

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**September 17, 2013**  
**Kelley School of Business – CG 1034**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joelle Bahloul, Abhijit Basu, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Gracia Clark, Claude Clegg, Mike Conway, Carrie Docherty, Nathan Ensmenger, Alyce Fly, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Margaret Gray, Vivian Halloran, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Timothy Hoch, Gretchen Horlacher, Brian Horne, Jason Baird Jackson, Jennifer Laherty, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Joseph Miller, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Jamie Prenkert, Olivia Rios, Lauren Robel, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Mikel Tiller, Julie Van Voorhis, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, Nona Watt, James Wimbush, Rega Wood

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Marion Frank–Wilson (Lori Duggan), Brady Harman (David Breed), Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone), Kelly Thacker (Maryanne McDonnell)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Baxter, Ying Ding, Jake Docking, Katy Flanigan, Krista Glazewski, Dennis Groth, Cheng Kao, Christopher Kauffman, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Bradley Levinson, Karma Lochrie, Michael McRobbie, Jose Mitjavila, Deanna Reising, Lisa Sideris, Adam Szczepaniak, Jessica Tooker

**GUESTS:** Hannah Alani (IDS), Elisabeth Andrews (Office of the Provost), Bonnie J. Brownlee (Journalism), Michael Carroll (Office of the Registrar), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Mary Favret (English), Deborah Galyan (College of Arts & Sciences), Walter Gantz (Telecommunications), Jane Goodman (CMCL), Paul Gutjahr (English), Autumn Harrell (Education), Edward Hirt (Psychological & Brain Sciences), Owen V. Johnson (Journalism), Anne Kibbler (Journalism), Bob Kravchuk (SPEA), John Lucaites (CMCL & College of Arts & Sciences), Lesa Hatley Major (Interim Dean of School of Journalism), Jane McLeod (College of Arts & Sciences Associate Dean), Ted Miller (SPEA), Tom Morrison (VPCPF), Jessica Myrick (Journalism), Richard Nash (English), Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office), Jean Robinson (College of Arts & Sciences Associate Executive Dean), Jennifer Robinson (CMCL), Harmeet Sawhney (Telecommunications), Susan Seizer (CMCL), Larry Singell (Dean of College of Arts & Sciences), Ted Striphos (CMCL), Susan Thie (Journalism), Anjali Vats (CMCL), Stephen Watt, (English)

## Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/13-14/09.03.13.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for William “Bill” Herman Kroll and D. Dean Summers

William “Bill” Kroll: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B6-2014.pdf>

D. Dean Summers: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B7-2014.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Herb Terry)

Circular B2-2014: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B2-2014.pdf>

List of BFC Members on IUB Strategic Planning Teams

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/aux/BFCSPTMembers.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer’s Report (10 minutes)

(Provost Lauren Robel)

5. School of Media Update (60 minutes)

(Provost Lauren Robel and Larry Singell, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Lesa Hatley Major, Interim Dean of the School of Journalism) [DISCUSSION]

6. Question / Comment Period<sup>1</sup>

7. Report of the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities (20 minutes)

(Vice President Tom Morrison) [DISCUSSION]

8. Old Business/New Business

## Minutes

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Terry should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcOFF@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcOFF@indiana.edu)

**TERRY:** We have a very full agenda so I'm going to go ahead and start, maybe she's looking for a parking place. I don't know. First of all, is there a motion for approval of the minutes of September 3<sup>rd</sup>?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** So moved.

**TERRY:** Is there second?

**GIERYN:** Second.

**TERRY:** Then moved and seconded. All those in favor please say 'aye.' [Aye]. Are there any no's or abstentions? The minutes are approved. Tom, would you present the two memorial resolutions?

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR WILLIAM "BILL" HERMAN KROLL AND D. DEAN SUMMERS**

**GIERYN:** Professor Emeritus Bill Kroll died April 27, 2012 in Bloomington. He was employed for thirty–six years with IU beginning in 1955 until his retirement in 1991. His hard work and good fortune took him from being a lecturer and film supervisor, to a technical supervisor of the broadcasting services, operations supervisor, a full professor (1975) in Telecommunications, deputy director and finally to the Executive Director position (1980–1991) of the Indiana University Radio and Television Services and General Manager of WFIU and WTIU.

While teaching in a junior high school in Cumberland in his native Maryland, he was attracted to Indiana University by the national reputation of its graduate program in audio–visual education. With the flood of other World War II veterans, he and his family came to Bloomington for summer classes, living in a trailer in Woodlawn Courts. He completed his M.S. in Education–Radio & TV in 1953.

As part of his graduate studies, he had enrolled in a television production course in the Department of Radio and Television, and become a key figure in the department's programming activities. Bill's background in film production was particularly valued, so in 1955 he was asked to join the department as a lecturer and film supervisor.

Bill Kroll taught undergraduate and graduate courses in film production, instructional system design and in the structure, organization, and funding of US public broadcasting systems. His career spanned the period from kinescope recording to satellites and fiber optics. He started with IU Radio–TV Services in its postwar Quonset hut on the south side of the Jordan River when the FM radio station was in its infancy and television productions were aired by WTTV Channel 4. In the early 1960's, Bill coordinated the construction of a state–of–the–art facility, the Radio–TV Center on IU's Bloomington campus, which housed one of the largest television studios between the East and West coasts. In 1974 and 1975 he designed and taught an

innovative film workshop for high school teachers that was funded by the Indiana Arts Commission. In the 70's, Bill shared his expertise with the international media community: film work in Tunisia, consultant in Chile, co-director of the design of a national educational technology program in Saudi Arabia.

Bill Kroll contributed to over twenty television series and individual programs which aired in Bloomington, state-wide, and nationally on public television. Among those was "Doc- The Oldest Man in the Sea," (1980), a documentary for which he was the Executive Producer about IU swim coach James (Doc) Counsilman's record breaking English Channel swim.

The *Indiana Daily Student*, April 29, 1983 issue, wrote of Kroll's invitation to the White House where he shook President Ronald Reagan's hand and was congratulated on the WTIU Job-A-Thon. The Job-A-Thon was an attempt to match area employers with the unemployed through free appearances on WTIU. Bill was quoted as saying, "I guess it was a big deal. How many people get invited to the White House and get to talk to the president of the United States?"

Throughout his life, Bill served on various campus and local committees. He was an active member of First Christian Church in Bloomington. At Bill's retirement celebration on May 11, 1991, he was named a Sagamore of the Wabash by Governor Evan Bayh.

In retirement, Bill Kroll was a regular volunteer for WTIU/WFIU. He was often seen at theatre and athletic events with his wife of nearly sixty-five years, Kate. He especially enjoyed vacationing with his family along the coast of North Carolina. At the time of his death he had three sons, Craig of West Lafayette, IN, Kim (Lena) of Laurel, Maryland and Chris (Lisa) of Bloomington, six grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

Dean Summers was born in North Liberty, Indiana. She attended Indiana University and completed her bachelor's degree in Sociology and Physical Education in 1944. She subsequently received her Master's in Education from the University of Wisconsin in 1946 and a Doctor of Physical Education in 1956. While completing her graduate degree, Dean Summers was asked to teach swimming for the summer, which turned into full-time employment when a faculty member resigned.

Summers was subsequently appointed to the faculty in the Department of Physical Education of the then School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, now the School of Public Health. She instructed courses in individual sports, tests and measurements, and the theory of individual sports. Dean Summers also mentored graduate teaching assistants, was the program director for racquet sports, and chaired nearly every department or school committee during her tenure. She attained the rank of associate professor, remaining on the faculty for thirty-four years until her retirement in 1980.

Among her many accomplishments, Dean Summers was responsible for bringing the first

women's tennis coach to Indiana University and launching the women's varsity tennis team. She served as Head Coach of the Indiana Women's Tennis Team from 1971–1977. Along with bringing women's tennis to IU, Summers created a synchronized swimming program and presented at a national convention on the sport. During her career she served as State Tennis Commissioner and Chair of the Tennis Advisory Board for the Midwest Intercollegiate Association. In 1968 she was a member of the Executive Council and Treasurer of only the Second International Congress of Sport Psychology, a major component of the International Society of Sport Psychology. Some of Dean's early research on youth fitness was actually submitted to President Eisenhower's Fitness Committee, which was chaired at the time by Vice President Nixon.

Throughout her career, Dean Summers was dedicated to service. She was the only woman at the time to serve on the HPER school building committee, a post she held for two years as the School shifted from the student building to its present location in 1961. She was largely responsible for development of the gymnasiums and dance studio. Dean was always happy to mentor new faculty. Her motto for every new member was, "Be prepared to put your whole self into teaching."

**ROBEL:** Thank you, please stand. [All stand in silence]. Please be seated. [All sit]. Mr. President?

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**TERRY:** Thank you. First of all welcome back to yet another meeting. You have in front of you a list of the BFC committees for this year. They are complete. I hope that when you look at them you'll see that we have a good group of folks serving the Council on members of the committees this year and I, and I hope you, are grateful for their service. Also before you is a list of members of the BFC who are also members of teams of the campus strategic planning effort. We did that informally at the last meeting. People held up their hands. We decided to actually publish it. As you can see, we have members on most of the teams. In many cases those members are ex officio members of the Council, but they are members of the Council and they are faculty colleagues. What I want to assure you is that we will set up ways for those members of the teams to talk to each other to talk to the Long Range Planning Committee, and to meet, if necessary, physically as one part of the effort to keep the strategic plan and the Council working cooperatively. Professor Joel Stager of the School of Public Health will continue as chair of the Long Range Planning Committee, he therefore becomes a member of the BFC Executive Committee, and he and the Long Range Planning Committee will work with Vice Provost Venkat who is the primary coordinator in the provost's office of the strategic planning process. I am confident that faculty views on the issues assigned to the teams will drive what they ultimately recommend, that the BFC will be kept informed as the process moves forward, and there will be appropriate opportunities for the Council and relevant

committees to weigh in on the plan before it's adopted in any final form. I expect we'll devote time to it in the spring as it comes together and is finalized.

