific.

Once again this year, as before, we think that we on this council should hear about distance education issues and the progress that IU has made in dealing with those issues to date. Accordingly, we on the Agenda Committee plan to ask Dean Kathy Krendl in the near future to make herself available to us on this council for a report and discussion.

Those of you who were council members last year, or who, if you were not members then have extraordinarily acute memories about proposed business of last year, will recall that Lee Caldwell, who is in charge of the computing program for the entire University, was due to speak to the council in the early months of the calendar year. That meeting in fact had to be cancelled because of bad weather, and it turned out that Mr. Caldwell was no longer available to meet with the council for its later meetings last spring. We want to bring him back for an official introduction to this group and for the opportunity to have him report to us about his work again and problems and issues which that work is encountering.

Another matter of perennial concern to us, and about which we shall need a report soon, is our ongoing attempts to contain health care costs and to develop appropriate management programs.

We shall want, similarly as we do every year, to hear from James Neal, Director of the University Libraries, about the overall situation of those libraries and his work in dealing with the various problems which the maintenance and development of those libraries pose.

Another matter that has come recently to the attention of the Agenda Committee concerns IU diplomas. Now, and at least for some time in the past, those diplomas indicate that the degree comes from Indiana University and added thereto is information about the specific campus at which the student has done her or his work. Some groups throughout the IU system are advocating the deletion of that campus-specific information; other groups are pushing in the opposite direction. Here is a matter which, we think, falls indeed within the purview of the faculty, and hence more particularly within the purview of this council.

We have heard already this afternoon, as we have heard so often before, about so-called productivity issues, and it is very likely that those issues or something having to do with them will come to the attention of this council in the succeeding months of this academic year.

And lastly for now, let me mention that the Agenda Committee has agreed to refer to the now constituted Faculty Affairs standing committee of this council the question of developing at least minimal standards for boards of review that will operate on the various IU campuses, and particularly what at least minimal due process on the parts of those boards will involve.

Kathy, do you in fact have any last-minute thoughts about additions, subtractions, or changes in this report?

WARFEL: No, I think that was a good preview list. We might say something about the membership of the standing committees of the UFC and some of the committees that aren't standing committees -- true confession time: The Agenda Committee was late in getting the standing committee rosters put together. Some of the committees don't have a complete roster yet. Some people may not feel that they were adequately notified or warned; so these are not set in concrete. We can still shuffle the membership around to some degree, but we need to do it in the relatively near future.

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

BRAND: Good. We are off-camera; so we can talk from our seats. We are at number five now, the question and comment period. Professor Spechler?

SPECHLER: This is a question for Paul and Kathy. I assume that of these many items, you will be informing the committee that has primary responsibility for them that they should proceed.

EISENBERG: Certainly.

SPECHLER: One item that was pending last year, Paul, you'll remember, was the line of authority and approval for tenure and promotion dossiers. That was before the Committee on University Structure for some reason, and we have made some progress on that. President Brand's reorganization during the summer months touched on that matter; and I've already discussed it with Don Gray who, as luck would have it, remains co-chair of that committee. I assume that, by not mentioning that, you didn't mean to tell us that this is a closed matter and that we ought not to discuss it. So I'd like your opinion on where we stand about that. Incidentally, one other matter that has attracted a lot of attention and, I might say, curiosity, is the role of Professor Gray with respect to this council.

EISENBERG: With regard to the first matter, you are quite right, Marty, that in fact the Agenda Committee has not forgotten about that matter of the structure of handling . . . cases that would involve . . .

SPECHLER: Paul, we can't hear you.

EISENBERG: . . . schools on more than one campus. We know that the Structure Committee at least began to address itself to that issue last year; and I might have said in my remarks a few minutes ago that it is intent of the Agenda Committee to charge the Structure Committee to continue with that work this year.

In regard to your second question, truly it would be best if Don Gray would himself try to answer it rather than for me to do so in his stead. Don?

GRAY: I'm not sure what . . .

SPECHLER: Well . . . you were hired; maybe the guy who hired you has something to say. (Laughter.) Why make this dangerous step?

BRAND: I've asked Don Gray to serve half-time as a liaison to keep faculty communications on all campuses open and at a rate which we can all tolerate and which is higher than what we have now. And so Don, I think, serving in this continuing role as a faculty member in the English Department has a right to serve on this council, if elected. I don't see how that interferes with, and indeed it supports and complements my objective, which is to improve the line of communications with this group, but indeed with all faculty.

GRAY: It never occurred to me that there might be a conflict between being here and the half-time position with President Brand. If there is a conflict, I would be happy to resolve it by resigning from one job or the other.

SPECHLER: I didn't mean, Don, to suggest that there was any conflict. In my view, it adds to the channels of communication that we have to the President [and that] can only be to the good. But, in the past this council has communicated to the President directly over about twenty yards of carpet, and also to our Agenda Committee and the co-secretaries. So I assume that your role similarly is not to lead from theirs.

GRAY: No . . .

BRAND: Entirely independent to that. I project no changes other than improvements that we can make over time, with the President's office and the relationship with this body and the Agenda Committee. Don's role is to supplement, to increase communication, including people who may not have the opportunity to serve on this council.

WARFEL: Let me say something about the first half of your question. When Paul gave the preview list of upcoming topics for the council, it was not an exhaustive list. The thing you mentioned is one thing that is coming up with the University Structure Committee. Many of the committees have

things that they are working on. Many of the campuses have things that are going to be coming up to UFC during the course of the year. So, there is more going on than Paul covered.

EISENBERG: I thought I had said explicitly that mine was not an exhaustive listing, but nothing more than random samples. One might, however, mention that we have discussed ourselves in the Agenda Committee the matter of clinical ranks, which is certainly a rather pressing problem, and if you or anybody else among the members here were wondering whether we need to look into the matter, the answer is 'yes'. It will be under consideration . . .

BRAND: Other questions, comments, issues? Seeing none, I suggest we adjourn to the executive session and then at 3:00 into the committee meetings.

Paul Eisenberg

Co-Secretary