A word about the next Council meeting, October 1<sup>st</sup>, it will not be a regular BFC meeting, rather it is the regular State of the University address from President McRobbie. It will be not here, not in the Union, but in President's Hall in Franklin Hall. I happened to run into Tom Morrison this morning he assures me doors will be completed and opened in time to get into the building for that meeting. You have no homework for the next meeting but I hope you can attend as the speeches do amount to a summary of presidential plans for the coming year. I did assign homework last time. It was to prepare for an appearance here by Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, David Johnson, that annual report, asking him questions about the undergraduate student body, recruitment, and hearing from Vice President Morrison about parking and about the possible move of a campus fraternity were to be the agenda. I imagined that these items might each take up about half of our meeting and that was a reasonable time for each. The proposed new Media School in the College of Arts and Sciences have, however, taken priority for reasons that will become clear today. It's our first item. We have scheduled for sixty minutes, but I can easily imagine it will take that long and perhaps more. We have to deal with it today because it is scheduled – it intersects with the October meeting of the Board of Trustees. Since Vice President Morrison had already put us on his schedule, we're keeping him here today, but I ask your indulgence and his. We'll make sure that he makes his presentation and I hope there will be time for questions, but the demolition crews are not at the doorsteps and I am confident there will be time to continue this topic if we wish to do so on October 15<sup>th</sup>. I'll urge the Executive Committee to schedule it at that meeting if at the end of the meeting today, or if subsequently we find that desirable. After Executive Dean Singell spoke at a faculty meeting of CMCL, Communications and Culture, faculty on September 10<sup>th</sup>, it became clear that faculty across the campus, not just in the College, needed to discuss the plans that are proposed for this new school before it goes to the Board of Trustees, thus the Agenda Committee added and decided today's agenda and Provost Robel, Executive Dean Singell, and Interim Dean Major quickly agreed to come here today. Dean Singell has brought along several other of the College deans, he can introduce them. Except for the president who must ultimately make this proposal to the trustees we have the key players here today.

I wrote faculty in the School of Journalism, the College departments of Communication and Culture, English, and Folklore, for reasons that will soon become apparent and members of the College Policy Committee and asked each of them if they would send me questions related to the school and CMCL thought should be proposed to the provosts and the deans. I summarized what I received. It was quite a substantial body of communications, especially given the weekend and the Jewish holiday and the short time frame. I sent that summary to the provosts and the deans late yesterday. While they are here to answer questions from you, from the Council, I also trust that they will address the key questions they were sent. I want to make one personal disclaimer. I am an emeritus professor in the Department of Telecommunications, and therefore I have prior engagement with this issue and know the issues and the players well. I am trying very hard, at this point, not to be a specific advocate for Telecommunications, my gut job is to promote the policies that we have towards mergers and reorganizations to try and

help make an informed decision by the administration and by the trustees and make sure the faculty are heard. And I hope that all of those in media, CMCL, and in Journalism understand that I'm not a representative of my former department. I did receive one set of questions from the faculty that I think I should answer rather than the deans. Let me address those quickly. We have a campus policy on merger, reorganization and elimination of academic units and programs that was revised as recently as 2011. It's intended to assure the faculty are informed about reorganizations and have an effective voice in them. I was asked whether or not the BFC was going to put that policy into place now, and the answer to that is yes and why we didn't do it earlier when the school idea was first floated. Last year's Executive Committee I think did not put the policy into effect then because then there was not a specific plan for reorganization to respond to, and that's what really the policy imagines. There'll be a plan, it's out there, and then the policy kicks in to provide comment as it's refined. What we had was a report from a taskforce that the provost organized, and that she generally endorsed. I think we imagined last year, that the plan would be fleshed out, shared with the faculty, and then we would set up the review with comment periods that are contemplated in the policy. So far we haven't seen that refined a plan and so we haven't put D-16 into effect until now. Clearly there now is substantial indication that there will be a reorganization within the College. We're going to follow A-16. It calls for either the Executive Committee or – itself – or an ad hoc group that that committee creates to make faculty aware of reorganization, plans, receive and summarize faculty comments, and transmit those comments to appropriate administrators. I am recommending to the Executive Committee, that we create an ad hoc group, and included on that group representation of the College's policy committee as soon as possible, and that the group work with the provost and the College to inform the campus of reorganization plans as they develop. Unlike what was contemplated when D-16 was written, I think, this is going to have to be something of a rolling process as the development of the school and the reorganization of the faculty to carry it out will take place over time. I think you'll appreciate more about that after we hear today from the provosts and the deans. I'm sure we will have more to say about this on the 15<sup>th</sup> and to now we can move forward with today's business.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT**

**ROBEL:** Great! Thank you. And if it's okay with everyone since we have so many guests and we have so little time, what I'd like to do is just walk through a presentation – and Elisabeth where will that... ? Okay, thanks. And I thought it might help to first welcome to everybody who is not ordinarily here at the Council, it's good to have you here. It's nice to have a full room... let me see... [comment indistinct]. I thought what might be helpful today is to walk through the history of the development of thinking around the programs in Communication and Culture, Telecommunications, and Journalism to get a sense of what the steps have been leading up to this day to give a kind of overview of what the president will be asked to consider and whether – what he'll be asked to think about sending to the Board of Trustees, what would be included in that, and what would not be included in that, because I think that what would not be included in that is probably the critical thing for most of you here today. But, we'll see. So let's kind of walk through the history because I think not everybody probably has it and it might be helpful to have it.

Back in fall of 2009, the Board of Trustees asked for a report on the academic organization of the three programs we're talking about today. And my predecessor in this office, Karen Hanson, after communications with our – with the dean in Journalism and the dean of the College at the time – all of the players have changed the lengthy period of time since this all started – and the chairs of the departments of whom I think maybe Walt – Walt is probably the only remaining player there – the provost put together a taskforce on communications studies, and in March of that same year Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communications and Culture also convened a separate internal assessment of the academic organization of these academic units and our president was on that and several of the people in this audience were there as well. So the internal taskforce presented its report first and it essentially asked the question that you see up there; is the current structure outside the mainstream communication education at comparable universities? And the conclusion that that taskforce came to is there doesn't seem to be a consensus on optimum organization of the various units that we're talking about. It expressed concerns about any reorganization that would bring Journalism into the College or that would take Telecommunications and Communications and Culture out of the College. It did this based on a number of things. First, the idea that any upside that might come from combining these units would depend on resources and facilities that were not available at the time and I think in 2010 that was a pretty reasonable analysis of the situation. It did so based on the differences in methodology and I would even say epistemology of the various groups involved. And it did so because it didn't see at that point an upside or anything to react to. The report was pretty plain that in the absence of having some kind of something to react to, there wasn't much it could say other than we're fairly happy doing what we're doing right now. It did, however, see a lot of opportunities to have enhanced cooperation among the units. So I'm sorry it's small, but I thought it was important maybe to put up what the report actually said. It said it thought that there was a possibility that creating a new school would be one way to help overcome many of the barriers that have been noted by others, by the Board of Trustees, by students, by faculty, especially more moderate approaches do not work. The taskforce could envision circumstances in which external developments might make the creation of a new school more attractive to faculty and graduate students, and it mentioned two in particular. One was that Telecommunications had for some time been thinking about ways in which it could present a broader range of offerings in what it was calling mediated communication and that it was having some difficulties working that out with the School of informatics and it also said the convergence of media in information communication technologies is creating additional pressures on Journalism and Telecommunications to expand their offerings in ways that would lead probably to some more serious overlap than there already was. This was going on at the same time that the campus task force was looking at these same areas on the path of the provost and in answer to the question that had been posed by the Board of Trustees. And that taskforce in – up until May – held ten open meetings – meetings with the department chairs, with the departments themselves, with graduate students, undergraduates – and it issued its report on May 6, 2010. So what that report concluded was that at every turn it had been met with barriers among and between these departments, and even more consistently perceived barriers within the College between units, within the College, and those outside of it. The taskforce for reasons that will become apparent in just a minute said whether those barriers are real, exaggerated, or wholly imaginary, the



taskforce believes strongly that they are interfering with the educational opportunities for students and for the campus' ability to marshal its considerable resources to provide our students with the best education possible. So what kinds of things in addition to barriers, did the task force see? Well, it saw inadequate facilities. It said inadequate facilities appear to be causing significant barriers that Communication and Culture have, you know, media equipped classrooms, that there were – it was inadequate access to Telecommunications' state of the art production facilities, that Ernie Pyle was generally an inadequate facility for the educational programs that were being mounted there. And it concluded our urgent recommendation is that the faculty and leadership for Journalism, Telecommunications and Communications and Culture, together with the campus and university administration, act quickly to eliminate real barriers and demonstrate the fallacy of imagined or exaggerated ones. So this was May of 2010 – a while back. It also said that a new school that included Journalism, and elements of Communications, and relevant faculty from other units might be essential to respond to the challenges of teaching and research in these areas in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It noted the dean of Journalism's at the time concern about some – the need, or perhaps even the inevitability, of some form of integrated structure. It said all three of the units, we have considered offer important, yet unique perspectives on communication but it is not at all clear that in the current structure these separate organizations are moving IU to the forefront of this new and dynamic communication environment.

Now why with these kinds of recommendations around urgency and immediacy and inevitability, did the taskforce not make a recommendation in 2010, consistent with those proposals? With those findings? Well, this is the reason why. At about the same time in 2010 the president charged the New Academic Directions committee and that New Academic Directions committee was asked to consider all of the ways in which the university should be, might be, reorganized in order to provide the most effective research and teaching environment for now. I'll put this up on my website just as soon as I'm done, so it'll be available to everyone. The New Academic Directions committee met during 2010 and it issued its report to the campus in 2011. The president and the trustees accepted that report in 2011 and these are some of the recommendations of New Academic Directions. It said that despite what were fairly constrained fiscal environment at the time, we still needed to make strategic investments in existing and new programs. It said that it was important to reduce barriers and encourage inevitable alignments among academic units, make sure that we reviewed the policies that might heighten those barriers and seize opportunities for structural renovation. It – there's a lot of 'seizing opportunities' at play here typically – [Laughter]. It also said that as part of seizing opportunities for enhancing academic efficiency. We should focus specifically on small schools and consider the possibility of consolidating small schools to reduce the cost of administering our programs and free up more funding for academics. In the realm of structural innovation it specifically noted the things that you see up on the slide and you'll see that a lot of them – that you'll see in a moment – have moved through a process to greater completion and one of them in particular was media and communication, and the recommendation in New Academic Directions was to develop across a cross-disciplinary virtual school which I think was what we're proposing, and what SGIS in effect is. The report specifically said about communications and communication and media that we needed to think about ways to bring

together the complimentary and partly overlapping pieces, assets, in these fields, and it noted – and I completely agree with – how deep our archival materials are in film, and it noted the investments that had recently been made in the IU Cinema as cultural assets and intellectual assets that can be brought to any project that brought these groups of faculty together. It noted that there – it – what it called enormous new opportunities for degrees, for a higher national profile, for external funding. It noted faculty resistance to a new standalone school, and it ended up suggesting a comprehensive virtual school either within the College or as a unit that would serve as a bridge across Journalism and the College.

So what has happened since New Academic Directions? Well, quite a bit of structural reorganization; the elimination of the School of Continuing Studies and the replacement of it really in many ways with the president's online initiative, the transformation of health as – or education and recreation and public health, the new integrated program in the environment which has added – is in the process of adding – degrees and organizing programs around the environment and sustainability, a taskforce on an innovative program of design that is part of the strategic planning process that's going on right now, the merger of the School of Library and Information Science and Informatics to create essentially – well, really, the biggest of the information orientated or "I" schools in the country. The investment in that merger and several of the other places that we've seen in building faculty and the creation of new programs, the investment of campus funds, the creation of the new School of Global and International Studies and again of corresponding – corresponding investment in building – in the building and the faculty and the creation of programs.

Then in the fall of this past year, I put together a committee, asked for recommendations from the dean of the School of Journalism, the chairs of the departments, and the dean of the College to begin to give shape to what such an opportunity might look like if we pulled it together. That committee met throughout the fall, I believe it met with external constituencies and it issued a represent – a recommendation on December 19<sup>th</sup> that I shared with the campus. I was very clear with this group that I didn't want or need them at that point to make a structural recommendation, because it was clear from the long history I've just gone through that the structural recommendation was going to make some people unhappy no matter which way it went. If – if in fact at the end of the day we saw opportunities for making – for creating new knowledge and for creating new education programs that would make better the world and our students' experiences, that it was not going to be in a way that would make everybody happy. That just is, that was not possible given the three year, well actually at this point five year history here. Could you back up a second... ? So the – the recommendations were – were very curricular. They talked about combined undergraduate – a combined undergraduate degree, a number of tracks, the idea that we should have, we should develop some work in emergent media and from that point until March, we – oh, thank you – I asked for comments from the campus, and I got a lot. Although I will say that most of the comments I got came from Journalism and that Journalism [comment indistinct], in particular as had been noted by everybody up until this point, the structural piece was going to be a problem. It was going to be hard and it was not going to be something that everyone would agree about. There were concerns, a lot of concerns, particularly in Journalism about maintaining the things that the

Journalism faculty was particularly concerned it had managed to build up over time, so maintaining faculty lines, maintaining innovative programs, ensuring the continuing support for their students that the school had built over the years. There was a concern about the possible loss of visibility and prestige if Journalism returned to the College. There was concern in that regard about the size of the College. There was – and no one could agree on the name. I mean, I think it's fair to say that if we pulled these – this – set of wonderful intellectual assets together everyone will want their name first. Everyone will feel deeply wounded if that name is not first or worse yet, if the name isn't there. There are concerns about legibility to the outside world. There are concerns about programs and their internal legibility and there really are deep concerns about people's professional identity. So where do you feel that you belong, you know, in an academic environment?

So in the State of the Campus with this long background and with all of these comments, I said that what my recommendation would be to the president, and if he agreed, the Board of Trustees, would be to bring Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communications and Culture together in a new school within the College. In the time since the State of the Campus, the legislature has committed 21 million dollars to refurbishing and building out Franklin Hall which was one of the key concerns of – I think every group that has looked at this reorganization has been facilities and the possibilities of collocating as many faculty as possible. Not everybody in this building because we have some really good facilities around production, but a lot of the faculty in one place. Over the course of the summer the College and the School of Journalism worked to come up with a memorandum of understanding to address some of the issues that were particularly critical to the School of Journalism. And the way I described it to the folks working on it was, please try to come up with, not a ceiling but a floor, you know something that will assure that the faculty going into the this new structure will not feel that they're losing faculty lines, that they're – they won't feel that they're losing programmatic initiatives, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera... Because there are many wonderful things in the School of Journalism that need to be maintained and celebrated. We put together a committee to work on a program statement. A program statement in this context means simply what will the spaces in the new building be used for. So how do you imagine taking a building that has had such a life, you know? It was a library and then moved its way into the – it moved its way into a lot of administrative uses and now it's being returned to academic purposes and sits there right on the edge of the campus right when you come in. How do you imagine repurposing that so it's – it's full of life and full of – particularly classrooms, faculty and students? And then a small committee to develop ways to commemorate the legacy of Ernie Pyle, because it was clear that that legacy is something that as a campus we should celebrate. It's highly meaningful to our entire campus. It's meaningful to our alumni not just in Journalism, but across the campus. And if – if this new school will not be located in Ernie Pyle Hall, how can we make Ernie Pyle and his legacy visible to the rest of the campus? And thank you to those of you in this room who have agreed to help with that.

So a lot of what we've looked at so far is internal. You know, what do we want? How do we think about our organizing ourselves? How – what are the ups and downs looking inside at ourselves? I'd like to push us out to why the world might consider needing us to reorganize a

little bit. You know, what's in it for the world? You know for me part of the big set of issues that we need to think about have to do with what I would describe as the heart stopping erosion of outlets for excellent journalism in the world, you know? The need to think about ways in which we can bring together so many of the resources we have for creating story in a way that will help our students if they – if this is the path that they want to take. So I think that the – another piece of why the world might need us to reorganize is that the world has reorganized, it's reorganized. We've all been reorganized in – by the digital revolution that is all around us and that so many of you in this room study and understand. This particular little piece I bet most of you in the room have seen... . PC it's... [comment indistinct]. Is there anyone who wasn't seen this?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** I haven't seen it.

**ROBEL:** Not that many? A couple? What it does, this is a piece that the *New York Times* put out last year.

**VOICE FROM THE COMPUTER:** I had no ability to control what was happening to...

**ROBEL:** What it does is it takes every available form of storytelling and pulls it together to tell the story of a horrible avalanche and it does that not just in the context of deep and engaging scientific and investigative reporting, but it also does it in the context of having access to things like GPS data, lidar satellite data around – about geographic terrain. All kinds of embedded information that bring the journalism and the story – really the story – to life in ways that brought 3.5 million readers to the *New York Times* website within six days – half of them new to the *New York Times* website. So there's a digital revolution that is sitting right around the edges of how we teach and what we know about the way we are communicating and that many of you are studying and thinking about. We have undergraduate students who need to present legible and relevant credentials to employers and we need to experiment with forms of educating our students that do two things; that protect and preserve the liberal arts while providing pathways into professional education so that we are sure that over the course of the next five to ten years the College of Arts and Sciences stays healthy as well as the professional schools. So during the summer and fall of – of – well, while you were gone –

[Various comments about the progress of the slides].

So if we talk about, I'm going to say this is a working name that has not been approved by anybody at this point, you know? It's just a working name, because every time I put the Indiana University Bloomington School of Journalism, Communication and Film out there or try to rearrange the pieces it was pretty clunky. And I know this name's not going to make anybody happy either. But let's just start there for intellectual purposes so that we can think about it. So if we imagine this M school, and think about it as the pre-eminent public university site for teaching and research about the understanding of production of media writ large, communication within – within media. What would the elements of a new school look like? Well, possibilities would include num – a lot of things. We could talk about General Education,

new kinds of General Education courses that could look at media literacy in a way that would expand the campus. We would certainly be looking at synergistic liberal arts and professional education for all of the relevant pieces we've been talking about, and particularly experimenting with three plus two, four plus one, kinds of degree possibilities for our students. We would want, I think, to highlight what I believe to be incomparable assets in the study of film, collections around film, and film production. And informatics would like to work with this new entity to put together the beginnings of new kinds of education for our students around digital media, particularly starting with the digital media certificate. That is the last you're going to hear about curriculum for a reason I'll get to in just a minute.

So what kinds of assets do we bring to the table? But just in general terms with the broad – the broad – the widest possible lens. There are over 300 of us on this campus who study media and communication in one way or another. We have, as I mentioned, the film archives in the IU Cinema, we have excellent existing production facilities that we can bring to the table, we have the breadth that these three departments bring to the table to begin with. The humanistic inquiry coupled with the social science and the professional training. We have the largest "I" school in the country now, and that "I" school gives us the possibility for really building joint – joint certificates, joint degrees, joint programs – and for our students – from our students' perspective going digital fast, okay?

What would a proposal to the Board of Trustees include? It would include as I said back in March, a new school in the College of Arts and Sciences that includes at a minimum Journalism, Telecommunications, Communication and Culture. Pretty clear that, or at least we think it's possible that, not everybody who's in those departments now would want to be in a new school and so you'd want to have pathways elsewhere but that's, I think, that that's the kind of beginning space. As I mentioned, a certificate program with Informatics that allows us to begin to work on digital media production and a new facility in Franklin Hall. What a Board of Trustee proposal would not include: articulated curriculum or degrees, as with the School of Global and International Studies and every other merger and reorganization we've been through, curriculum is a matter for faculty development, you know? And that's where that takes place, and it would take place in the eighteen months after we get some approval from the Board of Trustees. It would not include new administrative departments, again, thinking about who wants to be in such an enterprise and who does not, people for whom it makes sense and people for whom it doesn't. Much like in SGIS, when we're dealing with core departments, core faculty, and affiliated faculty we'd start there. And it doesn't begin with the disillusion of existing departments. All of the New Academic Directions schools have included the following elements: all faculty are by faculty policy at the campus level entitled to be considered under the P&T procedures and substance in place when they came in. As I mentioned faculty in the new school create their own governing documents and curricula. That has been a piece of everything we've done so far. All students are always entitled to continue with their degree programs until they're done which means it always takes four or five years to – maybe even longer – to wind down anything and start up something new, and of course it almost goes without saying, but I'll just say it, any endowments or any gifts that have been given in support of people's programs are governed by donor intent and those go with the programs, where the

donor intends them to go. So that's, that's basically it. Is there anything at this point you would like to say Larry or should we just – how would you like to proceed?

#### **AGENDA ITEMS 5–6: SCHOOL OF MEDIA UPDATE AND QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**TERRY:** I would like to see what Larry does have to say.

**SINGELL:** I mean, I think probably that will generate questions and probably the most effective way to proceed is to allow people to ask questions.

**ROBEL:** That makes sense to me. And how much time do we have at this point?

**TERRY:** I promised Tom at least twenty minutes, so we have close to an hour.

**MORRISON:** I'll cede my time. [Laughter].

**ROBEL:** No, no I'm sure of it! [Laughter].

**TERRY:** We need a larger meeting room with more seats.

**ROBEL:** Okay. Yeah, Gracia?

**CLARK:** I'm interested that – why do we need a new school for this? Because it doesn't address the main – why don't we have a virtual school like they suggested? It doesn't address the main problem of problems with cooperation and joint curriculum and joint studies between schools in general and between College departments in general. It doesn't include – I mean I can think of people in different departments English, science, history–

**ROBEL:** Sure, who would want to be affiliat –

**CLARK:** – who would be involved in media studies and it wouldn't make things any easier for them necessarily and the same could be said of a variety of other topics so –

**ROBEL:** –Are you asking –

**CLARK:** –I'm wondering –

**ROBEL:** –why do something like SGIS? What are... ?

**CLARK:** – Well, it just seems odd to me. I'm wondering why they said a new school would be necessary even though it was recommended against and was not really supported by the faculty involved.

**ROBEL:** Well, I – I'm not sure that I would agree with all the premises there.

**CLARK:** Okay.

**ROBEL:** I'd start with some significant history of people recognizing that there are things to be gained by bringing these, these, these departments together. The difficulties that were outlined in the – in all the reports leading up to this about the operation across school boundaries are a piece of that. I think there are certainly lots of reasonable positions one could take around any of these reorganizations and I suspect that there will be a large number of quite reasonable positions here. But the thing that we're – that is, I think, compelling about bringing this group together in this way is that it allows us to think about building curricula together. And so far, no matter what might have been possible theoretically, staying the way we are, in fact staying the way we are, we haven't taken those opportunities and so, this is a – this is an effort to help facilitate that; to free up some resources, to make available some resources, to build some pieces into a new school that would allow for some of the things that have historically been identified as problematic like facilities. Will it be perfect? No. I mean, there's no perfection in academic organizations.

**CLARK:** But it still said cooperation has to be within a school. I mean, say, someone like school of art has media people –

**ROBEL:** Well, we start – we start with cross-school cooperation with Informatics, but I think most people who've looked at this have identified barriers and this is a – this is a chance to try to eliminate some.

**SINGELL:** I mean, I would also say that I mean I think that it's very difficult when there are unit separations to forge – you have to forge an agreement for any kind of partnership that one has to have and by bringing the faculty together and providing a collective set of resources that are shared and where there's a common vision for how those will be used – will allow them to be used – it is very difficult if you, if you were – if you were in Communication and Culture and you wanted access to the production facilities, it was very difficult for them to get access to that. And any agreement that would've been struck, if they didn't have the property right to it, if they didn't have the access to it, it was going to be very difficult for them to be able to do this. Now with the collective group of individuals making decisions, the allocation of those scarce resources amongst them will be done on the basis of what makes programmatic sense and not on the basis of who happens to have the production facility. So I mean, I don't think a virtual – I mean when I first arrived, I had a discussion with the chairs of the two departments in Communication and Culture and Telecommunications and Dean Hamm, and – and truthfully I mean we were trying to make progress on that but there – in the end, was the solving of the be able to access to facilities was not going to be solved by the [comment indistinct], it just was not.

**ROBEL:** Yeah?

**MCGREGOR:** Building on your comment that that strategy strives by looking at the outside world and what is going on out there and agreeing with that. In other words, did your survey include looking at what the outside world is doing with regard to this kind of education? I think immediately of the major – I think they're probably professional schools – but to think of Edinburgh and Penn, Columbia, Missouri, on and on – Newhouse – there's a list of major players that seems to be – establish what might be an industrial standard, which any new school that's going to compete in this arena would have to meet. And then the question would be then what – what were the findings if that analysis were done?

**ROBEL:** Well, I luckily was able to build on the work of four committees, not just one and a lot of discussion and I – I think I agree with the internal group that said there's no... It depends on where you – what you think your best assets are, how you build towards the future. I – I think we're in a world in which people are have – are struggling, frankly, to build towards the future in this area. They're feeling a lot of stress around these programs. A lot of programs are disappearing across the country. We have phenomenal programs so one – one way to think about this is not can we – can we be – can we compete with USC over all of film studies or around film production but what can we best do with all of the assets we have at this moment in time. That's – that's essentially the best we can do. I – I think that the assets we have are pretty phenomenal and I would hate to see any of them lost or not – not get the resources because they stayed below scale. This gives us scale.

**SINGELL:** The other thing I guess I would say to you is the following, which is just that I think that IU doesn't necessarily want to replicate what other people are doing because I think we want to position ourselves in a particular niche that it gives us something that is competitive in some broad sense of those schools but also uses out assets to give us some unique character that attracts a particular kind of students that I think –

**MCGREGOR:** So a brief answer would be to say, let's break new ground.

**ROBEL:** Let's break new ground. Let's break down some barriers that – that pretty much everybody has identified let's put some resources on the table around these programs, and let's see what smart faculty can do with it. I – I would bet on smart faculty in these areas any day of the week. Yeah, Carolyn?

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** Yes, would you clarify the last slide? I thought I saw in the last slide a comment that said something like the report that you will be presenting to the Board of Trustees in October would not include the dissolution of existing departments. Is that a fair statement?

**ROBEL:** Yeah, that – yes!

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** Okay.



**SINGELL:** So let me articulate. I think this a fair one for me to answer and the reason why is because I mean this is –

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** Okay – may I – may I finish please first? I need to preach another point here and that is, does this mean you're simply not going to recommend it to the Board of Trustees, but that you are really going to dissolve the Department of Communication and Culture?

**SINGELL:** So, if you remember the original report that came from the faculty, the original report from the faculty said that that all the faculty would come into the into the school but that the – the – the departments that were in there – there was nothing called "Telecommunications," or nothing called "Communication and Culture," and in fact it moved faculty around in a way that they were not going to be positioned necessarily in the way they were. This – this report most definitely says, look there will be units in there, now you're not going to see a Department of Telecommunications or Communications and Culture because it, in the context of where this, the – the vision of the school that doesn't make sense. That's the first thing.

The second thing, and I mean I went and talked to Communication and Culture first about this, and I talked about the fact that when – when this proposal was being developed the thing that I began to become concerned with was that by calling it a "Media School" and then going in that emphasis and I think that that's the vision for the school and I will defend that vision as the appropriate one, I began to be concerned that College faculty would not necessarily – who were in Communication and Culture – would see themselves fitting into that unit and so what I wanted to do in advance was to talk to them about the fact that this could be a possibility and that – and that in fact the – if that is a possibility what might be alternatives because I thought that I was responsible for taking, you know – deal with the implications – strategic implications – of coming up with the proposal for a school if some significant fraction of the faculty don't necessarily see themselves in it. So it was really, I mean when I came to the department, I said here's something that I envision happening and I talked about Folklore and I talked about English and the potential changes. I was saying I could imagine this is a something that would make it successful for the faculty. I also said nobody would be forced – to be able to join any one of these organizations I mean I – once the proposal is before the Board of Trustees and it's out in the open people are going to be able to see where they might fit and then have a choice to be able to do it. And we're going to follow procedures that the campus has with regard to where faculty go and if you know CPC policy it says look, both the sending and the receiving unit have to agree so it is not going to be the case that you can say well I'm going to become part of this Media School and because I want to be part of this Media School, the Media School is going to have to do X, whatever X is, it is not consistent with the vision. So I am not – we are not saying – that yes you can come in here and you can do whatever you want, that's a – that's a different statement, but we are saying that there will be freedom for faculty to be able to come in and say here's the vision of the school do you imagine yourself here. If you don't imagine yourself here, we are willing to work with you to try and find some place for you to go. And – and there is flexibility about how you see yourself in there. I mean, you know, we're willing to learn with you and have a – you know there's eighteen months to have a discussion

about it, but I mean I do believe there is a vision for the school and that vision does mean that some departments may choose not to – or some faculty members in these departments may not choose to participate in this.

**ROBEL:** And I – I think it's important to emphasize what – what the Board of Trustees is being asked to do if the president approves it. I mean we still have another stage to go and that is the what – what's critical for the Board of Trustees is the bringing of Journalism into the College and into the new school, that's the – that's the structural innovation. The rest, I think, is we've got ages to work that out. We need to start talking about it –and we have, but – but we've got a long time to work that kind of –

**HATLEY–MAJOR:** And that's faculty input –

**ROBEL:** – and that's faculty input –

**HATLEY–MAJOR:** – that's faculty who determine what this looks like and I think that's important in terms of [comment indistinct]

**ROBEL:** Can I work my way around? Thanks.

**HASS:** I think I'd be more concerned if I was on the inside of the school than the outside. I am on the outside of the school. I teach computer music and media at the Jacobs School and like Fine Arts I think we were both a little less vocal than Informatics about potential overlaps and this school moving into the areas that we've traditionally excelled. And I – I do – I welcome that diversity and in fact two of my students teach sound art for telecomm so I hope we collaborate across schools, but do we need to have – those of us on the outside that may see part of our mission being duplicated – do we need to have any concern about that? About our student base being diluted or is there something else that you see as a possibility?

**SINGELL:** So this is something like I would say with regard to SGIS. I mean, one of the things that this school is actively – I mean and it's part woven in the DNA of the proposal – is that we want to form partnerships with the other schools, and if in fact you're doing something well and doing it excellently and it folds into what it is that we do, we'd like to make it part of what the school is. So SGIS is trying to build programs that sit up between the border of the College and whatever unit it is, and I imagine the same thing. So in fact what I would encourage you to do, would be in fact say, we're doing this thing and we're doing it really well and we would like to participate in this and here's a joint program that we could do and that's exactly what's happened with SGIS. There are joint programs that are happening and I would imagine the same thing would happen here. So I do want you to be able to be – to articulate what it is that you think you do well. If there is a potential of overlap and then a way in which we could potentially partner, because we'd actually like to make use of that to be able to give our access – our students' access – to what you do well and give your students access to things that we do well and maybe we can both benefit.

**HASS:** Although I think that it was the last week that somebody in the Council made the comment about how difficult it is to get faculty support for working collaboratively across schools because none of us get credit for that. So that would be something I would love to see attended to with any collaboration.

**ROBEL:** I agree and – and in fact, it's one of the critical questions that we're looking at in just a number of the strategic planning groups. You know people often talk about that as an RCM problem and I – I actually think of it as a – as a – as just a plain problem. It's a – if you're in a non-RCM environment talk to your colleagues who are in non-RCM environments and ask them if their interdisciplinary initiatives are, you know, soaring with ease and no work on anybody's part. It's – it's the difficulty of interdisciplinary collaboration and that's something as our – as a campus we have got to – I think all of us agree – we have to get better at.

**SINGELL:** But there are some examples of things that are arising as a result of this mad thinker successful model sitting in the Kelley School of Business and Don Kuratko proposed an entrepreneurship degree that would have students from the College take classes in Kelley and in partnership with SGIS there would be some classes offered in SGIS and it would be a joint – a joint program – certificate that was held well between Kelley and the College and so I think there – there are some things that are beginning to emerge that might facilitate that as ways [comment indistinct].

**ROBEL:** I – I love the fact that Informatics is at the table from the start on this because that's certainly isn't – something that's been historically difficult and I know that it's something that matters a lot to faculty in the College and I also know that it's a place where we need to nest some resources so we – that's a wonderful insight. Yeah?

**HASS:** I'm curious about student voice will be included in the process.

**ROBEL:** Well, there's been a lot of student voice, although it's been – as it is always with students over time, over the long period, the five years since the Board of Trustees first raised this question. I would love suggestions about how to include student voice. I think the difficulty, the graduate students, it's critical you know, particularly for graduate students. They need to understand what their programs are leaning towards, that they won't be dismantled, that they, you know, the – their degrees will – will be visible and meaningful to the places where they go to work. You know for undergraduates it's just a lot tougher.

**SINGELL:** But can I also interject here, too? When the committee put together the report we had town hall meetings. Students were invited to that, and they had an opportunity to give input both graduate students and undergraduate students. Tomorrow I'm actually going to lunch with students from Journalism and, and I'm taking them out to lunch, and I'll listen to what they have to say because I'm interested in what it is they're trying to say. So I mean there are various ways in which we can have touchpoints with regard to that. I think that that's going to be important. So undergraduates are harder because they're here for four years and they don't necessarily have the long term vision of the College and –

**ROBEL:** The other thing – and Lesa you can chime in here – what I’ve been hearing from undergraduates is – and I hope you find this is encouraging as I do – I trust the university will do good things for my education.

**HATLEY MAJOR:** And I’m Lesa Major, Interim Dean. And Jean said – Jean Robinson of the College – said, “Introduce yourself people may not know who you are.” So I’m Lesa Major, Interim Dean, the School of Journalism. We have had a place and Anne [comment indistinct] our communications director as well has had a place a place on our website that is a merger update for the School of Journalism. It’s also had place for students to comment, alumni to comment, and so we have done quite a bit of that. I also ask professors and other students if I can go into their classrooms to talk to students about the update and then get input. And I’m joining Larry’s lunch tomorrow and I think that we’ll begin – we’ll do that as we move forward the same way we have faculty input on what’s happening, we will do the same with our students to hear what they have to say.

**SINGELL:** And I’ve already met also with telecom in advance. I actually met with Telecommunications students and Communications and Cultures students and took them last year, I had several – a series of lunches in which I went to – went to lunch with them and asked them questions and the recommendations that came from those departments about who would be someone good to talk to. So I mean I have begun those conversations and tried to hear what they’ve had to say.

**HATLEY MAJOR:** And we’ll keep going.

**SINGELL:** Yeah, it’s not over.

**HATLEY MAJOR:** It’s not over.

**ROBEL:** That – that’s the main point I want everybody to take away from today. We’re not at the point of, you know, curriculum and degrees and – other than the certificate with Informatics, which I do feel very good about, but –and you know structures. I think that when these faculties are assembled, my guess is that there will be some – some interesting conversations about organizational and structure, there have been in every reorganization. But we’re not – we’re not there yet. You know we’ve got a lot of time in front of us to have those conversation. Yeah?

**CLARK:** It does seem to me that you’re having the conversations after the reorganization takes place, and then we’ll discuss what the programs are and that seems a little bit reverse order to me. I also had a specific question though which is, you say that no one will be forced to join the – the new school and if they opt out, for example, of Communication and Culture will there will be a Communication and Culture department, will they have to find a home in another department?

**ROBEL:** Well that's – those are decisions that – that what the reorganization policy and what our campus policies say and what I believe is that faculty should make judgments about where their work – their work will be facilitated. And so, if we start as we did with SGIS, or as we did with moving SLIS into Informatics, if we start with the idea that we're moving groups of faculty within their departments and programs then at that point faculty can say this just doesn't work for me. It's not – it's not who I am. There should be other options in a campus as large as ours, and I think there will be. I am clear there will be.

**CLARK:** What about people from other programs who may want to join for the –

**ROBEL:** – I think that's – that's also possible! One of the –

**SINGELL:** – So – so in – in SGIS, eleven faculty have already chosen to join SGIS and move their lines from other units into SGIS. And I could imagine the same thing could happen here, they'll have an opportunity –

**CLARK:** – But for example, the area studies centers were not offer the choice of whether to go into SGIS or not.

**SINGELL:** No, they were not, but they're actually – those faculty have their lines in departments not in area studies. The area, I mean, again there are examples like that with regard to the school, but this school has a conceptual framework to it. It is not – we're not saying we're doing something, I mean, the fact that me–

**ROBEL:** – We're not teaching federal jurisdiction in here.

**SINGELL:** Right, I mean this is a Media School and it has certain attributes to that, and there are certain things that are related – related to being able to teach media effectively. So there's no doubt that it has a shape to it and that will affect the way in which faculty decide to sort into it or not. And in fact, I mean, I tried when I became worried about the fact that, you know, in particular Communication and Culture might not find – all the faculty find themselves there – I then began to think about well, are there other places or discussions that have happened on campus that could be worthwhile and in fact, I mean, those conversations are happening. Nobody's being forced into it, but for example, the English faculty and the rhetoric faculty are beginning to have conversations about whether we could form a rhetoric program, and that English could transform, and I actually think that's an exciting opportunity to think that we're talking about was something that would make the campus better and that I actually think would potentially provide those faculty something that they could genuinely be excited about, and if we invest resources, could in fact do something that they would feel really good about. So it's a proposal and it's a proposal that's competing with well, do you see yourself in some other place, like in the new school? And I think those are the conversations that have to happen. And by the way, I mean, it's not in advance, I mean, we had a draft proposal, I mean – I mean liken this. You are academics in this room and all of you have submitted your work to outlets. We don't have discussions about drafts with referees and with journal editors and

things of that nature. We provide them a finished proposal, and that, this proposal the biggest part has been Lauren and I trying to establish what it is that seems reasonable and talking.

**ROBEL:** –and Lesa–

**SINGELL:** – and Lesa, excuse me, and Lesa being involved in that conversation. So we've been having that conversation all summer with regard to –

**CLARK:** – so the vision is basically the vision of the few.

**ROBEL:** No, the vision has come out of that long process and all of those comments.

**CLARK:** Sure.

**ROBEL:** I mean that's – that's what is informing this at the end of the day, you know New Academic Directions and the – and the various directions that – that came out of that report around thinking about how to free up resources for academics, you know, how to assure that we lower the level of administration and make the – make those resources available to academics, how we achieve scale, how we – how we work with what people have said to us for the past five years. You know, that's where this has come from.

**SINGELL:** It's also the case that I think there are multiple constituencies here as well. I mean, you know, we talk about students are a constituency, and we – and I think there's been a real interest in saying what do our students want or need? There's faculty, and faculty have been involved in this process. They may not have felt as – as good about it as they could be, but there have been multiple touchpoints over many, many years which is what her – what Lauren's PowerPoint demonstrated. There are also the College interests that need, and Journalism's interests in making sure that those things are met. There are alumni interests and, you know, a big issue with regard to Journalism when we were having our initial discussion was making sure that the alumni felt like, that this was something that was meaningful. And obviously the president has to approve of this as well, and so this is not something – and then the Board of Trustees. So, I mean, there are multiple constituencies and there may not be perfect alignment. In fact, I'm certain that –

**ROBEL:** –There won't be. There just won't be there –

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** – Provost Robel –

**ROBEL:** Yeah?

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** May I ask a question?

**ROBEL:** Well –

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** – If I'm not out of line in terms of the–

**ROBEL:** – I just want to be sure that everybody–

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** –Okay.

**ROBEL:** – who has a question and would like to ask it gets an opportunity –

**UNKNOWN FEMALE VOICE:** – Is it possible for other people to speak who aren't–

**ROBEL:** –but yeah – yeah–

**UNKNOWN FEMALE VOICE:** Are you sure?

**ROBEL:** Susan?

**SEIZER:** Thank you. I think one of the things that's just happening right now in this last conversation is that the faculty it seems you know [comment indistinct] heard something very different from Dean Singell last two weeks ago Friday which was that – that our department was to be dissolved and that only the film and media faculty were invited to join the new school. I'm hearing something very, very different –

**SINGELL:** – Well that– that's not what I – what I said was the following, which is that the way in which the direction of the proposal was going being, the obvious fit in the school was the film faculty.

**SEIZER:** –Right.

**SINGELL:** Those are the obvious fit. The proposal has a vision to it. Those are the obvious fit to it, and I said, given that that's the case, then what are alternatives that might happen? And – and it is the case that the faculty proposal broke up CMCL.

**ROBEL:** The–

**SINGELL:** – Right? I mean it did – CMCL was not going in full, neither was Telecommunications.

**ROBEL:** – And I would never argue with a communications scholar about –

**SINGELL:** – what – what was heard versus what was –

**ROBEL:** – what was heard versus what was said. So I take that – [Laughter] so I take as a starting point what you heard, so that's–

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** So we still exist as a department and we will exist if we will it to be?

**SINGELL:** No, I didn't say that either. [Laughter].

**ROBEL:** –Well I – here's the– well let's let Susan ask her question and then we can come back and – and talk–

**SEIZER:** Yeah, so my question is very simple – is just is the department, are the faculty members of the department of the Communication and Culture all invited into the new M school?

**ROBEL:** From my perspective that's not an issue for the Board of Trustees right now, and I think that the – once we get, if we get – may not, you know, but if we get past the Board of Trustees, I think at that point, we have to think about – the Board of Trustees' proposal will not say dissolve Communication and Culture. I think once we get past the Board of Trustees we'll have to have a conversation about what works. There – the various kinds of proposals I've seen so far have not had any departments. I don't know if that's workable. SPEA has tried that, and they've had mixed success I think. SPEA people can speak up with their own views, but I – I think there are pros and cons with departmental structures, and I think it's likely that not everybody's going to want to be in the – in this new enterprise. But that's not the decision that has to be made today. That's a decision that we have a good eighteen months to make and to talk about.

**SEIZER:** My final follow up question is, why aren't we seeing the proposal before it goes to the Board of Trustees so that we can understand –?

**ROBEL:** – Well you've basically – you've basically seen it. I mean the – so what are we talking about? What is the Board of Trustees being asked to do? The Board of Trustees is being asked to allow us to create a school of media that includes or – let's use that as the working name – that includes the School of Journalism, brings the School of Journalism into the College and includes, at a minimum, Telecommunications and Communications and Culture. We may well end up as a faculty thinking that's not exactly the structure we want for our internal organization, but, for instance, when – I think when SLIS moved in they thought in the beginning we need to be a department still within Informatics and Computing. Is that accurate Tom? But – but I don't know whether in the long term that's where we're going to end up with all of you thinking makes the most sense – I just don't. But the reason we're having this conversation today as opposed to some other time, is because the president of the BFC was concerned that there's a proposal going to the Board of Trustees and I wanted to be sure that you understood the limits of that proposal, you know, it's not a proposal to develop a major in X, Y, or Z, except for that certificate in digital media, but other than that, it's not that. It's just not, you know, it's – it's a – it's a bigger concept than that.

**SINGELL:** The – and what I would also say is I mean you know you work in performance studies. What I can tell you is the way in which the – we – we envisioned it with media studies, it doesn't necessarily make – make for you to feel comfortable in there. If you look at what we propose and you say I see myself in there, and we have a conversation that says it makes sense



for you to be in there, that's fine. But I thought that I had to be honest with you in advance about talking about the fact that here's the direction – this is transparent. I'm trying to talk to you about where we were heading with regard to this. The way in which it looked like it was being considered, a media school is not what people – all the people in performance studies do. They don't. So the question is, if that's what the school is called, and that's what we're envisioning, are you going to feel comfortable and if not, what are the alternatives? And I began those discussions with you at that point, and I – and I still believe that's the case so–

**ROBEL:** – It may – it may be that you decide that you want to have something completely different. I mean that's – but that's – we're not at that point. I think – I think that's the one piece. If you go away from this meeting with nothing else, go away with the firm understanding that what the Board of Trustees is being asked to do is – is most critically to bring the School of Journalism into the College, into a new school. I mean, that's the structural piece for the board. I'd like to start with a group of faculty that includes Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, but there's noth – there's no axe hanging over everybody at this moment. We've got a lot of time – a lot of time to have these conversations –

**HATLEY MAJOR:** – And Lauren it also – I think it's important to remember this proposal, I mean, we did start with the proposal that was generated by –

**ROBEL:** – Right–

**HATLEY MAJOR:** – the committee in December. That's what we started, and in bringing Journalism into the College and thinking about the units, you know, starting with Communication and Culture and Telecommunication, we were looking at innovation as well. We were looking at how do we integrate these three? How do we break down silos and barriers and resources? I mean, this was coming from a place of innovation and of thinking how can we, at Indiana University do something that would create something – I know we keep saying innovative and that's – that's not always an easy thing to capture. And I mean what this does, I think, in this proposal is give a view, this overview, this broad look at what's possible in bringing these three units. "Snowfall" is – is an example of what happens when you bring media together with the use of photographs, digital, all these different things. And so, to me it seems like after – once we do – if the Board of Trustees approves this, then we have time to think about bringing faculty together, students together, to look at what we can do again to be innovative–

**ROBEL:** What we can do best–

**HATLEY MAJOR:** – in many different ways. And innovation can look like many things and involve many types of people and different things.

**ROBEL:** I feel like– I often have this experience in class where I forget about an entire side of things [laughter] in an auditorium of course, so is there anyone on this side who has a question?

**BAHLOUL:** [Comment Indistinct] question but it's not that I – has there been some thought to – since the beginning of this project in other organizations about how Indiana University would compare to other universities who have similar projects –?

**ROBEL:** Yeah?

**BAHLOUL:** – Initiatives through media and how would the current project, as it is now [comment indistinct] – but how would Indiana University compete with other universities in attracting students to come here rather than elsewhere?

**ROBEL:** I think indeed that is the – that is the critical thing that has been driving these discussions is a sense that we want to make the – the programs as competitive as possible to, you know – and as educationally competitive as we can, and make space available for the kinds of research and the kinds of production facilities that – that everybody has said that we need and we want. I don't – I – nobody has been – there is some common ground here in all of this, all these conversations. And it's the common ground that we start with, and the common ground is, it would be really wonderful to have as many of the faculty who think and write and teach in these related areas, collocated as possible. Will it be possible to collocate every single person? No, because we have these wonderful production facilities that we don't want to just, you know, give up at this point, but we'd like to build more. Would it be – everyone seems to agree – it'd be wonderful if the students who are involved in creating media of all forms had common space to get together. Everyone seems to agree that it would be really terrific if we could make the facilities available to students and faculty better. And everyone seems to agree that we have incredible programs to bring together, and that barriers do in fact exist to working together. So is this perfect? No, it's not. Is anything perfect in – in the academy or life or any other way? I don't – I don't think so. Mike, did you have a question?

**CONWAY:** A couple of comments and questions from our faculty members from Journalism who couldn't be here. Some of them we've kind of been through but I'll throw them out there. And this is – since we're all pretty use to getting bits and pieces of information of what's going on, that's where some of this comes from. One person says they've heard it will be a professional school, what does this mean in terms of research and the graduate program and overall [comment indistinct] mission of the school, if that's the case it is supposed to be professional?

**ROBEL:** What I – the way I described it was synergistic liberal arts and professional education, and what I meant – what I mean when I say that is that we take a – the grounding of a liberal arts degree and provide students with professional pathways. So there are many ways you can do that. They can be three plus two programs. They can be three plus one programs. They can be four plus one programs. They can be certificates. They can be – there are lots of ways you can do that. That's – that's the bigger picture here. So I – I understand that in the College there have been long standing concerns about professionalization and in Journalism there have been long standing concerns about deprofessionalization, and the goal here is to try to allow us to do

something that creates pathways for students. I don't think – this is a research intensive university – we will never deemphasize research. I mean it's who we are. We are a residential, research intensive university and, you know, making the case for why that's valuable is the reason that we're all, all of us who are involved in strategic planning are doing it right now. I believe it or I wouldn't be doing this job. But – but that's, I guess that's my best response, Mike.

**CONWAY:** And then – the other one that has come up a couple of different ways, I think it probably has to do with the meeting at CMCL that – that at least according to these people they're hoping they're not – that it's not going to be so media focused that communications scholars will not feel comfortable because of such an important role that CMCL scholars have already within the meaning of communication. That hopefully it's going to be a school where these people are going to feel welcome because they're already a part of our – in the Journalism School, there are students' work and their hope – and in most of what we consider peer institutions communication as a research is part of what goes on at these places, so we hope that it will be inclusive enough for especially a mix of quantitative versus qualitative social science, humanities, and it's not skewed in one direction or another.

**ROBEL:** I think that's our strength, to be able to put those pieces together.

**SINGELL:** And again, I think if you were to look at the faculty in Communication and Culture there are a number of faculty who a priori you could expect fitting well into that mission. Right? And there are others that may not, and that – and the issue is, again – I mean, as conceptualized it's possible that some won't but it is – there's absolutely no doubt that if you look at Communication and Culture, the proposal says that in fact Communication and Culture will come in at – at least to fill faculty, and perhaps more, and it depends on that conversation that happens after the Board of Trustees consider the proposal.

**SEIZER:** [Comment Indistinct] I think you didn't want to have an influential discussion so I'll say it in one sense, I think that performance and media are entirely intertwined.

**ROBEL:** Well good –

**SIEZER:** So I don't – I don't – I can't see how get media without performance – human performance–

**SINGELL:** –Well, that again, that is the influential debate we will have–

**SEIZER:** I know. I know, but I just couldn't – couldn't feel comfortable leaving the meeting without saying that.

**ROBEL:** – How about – Thank you, and how about one more, and then I – I kept Tom Morrison patiently waiting over here to talk about –

**GOODMAN:** Wow, thank you, I get the last word. So I'm – I'm Jane Goodman, the chair of Communication and Culture and I did want to make two clarifications for the record of this body. The first is that the faculty report from last year did not say anything about splitting CMCL across schools. There were places made for all the faculty, and two emerging new configurations perhaps performance in media which has been extraordinarily productive at all points. The second thing that I wanted to say is that this is not a few people not fitting in. This is over half of the department of Communication and Culture, and really destroying the interdisciplinary synergies that we've have built up over the fifteen years of our existence as a very successful unit in the College, so I would want to see some rational for dissolving that kind productivity as this goes forward –

**ROBEL:** – I have heard, and agree.

**GOODMAN:** Thank you.

**ROBEL:** Okay. Can we – can we stop with the clear understanding that we're going to spend a lot of time talking about this in the next eighteen months?

**CLARK:** – Is the vision statement public?

**ROBEL:** That – I mean it'll be on the website with – this presentation will be on the website.

**CLARK:** I mean, we've been referring to it's not [comment indistinct]. Have we seen a vision statement?

**ROBEL:** That – there is not much more than what I just showed you here in terms of the overarching vision.

**TERRY:** So...

**ROBEL:** I think – I feel very strongly that until the president signs off on this, it is probably not right for us to release a document. I mean, because he's going to take it to the Board of Trustees or not. But if he takes it to the Board of Trustees we will have a long time, actually eternity, to really figure this out and to figure it out well [Laughter].

**HATLEY MAJOR:** Jeez.

**SINGELL:** I hope not.

**ROBEL:** Let me – let me turn it over to Tom Morrison at this point. Thank you so much.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR CAPITAL PLANNING AND FACILITITES**

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** Was it something you said? [Laughter].

**MORRISON:** This happens all the time. I think I'm tired just listening. I could understand it. In the – Mr. President I'll – I'll – handle this however you desire, in terms of format. I came prepared with – with slides if we needed to, but I know the hour is short, so I want to answer your question that folks might have and – and address the issues which I think you wanted to hear from me about so....

**TERRY:** I think we have a half an hour if you could go over parking and the – and the current issues. [Comment Indistinct] Before you'd arrived I noted that if we ran out of time we'd continue this discussion [Comment Indistinct]. Your version's up.

**MORRISON:** Yes. Like the provost, I want to make sure we have plenty of times for– plenty of time for questions.

Let me deal with – with the parking question first. And I learned a long time ago never come to a faculty meeting to talk about parking. [Laughter]. And I keep breaking that rule all the time. And let me also provide some clarity is that, my operation – responsibilities that we have, deal with the construction of parking, and the construction of parking garages, the demolition of such, but it's not who gets to park where. [Laughter]. So I have nothing to do with issuing passes, parking tickets, anything like that, so I'll give you that caveat now. One of the – the main issues of concern, or big changes that we've dealt with over the summer, and coming into the academic year has been the construction of the Global and International Studies Building. For some of you that's a really good thing that we've –we've started that project and it's underway on the site, which was the last building site on the brink of arboretum. We're – we're excited about that, it is off and going, but the downside of that of course is – is that, it took out that parking lot while we go through construction. After construction is completed, in a little under two years, it will be the summer of '15 when that project is completed, about half of that parking lot will come back. That doesn't help us today. One of the things that has come out of this is that lots of folks working together, including members of the faculty, people from the Wells Library, staff included, our parking and transportation teams, tried to figure out how do we handle this disruption, and over the summer came up with various plans. And while no question it is inconvenient, so far so good understanding a certain degree of chaos.

One of the things that we did was try to maximize the surface lot that is just east of the Health Center. So this would be just south of the SRSC, just east of the Health Center in terms of maximizing that as a new surface lot. One of the questions that we get asked from time to time is, well why didn't we build the parking garage before we started the building? And I, of course, always say why didn't we think of that? The reality is we did obviously think of that and – but it met opposition with transportation and the transportation parking committee because of what the impact would have been on rates. That was one of the reasons. One of the other reasons was there – there were – there are voices on the campus who believe we should not build any more parking, and so there was no appetite for what it would have meant to rate increases. So I was one of those people who was going down the hall to then Vice President Theobald saying, 'You know, we've got to build this parking garage before we build the building.' And he would

say to me, 'Tom, there's no receptivity for that.' And – so – therefore, building gets funded and we get off and going and the reason we don't have a parking garage. Now, once people understood that impact, now coming under the last round of parking discussions, people said, yes, we want the parking garage. So we are looking at adding a parking garage in the summer, starting construction at the conclusion of Global and International Studies. One of the reasons we're doing that, is that the parking garage will go on that surface lot I just talked about, just east of the Health Center. So – we're not going to take that lot out of commission while we're also building the building because that will create total chaos. So our goal is – is to start that construction when the building completes in two years, or just under two years, and then next summer we are investing some funds to renovate more of the gravel parking lot at the stadium so we can push more student cars and transient cars out to that location, so that'll free up more spaces in the interior of the campus. That's been a goal of ours anyways, and that – that gravel lot needs work in terms of some drainage and things like that. So that will be the goal for next summer. So that's a little bit of an overview of parking. I'm happy to answer any questions on that.

**TERRY:** I just had one. How is that plan affected, if at all, by the trustees' interest in possibly monetizing or privatizing our parking system?

**MORRISON:** We've tried to keep the capital planning of parking separate from that – understanding that we have to look forward and think about future – future garages as well. The only way it's impacted is if – should the trustees decide to go in that direction there's a question of who holds the debt on a new garage, whether it's someone who's external to the university or the university itself. And we've looked at two models for that. It's that the university could still hold all the capital and ownership and the debt, too. So –

**TERRY:** Option number three, don't build the garage is probably not being actively considered.

**MORRISON:** It is an option. I mean, it's an option. It's still out there. There are again still input that we receive who would say don't build any more parking and – and so – and that's the kind of input we need. I would – I would guess there'll be some people – one of the things that happens in times of chaos like this, is that people all find where they park, you know, they all find new homes, and –

**TERRY:** Finding an academic department [comment indistinct].

**MORRISON:** Finding academic departments. And they find a new place to park. It's just like when your road is closed, people find a different road and a different route and people may look up and say, you know what we're getting along just fine. We're planning in such that we're not just fine. But we – the option three is an option and we have a little bit of time to figure that out.

**WOOD:** So the construction of the new school disrupts not just traff – car traffic but all foot access to the library, the main access and so forth, and there isn't even a walkway right now for

the handicap parking from library directly to the handicap parking. You have to go around. So are there ever any plans to facilitate foot traffic from say the auditorium to the library rather than making people go out, around the auditorium out to Jordan or to the arboretum?

**MORRISON:** I – we understand the frustration of it. It's all a construction site and so there – there's no straight line to be able to be drawn between the library and say the auditorium. All of that is a great big hole in the ground, and so – because the building has a very wide footprint, and so this is a – it is a problem, is that people have to either go out to Jordan and up to 10<sup>th</sup>, or they have to go through the arboretum. And we've made accommodation for ADA access parking in what was the existing lot, so we've put accessible spaces in the – in basically in the construction zone and allowed that access into the building. But it doesn't help us with pedestrian sidewalk traffic because we can't join – there's no way to get from their stuff because it's all construction stuff.

**CALLOWAY–THOMAS:** How would – how many parking spaces will be near the Global Studies School? Any idea?

**MORRISON:** I do not know yet. That plan has not been fully developed yet, but it'll be in round numbers about half. So I'm guessing it will be a couple hundred. Any more questions on parking?

**TERRY:** Just to make it clear, once the building is done there will be more direct access –

**MORRISON:** Oh yes, absolutely.

**TERRY:** – between the auditorium and the libraries. This is a temporary thing brought about by –

**MORRISON:** – yes –

**TERRY:** – the large size of the, not the footprint, but the construction site itself.

**MORRISON:** Yes. Okay. Second issue that we wanted to discuss today that – that has generated lots of questions is our – the university's real estate – proposed real estate transaction along Woodlawn – Woodlawn and 8<sup>th</sup> regarding the – the construction of a fraternity house at that location. I'm going to give you some history on this and try to fill in all of the blanks for you.

The university has been for, at least thirty plus years, trying to acquire the Phi Gamma Delta house on 3<sup>rd</sup> street in between the law school and Swain, and the fraternity owns that house. So it's not on grounds – there are lots of deals where we own the ground and the fraternity owns the house. The fraternity owns the whole thing, and the university has been trying for decades to acquire it. It is the only Greek house that is central to the Old Crescent, to the academic core of the institution. Both the university and the fraternity had the chance to buy that property in the 1940's. The university took a pass, and none of those people are still living.

[Laughter]. I would be right with you in criticizing them, but – but that’s what happens when sometimes we don’t seek and take opportunity, and so the fraternity bought it, and they have had it all –all these years, and they’re very proud of it. The Phi Gamma Deltas are one of the strongest fraternities in IU’s history and so, when I came into this role I was given the task as my predecessors have, go see if you can get that fraternity house. [Laughter]. And – and one of the things that I learned early in those negotiations was there were a couple of nonstarters, and the biggest nonstarter was for me to go to the fraternity and say, we want to buy your house, and oh, by the way, you’re going to go to north Jordan like every other fraternity. And their answer right away was thanks, but no thanks, we’ll stay here. And – because they own the property and we can’t take it from them, so we could suggest that – I came up with lots of versions to try and get that to happen and again they had been through this before and said nice try. [Laughter]. And here was the – the part of this that kind of shaped it for us is that they – they absolutely wanted to look at other options from us, but they needed to renovate. One of the reasons we got back to the table was the house needed renovation. And the reason why this is time sensitive now is because if we were to allow them to renovate, in terms of their financing or whatever, they’re staying there for another forty years. So the time was now to seek if there was an opportunity. So we developed as the university, developed some other options. And of course we briefed the Board of Trustees with those as well, to make sure they were always consistent with our master plans. We looked at sites along 3<sup>rd</sup> St. We of course looked at Jordan, no question about it. We offered them the best site off Jordan. We – we looked at some other sites along 3<sup>rd</sup> St., and we looked at the site in question at 8<sup>th</sup> and Woodlawn, which – which was a – was a master plan site. The sites along 3<sup>rd</sup> St. were not big enough in terms of the floor plate that we needed to play with. Actually, I think if we had a big enough site we might have been able to get that done. So then we end up with the 8<sup>th</sup> and Woodlawn site. The 8<sup>th</sup> – contrary to some reports that have been out there – it is consistent with the master plan. If you look at the master plan images, if I put one up here, which I have with me, you’d see from the master plan diagram from a few years ago, there was a structure on the corner of 8<sup>th</sup> and Woodlawn, because in the master plan Woodlawn becomes the new main street of the university. It goes all the way through from 7<sup>th</sup> all the way up to the stadium facility. We’re going to actually put a railroad crossing in at 12<sup>th</sup> to allow people and busses to go north and south, so Woodlawn becomes the new main street. The university’s interest in 8<sup>th</sup> and Woodlawn was looking at that site next to the Theta house and say we want something that is facing Woodlawn that is strong. Then you get into, what are the consistent uses? Collins is obviously a residence hall on the corner, the Theta house is a sorority house, right next door to where the potential fraternity house goes. Then – so it made sense residentially to put that in there. The downside goes without saying. We’re going to take out six houses, in that – on that property. Now let me talk about that for a little bit.

Those are the – the houses themselves are not historic structures, that whole neighborhood is. That whole block from Indiana to 10<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> to Woodlawn is a – is a historic neighborhood. The structures are not. They are contrib – what are called contributing structures. One of the things that we will – so we proposed that to the fraternity. The fraternity liked that site. We worked out an agreement in principle. They have to raise money to build their new house. Part of that agreement with us as the university that made sense for the trustees and for us as



the university, was that we would control the architecture. We want that architecture to be consistent with the campus. We've had a long history of doing that whenever we do, and that – and that is consistent with how we handle fraternities, and so we maintained that in the agreement, that we would control the architecture. We also contained them to just that site next door to the Thetas. The Thetas like the idea of having a – you can think about why. [Laughter]. I – I often said as I was negotiating with attorneys for the fraternity, I said, 'Just give me ten minutes with the young men that are in this fraternity to tell them that they'd be next door to a sorority and I can get this deal done just like that.' Or beside any other sorority, but that's a sub-part. So we – we put control on the architecture of the space and the other thing that we've – we've talked about – which has been our practice for the last few years that if we're going to impact older structures like that, we want them to live as much as everybody else does. There are no better historic preservationists in this community than Indiana University. We – we invest lots and lots of – of money in preserving what we have – in preserving our history. This one is in the battle zone. This one is in between the front door of Woodlawn and – and the rest of that neighborhood, and frankly we own the majority of the rest of the neighborhood. All that big block that I told you about, I bet we own about 65% of it, and so we wanted to treat it most delicately. So as we looked at those houses, one of the things that we always offer up now a days is – is that people can move those houses, and particularly one on the corner. The one that's on the corner of Woodlawn and 8<sup>th</sup> is probably the most architecturally significant of those houses. And we would offer up moving that – that house – even us the university. The others we would offer up to others to come and – and Bloomington Restorations is a – is a nonprofit that works in such areas and they've taken some houses from us in recent years. We would offer that up again. There is nothing certain about the agreement right now. You're not going to see the houses come down tomorrow. This is an agreement in principle with the fraternity. They have to raise the money for their property, if they don't raise the money nothing changes. If – if they do they have to notify us and then we go through process. Now, one of the issues of you is – and how it ties into the academic function of the institution, is there are a couple of academic entities in those houses that are on that site. We have obviously – we don't go into this blindly – been working on plans on how to relocate those. A couple of those houses are empty. They have signs in the front of them, but they're really empty. The one on the corner is India studies. They move into the new School of Global International Studies, so that's a natural one. There's another one that is the student radio station, that's a natural one for Franklin Hall per your recent discussion. So there are a couple of these that take care of themselves, but we have our spokesfolks working on relocations there should we need to do this. So that's – I can go into lots more details. I'm happy to answer your questions. We recognize it's sensitive. I was more than willing to come today and update you on this because I think it is an important thing for the campus. It is consistent with the master plan the university and it has the support of the trustees and the IU Foundation. It is somewhat of a triangulated deal because legally how we acquire the fraternity house has to involve the Foundation, and how we deal with the properties of the – of 8<sup>th</sup> street of the university's properties. So there've been reports in the newspapers about the Foundation is building a new fraternity house, nothing could be further from the truth. The fraternity will build the fraternity house with our approval, but they will finance that. This is all

just in terms of how we triangulate the real estate. But I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

**MCDOWELL (FOR THACKER):** The fraternity house that you acquire there by the Law School in between, what is that going like – bulldoze it – what is it going to become? Or what's it planned for in the master plan?

**MORRISON:** I know there are some faculty who would like to be the first one to take a sledge hammer to it. [Laughter].

**ROBEL:** I use to say that for many, many, many decades the law school deans had always been defeated to the east. [Laughter].

**MORRISON:** In fact when I started at the university this was one – again one of the first things. I think Lauren said hello to me, shook my hand and she said, 'Get that fraternity.' [Laughter]. But on its face we will evaluate. We have a few other fraternity and sorority houses in our inventory that we've acquired over time. We will evaluate whether it's worth anything. If it's not, it'll come down. The question is then what happens to the site? Why do you want it so badly? It's either growth of the law school, that was the initial plan, or frankly it's growth of Swain for lab space for physics. That's why it's an important piece of real estate and so – maybe my law colleagues don't want to hear me say this, but we're looking at the renovation of Swain. So if they don't act quickly we may – some opportunities there for lab space there. So that's the – but initially if there's no other plans in place we'll evaluate it to see if there's anything we could use it for – for offices or anything like that.

**STONE (FOR SONI):** You may wonder why we stay, well we stay because this is another issue that affects the College. I'm in this odd situation where my son is a Fiji alum so I hear things about the –

**MORRISON:** Right.

**STONE:** – but most importantly and recently I'm hearing from the faculty and programs that are not going to be moving into GISB, nor into Franklin, who are very concerned about being able to be in a place where they can continue to do their collaborative scientific research. And there are all kinds of rumors out there that they're going to have to move in the next six months, and I need to find them another place. So is there a way that we can manage the information so that the faculty who are working in some of these houses, in centers, can be involved in the process?

**MORRISON:** Absolutely. You're absolutely right. There are those who will know where they're going and others that Theresa Thompson, who does space for us, who's working on that behind the scenes. The good thing is – is that we have a big inventory of houses to – to play with. So finding like space is not a problem. You know it may be the faculty actually have a chance to decide this neighborhood or that. So that's what I've asked Theresa and Jason Banach, who

does real estate for us, to come up with what are the options for some of those others, and then let's figure out which ones work best. The timing for us – for this, if it were to happen, and we've told this to the fraternity is of course during summers. We don't desire to do this in the middle of an academic year. That's totally disruptive to our faculty. We know that. So the benefit of this is to do it during – so that's why nothing's going to happen immediately. They respect that as well. So – but we are working on some of those other options. And what's been ironic for me managing space, over the course of my career in higher education, it used to be that if you were relegated to a house that was a bad thing, and now somehow, it's become this romantic thing that everybody wants a house, and maybe it's because we have some nice ones. I don't know.

**CLARK:** Particularly if you have a fireplace in the director's office.

**MORRISON:** Yeah, I just dealt with a faculty member a couple of days ago who I saw at a function and said, 'I heard you're taking my house.' [Laughter]. And this is a block away, or two blocks away. I said, 'No, no, no, nothing to worry about.' I said, 'Tell me how you're, you know, why do you like your house so much?' He said, "Well, I get to come in in the morning and make coffee and sit on the back porch." It sounded wonderful! I'm thinking one for myself. [Laughter]. So, that's how things have changed a little bit. So what's been interesting is that faculty say don't make me go back to Ballantine, [comment indistinct]. [Laughter].

**CLARK:** I know that I've been reading the e-mails from some of the community groups that are concerned and I'm sure that they have – I'm sure the improved information flow would be a big help to them, too, and they'll be – they're concerned about the neighborhood environment being preserved because that's the historic part after all, not the individual structures –

**MORRISON:** Right.

**CLARK:** They might be pleased if that were also taken into account in the design of the building as well as conforming to the university standards of you know –

**MORRISON:** Right.

**CLARK:** Limestone and stuff.

**MORRISON:** No, in fact, I had a discussion with the person who represents one of the neighborhood associations just – just this morning and – because I've offered to meet with people one on one just to try and do what I'm doing for your today. It's hard to do that in some other settings, but this one's a good one. But I met with her today and said, you know, we are confining them to that to – to kind of take off the table some of the misnomers. We're confining them to that half block, you know, doesn't mean that actually they didn't want to go further for a few more blocks for parking and things like that. We said no, it's just this half block. The architecture is such that we wanted to blend into that block of Collins, the Thetas, the Honors College building, which is a great example of, you know – we took down a house on

that corner and now look at that building, and so that's what we want to inform the vocabulary. By keeping the trees – if you look around that site the trees are great old growth trees and we want to preserve those as much as possible. We want the city to invest in the brick streets. Those are in really bad shape. [Laughter]. And we as a – as a – again as the majority property owner, we want to see that improved. One of – the battle in the master plan is that people said that we've – the master plan says that we want the neighborhood to maintain gas lamps and things like that. We do. This is the edge of that neighborhood, so it's where it touches the university. And I told them when we first looked at this issue, you know, you can say to yourself this one's going to be hard, and it is. But it is – I can point to lots of decisions over time that, in the university's planning where there were houses in the way and you look now and go well that was the right decision. I was just doing a master planning presentation and I have kind of a memory lane picture of the site of the Global and International Studies Building and Wells Library – there were a row of houses along there in 1961 and of course we took those houses out and now look at all what's in that site. And it doesn't make you feel good but – but that's how the university has grown over time.

**SPANG:** Do you have a – excuse me [cough] I'm recovering from a cold – nevertheless the text of the master plan, as my colleague alluded to, specifically says that the goal is to keep that neighborhood residential, and nobody and nothing specifically refers to housing for visiting faculty, people sitting on their stoops. Right? And I understand that a fact that a fraternity house is a residence. Nonetheless, I think most people who live in a residential neighborhood don't want to live next door to a fraternity house. So I think the interests of the neighborhood, of the community, really have to be taken into account. To say, oh well this is just at the edge – being at the edge doesn't mean that the sound, for instance, doesn't travel. I think the real question there of university community relations, and this doesn't seem to have been handled in a way that makes the university look very good to the neighborhood.

**MORRISON:** Appreciate your comments, and I think that we – the master plan is consistent with this. That sort of was my comment earlier. Look at the master plan and any of the images of the master plan. It has that as a building site. This isn't anything that we just developed –

**SPANG:** But the text doesn't say –

**MORRISON:** – and I – and of course the author is somebody I talk to weekly, and–

**SPANG:** – but the people who read the master plan, the rest of us, we don't talk to the author on a weekly basis, so we don't know what the author might have been thinking. All we know is that when we hear residential neighborhood, we think little houses.

**MCGREGOR:** In this new location will the Fiji's own both land and building, and therefore have a lock on that location?

**MORRISON:** They – they will, and again they have that now, so that was their expectation.

**MCGREGOR:** So they would insist on that?

**MORRISON:** Correct. Right.

**CLEGG:** So this is a historic district does – is the city of Bloomington going to be a stakeholder as well? The district is on the national registry, I think. Is the city of Bloomington also a stakeholder? Or have they expressed an opinion about what happens?

**MORRISON:** We have had dialogue with city and dialogue with the mayor about this – about this. Just trying to be good neighbors. The statutes or the policy doesn't apply to the university. We – we have a different set of statutes that we live by then the city does. So the jurisdiction for the university is the state of Indiana, it's not the city of Bloomington.

**ROBEL:** We're at about the end of the meeting. How about one more? Is that Jason?

**JACKSON:** I just wanted to convey the concerns of my colleagues that – that this is likely to be remembered as a moment in the degradation of our relationship with the community and that concerns me. I have a question relating to Bloomington Restoration's role in moving houses. Is it your understanding that they would be willing to be engaged with us, in moving for instance the India studies house, or has this recent conflict precluded cooperation for the time being with them?

**MORRISON:** I know our real estate folks have had one conversation with them about the houses in general and they are interested. Now we haven't talked about specific properties or anything. There is a – there is a process we have to go through to do that, but I think, again, the early indication was that they were interested and they have been previously.

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much for coming, and thank you all for coming.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM