

Minutes

Indiana University

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

November 12, 2002

Indiana University Foundation, Peterson Room

1:30 - 4:30 P.M.

Summary of Action Taken:

Agenda

1. Agenda Committee Business
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
2. Question / Comment Period*
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
(10 Minutes)
3. Reviews of Upper-Level Administrators
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
4. Replacement of the University Research Policies Committee
(Professor Ann Gellis and Librarian Jennifer Hehman,
Faculty Governance Committee)
(Circular U4-2003)
<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/UFC/circulars/02-03/U4-2003.htm>
5. Discussion on University Directions and Criteria for Presidential Search
(General Discussion)

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Sandra Patterson-Randles, Anne Allen, Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Abhijit Basu, Julie Bobay, Polly Boruff-Jones, Richard Carr, Donald Coffin, Jeffrey Dean, Robert Eno, Deborah Finkel, Mary Fisher, Michael Foos, Ann Gellis, Laura Ginger, Peter Iadicola, Michael Nusbaumer, Mary Popp, Vandana Rao-Dev, John Ross, Albert Ruesink, Moira Smith, Rosann Spiro, Kizhanipuram Vinodgopal, David Vollrath, Kim Walker, Richard Ward, Nanci Yokom.

Members Absent: Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Myles Brand, Sharon Brehm, David Fulton, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, George Walker, Michael Wartell, David Daleke, Janice Froehlich, Marilyn Kintzele, Ruth Person, Mark Pescovitz, Cynthia Roy, Barry Rubin, Joshua Runyan, Roy Schreiber, Dennis Senchuk, Sarita Soni, Robert Tarver, Jeffrey Watt, Patricia Wittberg, Enid Zwirn, Judd Arnold, Bill Gray.

Members Absent with Alternates: Martin Spechler for Anna McDaniel

Visitors: Bill Schneider, History, IUPUI; Jennifer Hehman, University Library, IUPUI.

AGENDA ITEM #1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Professor Robert Eno

ENO: OK, take your seats. As you may notice, Myles is not with us. He has to be elsewhere today, I think he's actually in Hong Kong...

FISHER: He's left the building.

ENO: Yeah. And will not return. So last meeting signals the close of Myles' chairmanship of the University Faculty Council. And somehow today Mary and I will try to fill in doing the spectacular job that Myles has done all of these years by chairing this committee. We have an unusual agenda today, principally because the final item on this agenda is a general discussion item. We have a big issue to talk about. We haven't structured what this discussion might be, but there are few enough opportunities for colleagues from many of our campuses to gather together to talk about an issue such as the direction the University should go and how we should think about that and plan for it when choosing a new leader. We thought we should take this opportunity. We have a few pieces of Agenda Committee business. We have a piece of information to update you on in terms of reviews of upper level administrators. We have one piece of business that we need to conduct, our item #4 concerning the University Research Policies Committee and then we can move onto our general discussion. On agenda committee business I want to note first of all that Gerry Bepko sent a message that he was sorry that he wasn't able to be here today. Gerry often has joined this council on various campuses, not only when it meets at IUPUI. And he had prearranged other things for today and did not realize that he was going to be a designated Interim President at this time or he would have cleared this time. But he'll be joining us in the future; he's going to be taking over the chairman's slot for this group starting in the spring term, or during the spring term. So he did send his message of regret. I want to turn to something you have as a handout on white paper "Summary of Proposed HEC Appropriation Recommendations" prepared by Judy Palmer. This was printed out from an email that Myles sent to Mary and me knowing that he wasn't going to be here he sent this a few days ago. I'm going to read you Myles' introduction to this summary sheet that Judy Palmer has provided. He wrote us as follows, "below is an email that Judy forwarded to Chancellors and others on the HEC, Commission for Higher Education, recommendation." This has to do with how the HEC has formulated its recommendations for higher education to go to the legislature and we know from past experience that those recommendations, even when they're very good, often don't carry a great deal of weight with the legislature given the financial constraints. But, "please feel free to share this information with the UFC but several points have to be acknowledged. First, this is only a starting point. There is much to be accomplished in working with the legislature if this is to be the final outcome. Second, as we talked about it during the conference call, the results of yesterday's elections must be considered in the process. There is an annual \$800 million state deficit. The republicans now control both the Senate and the House [of course, he's referring to a conversation we had the day after the election]. As Judy notes, the HEC has been responsive to our requests for new research funds and eliminating the non-resident penalty which is worth several million dollars. We need to thank the Commission for this starting point. Informatics remains a high priority. The request will not come from the Commission but there will be reference to it in the budget which helps a great deal. There is an initiative independent of higher education budget we are pursuing in order to support new research

facilities. These facilities will include the multi-disciplinary science building at IUB and the School of Medicine buildings at IUPUI. It may also include some funds for some medical education centers and facilities on the regional campuses.” The attached email from Judy Palmer is a quick summary of the direction of the HEC recommendations. And in Judy’s email, I tried to keep this all on one page, there’s a final sentence I didn’t include but she notes that, “from our perspective this is a rather positive outcome, perhaps more than we had initially expected going into the discussions with the commission.” But of course this is just the Commission’s initial recommendation, the Senate budget committee and both houses will work this over until I suppose it’s completely unrecognizable. And all of the good aspects of this one may disappear, the other aspects, things that are disappointing in there, I expect that the legislature will strongly confirm. Any questions on that?

OK. One other piece of Agenda Committee business that I’d like to turn to now concerns one of our campuses that we rarely have heard from. It’s been some time since we’ve had any participation in this group of colleagues from our Fort Wayne campus, IPFW. But today Michael Nusbaumer and Peter Iadicola have joined us from Fort Wayne. They’ve joined us because with a transition in leadership this is an important opportunity for all of our faculty on all of our campuses to participate and also because there are some concerns up on the Fort Wayne campus about the relationship between Fort Wayne, Indiana University, the direction its been going and the impact on faculty, particularly the IU faculty on Fort Wayne. I’d like to ask Michael to fill us in on what’s going on up at Fort Wayne.

NUSBAUMER: Thanks Bob. I think you summarized the situation fairly well. By and large I think to speak for the IU faculty at Fort Wayne there’s been a growing sense of abandonment from Indiana University. Part of that is simply the result of efficiency issues in terms of management, but it goes beyond that in the sense of IU has a very different tradition in terms of faculty governance, in terms of operation, and IU faculty very much feel very little support and have been in terms of that IU difference. In Fort Wayne as both IU and Purdue came together as comparatively equal in terms of percentage of faculty. IU had slightly more students in Fort Wayne. IU’s interest in our activities seemed to have dissipated. Probably the best example of that, I would be more than happy to give more specific examples, is apparently the Board of Trustees just recently last May, approved management agreement for Fort Wayne. There are no IU administrators on Fort Wayne’s campus. This management agreement, even though I inquired back in the spring as to where the process and procedures were going. The next thing I heard was that it had been approved by the IU Board of Trustees and it would soon be approved by the Purdue Board of Trustees. To not have had any IU representative from our campus provide any kind of input into how it’s going, what are the problems makes us feel very isolated. At this point in time, part because of my history and part because the new presidency looming, it’s important for us to see if we can reestablish those connections, some of that tradition, some of that history in order to maintain an IU presence on our campus. Our concern is before long if current trends continue you will be issuing IU degrees but any sense of identity, any sense of difference, between IU and Purdue would have dissipated.

ENO: There’s one point that we’ve discussed in the Agenda Committee concerning this that I want to follow up on that Michael and Peter have let us know about. There are very sharply different policies at IPFW concerning non-tenure track faculty. This council worked for several

years to develop policies that would help support the strengthening of non-tenure track faculty appointments at IU...strengthenings that would improve the quality of hires, improve the quality of the delivery of instruction from non-tenure track faculty. Those policies don't apply at IPFW which has recently begun operating under new Purdue policies concerning non-tenure track faculties that limit those appointments, as I understand it, to one-year renewable contracts. Just the sort of appointment that we decided it was important to get away from to raise quality. The reason that this has direct impact on us is because the instruction is provided by people at Purdue whether they are IU faculty or Purdue faculty as the NTTs are who are teaching in IU programs. The instruction that's provided goes into courses that are now completely transferable to all of our campuses. They are part of our curriculum and they're part of our curriculum without any further review. Part of the reason that we felt that we were able to do this move toward transparent transferability of courses was because we have control over our own faculty. We're all different on all of our campuses, but we're in communication. We check on one another and we have mechanisms whereby we check on the comparability of instruction. And we can work through our differences in that way. To the degree that Purdue is putting IPFW on a very different track we should be concerned in terms of our ability to make these agreements that we reach among ourselves, payoff with the maximum benefits and the minimal downside. In the case of IPFW we really aren't going to have a good way to read on that. So these are the sort of reasons that argue for greater participation of our IPFW colleagues in the UFC. More interest on the part of the UFC and the part of our faculty's in what goes on at IPFW and a recognition that half the faculty up there is us...they're part of us. But we've lost the connection to them and they're pretty well floating free and that's probably not the best thing for the institution.

SPECHLER: well the news that the management agreement at Fort Wayne was approved without consultation of the faculty is very disturbing. It isn't the only decision that's been taken around here in the last few years without consultation and agreement with the faculty I must say. Welcome participation...we had up until a year or two ago, until two tragic deaths, wonderful representatives from Fort Wayne who spoke up as you have done and they had an opportunity to speak directly to Indiana University faculty and welcome a new generation of representatives from Fort Wayne. I think it's terribly important, Bob will remember that we visited your beautiful campus about two years ago. I hope we'll do that again, and soon, in order to reassert our interest in Fort Wayne for itself and not just because of our interest on other campuses.

ENO: Actually if we go according to our usual schedule of rotation for where we select our regional meeting, or schedule our regional campus meeting each year, Fort Wayne's turn would be next year. So, we should follow through on that and have a meeting up at Fort Wayne and have a chance to learn more about the campus and the issues of the IU faculty there. I think that's all the agenda committee business that we have under agenda committee business. We can move onto question and comments taking up any business that anybody wants to introduce.

AGENDA ITEM #2: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

SPECHLER: Bob, for some reason I landed on the search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School as now is being reconfigured, I guess is the modern word for that. And, I'm trying to think what all this means and whether the faculty will have a voice in determining the role of the Graduate School and its Dean under the new dispensation. As you know all too well,

the new Dean of Research was appointed without proper consultation with the faculty, we went over that before. But the Dean of the Graduate School is now sort of separate. George Walker had responsibility for both. So what can you tell us about the new vision, if any, for the Graduate School and its Dean?

ENO: I think one of the driving forces behind this was a notion that graduate students, particularly on the Bloomington campus, needed to have a strong advocate in the Graduate School office focused on their issues, focused on their problems. To try to make sure that the types of protections and benefits that ought to be delivered to graduate students so that they were, they felt that their issues were properly resolved by administration without confrontation. It was necessary to have an office that would focus on those issues. That wasn't a complete sentence and I don't know if I got the point across. One of the problems with the Graduate School under RUGS was while it was under a very capable Associate Vice President; nevertheless, there was not particular authority. The Graduate School has questionable authority because many of the schools run their own aspects of the graduate program. Sometimes run it very efficiently. There was competition for control of those programs and for the use of graduate students in teaching positions particularly on the Bloomington campus. I think part of the strategy was to see whether or not we couldn't have somebody who had more authority and more attention being paid to ensuring the graduate students were receiving the proper, the best possible pay, the best possible contractual agreements for working conditions and so forth. So we didn't encounter the types of problems with satisfaction among graduate students that other universities have encountered. I think that's part of the strategy for breaking off the graduate school into a separate unit.

SPECHLER: So this new Dean if I understand you rightly, will intervene if necessary with the Dean of each school to rectify any problems which may arise with graduate instruction in those schools?

ENO: I think the concept is more in terms of the Dean working with the faculty to come up with unified policies to govern the employment of graduate students, as graduate assistants and associate instructors and so forth. And then having the authority to implement those policies and enforce the implementation of those policies. Rather than having schools spin out individual policies and individual levels of support for associate instructors. That's my impression. Those aspects entered into discussions. You know Myles did not properly consult with faculty according to procedures it was a very unusual situation because we had essentially a merger of two vice presidential positions and he chose instead to meet with individual faculty groups. He did ask faculty council representatives to help him organize these groups for discussion last spring and these are issues that came up in the course of those discussions. I don't think that the Graduate School was in any case a focus of those discussions and I don't think we worked through these issues in a comprehensive way that would allow me to be clear in representing the vision that went into breaking out the Graduate School. The focus was on the research division but my best impressions of what the motivation was for breaking out the Graduate School are the ones I'm conveying rather unclearly right now.

FISHER: I think you're going to learn more Marty when the committee gets its charge. I think the first meeting's coming up, isn't it?

ENO: When is the first meeting? Do you know when the first meeting is?

FISHER: There's a...

SPECHLER: So Bob if I understand you rightly, the emphasis is on the graduate student as an apprentice instructor rather than a graduate student as a student, as such.

ENO: I think the inspiration comes from the graduate student as apprentice instructor but there are many issues that graduate students encounter in terms of their treatment as students which the graduate school will also have a role to play.

SCHNEIDER: I just got appointed to that committee, and there was not a date set yet.

FISHER: Yeah, I thought that the date was set.

SCHNEIDER: Having been present at some of those discussions. In fact, Bob is correct in that the focus was on research and the graduate school which is sort of left there and no grand plans were met or intended for changes there. Except that people from, especially the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses did express some issues and some concerns. In Bloomington it was the question of graduate students and in Indianapolis it was the question of sort of duplication of committees and procedures that had to be followed in Indianapolis and then again on the Graduate Council levels. So I think what you're looking for is that. I think what we'll need to do at that first meeting is to make a job description and take up our positions.

ENO: Yeah, those concerns are not absent on the Bloomington campus, the concerns of duplication, etc.

MALE SPEAKER: As we think about the office of Dean of the Faculties and various things are in turmoil and change it seems to me there are lots of opportunities for that office to lose financing and other clout even though, ideally, we're trying to strengthen it. In a time of change, monies that might go there under ideal conditions might be siphoned elsewhere.

ENO: Do you mean the Dean of the Graduate School? You said Dean of Faculties.

MALE SPEAKER: Dean of the Graduate School...

ENO: Yeah, we in Bloomington have our own issues with the Dean of Faculties. [Laughter].

MALE SPEAKER: Dean of the Graduate School...that monies and authority that might go there could be siphoned off as part of the new research operation and that seems to be a real worry. You may be left looking for a Dean for kind of the wrong activities and financial type of things. I don't know where the pressure points are to prevent that happening.

ENO: It's a difficult situation because there hasn't, I don't think there's a lot of advocacy for the Graduate School in the first place among faculty because those programs that participate in the Graduate, and have graduate programs, those schools that participate in Graduate programs tend to have an infrastructure that does duplicate and sometimes replicates more efficiently than the Graduate School itself functions that are necessary for graduate programs. In order to have a brief for the Graduate School, a newly constructed Graduate School is going to have to

demonstrate the type of efficiency and helpfulness to the process that will get schools to buy in to actually making it strong.

GELLIS: I am on the research end of RUGS and I really don't have much interaction with the Graduate School but I know that being part of RUGS and being part of the Budgetary Affairs committee that there has been a lot of effort placed in directing our attention to what we scholarships that we give to graduate students and I can't help but think that one of the tasks of this new Deans' position will be to have a greater, more focus on this particular aspect of graduate programs.

BALDWIN: Shouldn't we be concerned by how ill defined this all is? I was thinking particularly since there's a power vacuum at the top and no matter...a lame duck president followed by an interim president and we're doing these major structural changes...and hiring a president at the same time who may not agree with any of this...or some candidates may even feel straight jacketed by it...I just find it odd.

ENO: Well it is a, of course, these changes were set in motion before we had any idea that Myles was going to be leaving and I suppose before Myles had an idea that he was going to be leaving. But yes, it does create a sense of confusion I think on all of our parts. And we [several words lost from coughing] on the Graduate School issue. Ann actually raised a good point, it wasn't explicit in conversations, but I think it's true that on the Bloomington side with the devotion of focus in the new tuition, part of the focus on the new tuition money coming in is going to be on raising graduate fellowships and part of that is going to be accomplished by trying to get matching money out of donors for money that we put up to the new tuition. I think part of the reason they are breaking out the Graduate School, whether it was part of the original plan or is now a de facto reason, is to have somebody who's going to be able to focus on this issue and be able to help us in fundraising and make an identifiable unit to which these donations would contribute. And it's certainly true on the Bloomington campus that's an important matter.

BASU: Because this is a time of [one word lost, unclear], it might be a time also for us to think about a different structure of the university, speaking of Deans, where advocacy officers are separated from those officers who oversee audits to implement the primary mission of the university which is teaching and research. And if that's done and if the Agenda Committee can take that up if it's important in that case we can probably, effectively, influence the way the university functions with respect to fulfilling our responsibilities for academics. Advocacy deans, we call them deans, but it's a misnomer. There are so many advocacy deans with little neutral parties...and that's about it.

ENO: What you're saying is that you're picturing the new dean of the graduate school principally as an advocacy dean with no budgetary authority.

BASU: No, I don't. In fact there should be a person like the way George operated the office which is like furthering research support for the whole university. And that may come from supporting graduate students but that's not advocacy for graduate students, that's advocacy for research. Advocacy for the rights of graduate students as students, advocacy for the rights of

associate instructors...those who are there is essentially if from habit, that's different from implementing a budget for instruction and research.

SPECHLER: Well I'm afraid I have to disagree this time with my good colleague because, it's possibly because I'm an economist. I believe that advocacy without assets is rather weak. Well, we have this experience on the Bloomington campus, maybe you remember this, where the Dean of the Faculties long time ago, Henry Remak, gave up a lot of his budget. And it turned out he lost a lot of his influence as well. And that's too bad because he was a great Dean. And ever since then, in my opinion, the Dean of Faculties on the Bloomington campus, as contrasted with the Indianapolis campus, where he has money...the one on the Bloomington campus has been a relatively, structurally, weak position regardless of the character of the people who fill that position.

ENO: Yes, we're dealing with that now, the consequences of that very change back in 1969 that took the budget out of that office and it's a hot issue whether or not to combine them or to keep them separate.

SPECHLER: But there is one other budgetary matter where I do agree. That is that the Graduate School is a system school. Now to the extent that the Dean of the Graduate School in the future is to have a budget, does that budget extend throughout the university where there are IU graduate programs? That would be one alternative that I would favor, but on the other hand budgets are voted as most of you know by geography in this state so Indianapolis has a budget, Bloomington has a budget and so forth. These two principles are contradictory to say the least. And that will have to be squared I would think.

ENO: I presume it would be funded through assessments which we all find very attractive for any office but it is a central office.

SPIRO: It just seems that all of these high level decisions to restructure anything at this point in time is absurd. It ought to all be put on hold until we have a President. It's not like the university's going to quit functioning if we don't fill these positions right now that's for sure. And even the strategic plan...that ought to be put on hold as well. A lot of people have put a lot of hours and time into it and if the new President doesn't like it it's down the drain. If the new President doesn't like the structure a lot of it, all of these hours are going to be wasted. I mean, I give Sharon Brehm credit for backing off, I mean she did it for a lot of reasons but certainly one of them had to do with the uncertainty having to do with the new President or our uncertainty because of that...or for whatever reason. But a lot of these other decisions ought to be put on the back burner as well, it just makes absolutely no sense to me, unless somebody here can explain it to me, I don't know.

FISHER: And many of us have talked to the Trustees and advocated that be the case and I think the Trustees have spoken fairly forcefully that the McRobbie thing is a decision that's been made and it's not going to be reversed. And that they support Myles in making that recommendation and we're going to live with it for two years until it's evaluated...is basically where they came from. You know I think we need to continue to voice our concerns, I don't think that should shut us up in any way, shape, or form but I think we need to be aware that it's coming from the Trustees and they feel some kind of commitment to move forward for some reason with these

things. Because we asked the same question about the Chancellor search in relationship to IUPUI because it made no sense to us to continue the search given that that person wouldn't have, wouldn't know who he/she would be reporting to and that search is mid-way through that process and we've asked that question repeatedly to the Trustees and to Myles and they are moving forward on it. The only thing that would stop that is if we see that our preferred candidates would back out at some point which they have not done yet. So you know I think all of us are in for some issue are up in the air about this very same issue.

ENO: I think there are an unusual number of restructuring sorts of initiatives going on and I think it's probably a good idea to look at each one individually. Michael McRobbie's appointment has been completed by the Trustees and George Walker is retiring and so something would have to be done. The Graduate School, that may be a different issue. We do have an Associate Dean in charge of the Graduate School. We had an adjustment made in terms of the Associate Vice President for Research position in Bloomington where we were initially going to have an immediate national search but as Myles' situation changed it was decided instead not to have a national search but to see whether or not we could reach an arrangement with the current person who occupies the comparable position, that worked out very well. Probably want to approach each of these on a case by case basis and I have to admit that the Graduate School Dean appointment is the one that confuses me most. The mission has been unclear to me from the start, although not necessarily negative, it's just unclear. And the compelling nature of the appointment seems less urgent than in other cases.

FISHER: Do we want to make a recommendation of some sort?

ENO: I wouldn't know what to recommend because I don't have enough information. Do other people have a sense that there is a direction of action the faculty should take on this right now? I think search committees have influence, undue amount of influence when they raise questions and actually get down to it and Marty and Bill who's no longer sitting here...you're on the search committee and that may be the most effective venue to raise the questions in the context of how do we configure the position, is this actually a time when we can find, configure the position well enough to find an ideal candidate? My understanding is now this is going to be a national search whereas it was originally planned to be announced as an internal search. I think search committees have more leverage than council groups like ours which in this case, I think we'd all acknowledge, are speaking from very minimal information. Perhaps because there's just not much information to have.

SPIRO: Well I think you're right we have to know about each and every position and make recommendations with regards to that. But it just seems, as you said, that there's an unusual amount of activity in restructuring, when we don't have somebody in the top leadership position.

ENO: Just imagine how they feel at the NCAA. Any other questions or comments?

**AGENDA ITEM #3: REVIEWS OF UPPER-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)**

ENO: OK, the next piece of business on the agenda is actually an update item for all of you. We want you to, the Agenda Committee, wants you to know what's been going on in Agenda Committee discussions concerning Reviews of Upper-Level Administrators. I think, am I going to be the one to...ok, but my Agenda Committee colleagues should correct my errors, because we were trying to run through our patter in the Agenda Committee, we weren't straight on it a couple hours ago and I'm probably not going to be straight on it yet.

FISHER: I took notes so I'll be there to help you.

ENO: Last spring, the Trustees decided that they would have to rewrite the mandatory retirement policy for upper administrators because an EEOC complaint against IU had found that the existing procedures were contrary to law. Mandatory retirement which is a form of implicit age discrimination can only be allowed for those who are considered to be bona fide decision-makers in an organizational structure, otherwise you can't force people to retire. Our procedures have been very broad. We have mandatory retirement provisions for people such as the Athletics Director and it seemed a shame that Athletics Directors should have to retire. [Lots of laughter]. Anyway as a result of this the Trustees undertook to rewrite and narrow those provisions and in that context some faculty groups including the Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda Committee suggested that really mandatory retirement policies were implicitly objectionable. They were a form of age discrimination even if it was legal to have them in some circumstances it would be better to do without them and most other universities, in fact every other university we could identify, does not have those. So we asked that the procedures be sunsetted for five years, after five years and in instead we'd develop good review procedures that we would have faith in on the basis of which actual non-reappointment decisions could be made when called for, for upper administrators. The Trustees actually agreed to do this, they built in a sunset provision. They did build in an escape valve that said if the faculty can't come up with adequate review procedures, credible review procedures for upper administrators then we will renew the provisions. But it did us a five-year window in which we can come up with a new system of reviewing upper administrators in a way that will allow for us to be confident than when an administrator is reappointed it's because that administrators is going his/her job. The Agenda Committee began having discussions with Myles concerning how to design these procedures. There aren't a heck of a lot of models out there, I did a web search on this and I really found zero models available on the web of review procedures of upper administrators to go with. Myles had been concerned about these issues for some time, he'd been working with Al Ruesink who is his faculty advisor in Bloomington to discuss these issues and so the Agenda Committee joined the conversation which really had been going on between Myles and Al already. We made some initial forays in trying to figure out what would go into such a policy, we're no where near recommending a policy to the UFC and to the Trustees on how this would develop but we want to update you now that Myles is departing our group as to what it is we've been thinking. First of all we've been thinking that the UFC should only be developing policies to recommend to the Trustees that would apply to the Chancellors' level and up, including the Presidents' level. But that those policies should be consistent with what we believe would be applied at the campus level to administrators who are currently covered by the retirement policy which would include Deans. And we would hope that individual campuses, if we develop successful procedures, would then emulate those procedures on the campus level to a point where the Trustees would believe that the entire system now has review procedures with integrity that will allow them to have the

sunset provisions apply to the mandatory retirement procedures. So the first principle is that our group is going to work on policies that apply Chancellor-level up but also hope that these would be models for campuses and their chief academic officers and also we hope that these would be models for non-academic appointees subject to the retirement policy like non-academic Vice Presidents that the administration would adopt in order to ensure that those positions are credibly reviewed. Second, in discussions with Myles we felt that one of the key ways to have a credible review was to have reviews of administrators that included outside peer reviews including a site visit by an outside peer reviewer. For example, when Chancellors are under review, under new procedures, we might include in those procedures the fact that the review committees would invite to the campus a chancellor from a comparable institution who would provide the review committee and the review committee chair with feedback about what that site visit yielded for information so that the peer reviewer could evaluate the chancellor under review. The same types of peer review would apply if we devised procedures along these lines to the President, hopefully then to non-academic Vice Presidents and hopefully then to campus deans as it seemed appropriate to the campuses. That would be one component we were thinking about. Another component we were thinking about was employing professional consultants familiar with higher education to participate in review committee activities and advise the chair and members of the review committee either by sitting on the committee or visiting with the committee on a frequent basis, that's another possibility. A fourth component of our discussions was the role of surveys. Surveys of constituency groups, faculty only in some cases as with deans perhaps, broader constituency groups in other cases. There is disagreement about the appropriateness or shape of survey instruments in review procedures that we might develop but that certainly to our thinking of what we would have to determine before we came to this council with any recommendations. Fifth, we've been thinking that in the case of problematic reviews, where there were significant negative features to the review, there should be an automatic mechanism that provided for a focused review of problems associated with a positive reappointment decision... focused review of problem areas on a shortened time table. For example, if a chancellor were reviewed after five years and there were problem areas that seem significant a decision could be made to say well we will have a focused review say two years from now to assess remediation in those areas and that focused review which would have a narrower range would also conform to the normal types of structure of review committee activities for administrative review. And finally on the structure of those activities we want to ensure that these procedures, at least as they bear on academic appointees, would be review committees that include the norms of faculty majority and faculty chairmanship which are associated with academic position reviews at this time. Those are simply items that are under discussion. I don't mean to by noting any of these I don't want to indicate that there has been any decision on any of these areas but we did want to keep the council informed of the types of issues that we're discussing. A subcommittee has been formed out of the UFC Agenda Committee to address these issues more intensively. It was formed a month ago but intervening events have sort of distracted our attention and the subcommittee has not done a thing as a subcommittee yet. It's embarrassing for subcommittee members, of which I'm one. But we plan to continue from this time on I'm sure we'll get fresh ideas as Gerry comes and joins the Agenda Committee next year as the presiding officer of this body and we get some new perspectives to share. Conversation, discussion on these issues? Nothing seemed outrageous?

SPECHLER: Let's go back, maybe I didn't pick up everything Bob. What's different about this review from a normal administrative review that the President and everyone else from time to

time...and why do we need changes of the review procedure? Especially the kind of expensive possibilities that you've brought up. Consulting is very expensive, not usually very helpful. Outside Chancellors, wonderful people, totally ignorant of the situation. You know, what's wrong with what we have in periodic review of administrators?

ENO: Well I think one of the things that's wrong is that the Trustees don't trust the process and as a result we have a mandatory retirement policy which seems to be offensive to many faculty members and may in fact encourage people who would be perfectly good staying on to prepare to retire at the prescribed time.

SPECHLER: Well I agree with that, but what's wrong with having the normal procedures at five year intervals including a normal retirement age? So to speak, the previous or historical retirement age.

FISHER: Myles was able to put forth his case that he felt very strongly that the type of surveys are conducting, the type of response rates some campuses get, the general lack of helpfulness in the comments in helping him as an administrator to know how to assist the improvement of performance in the chancellors or whoever it is that's being evaluated...he doesn't feel that that process by itself without an addition of, an infusion of, other perspectives is a process that was going to be able to be accepted by the Trustees or one that he felt was going to be adequate as well. So I mean many of these discussions began with Myles and of course as Myles will be departing we're going to have to take this up with Gerry Bepko and you know we'll have to get other perspectives on it as well.

SPECHLER: Well let me suggest before we go spending a huge amount of money on people who I don't think will be very helpful that the President go to the campus, meet with the campus elected faculty leaders and others and talk face to face about the performance of this or that administrator. You know it's very uncomfortable and I'm sure all of us have experienced this, it's very uncomfortable to speak negatively in public about administrators who determine our salaries and our promotions...that's uncomfortable. And we wouldn't want to do it, not because of personal jeopardy, but it's likely to hurt the campus, and so I really suggest that the best way to do it is face to face contact with people who then would feel free to speak openly.

MALE SPEAKER: I guess the way I think about this is what we have here is an opportunity to look at the way we evaluate upper level administrators because of mandatory retirement policy and it gives us an opportunity to ask if we're doing as good a job as we ought to be doing. Whether there are mechanisms we can put in place that we may like to be able to put in place and now have an opportunity to do so because somebody has raised the issue. And if the answer is that there are real simple ways to do it then that's an answer, but having the worst experience of my professional life being on a chancellors' review committee, I can tell you that my personal opinion that those procedures seriously need to be looked at. And if this gives us the opportunity to do so I think we should be happy to take that opportunity because I think those reviews could be made much more valuable from our point of view and I'm not terribly concerned about what Myles thinks or what the Board thinks or what the new President thinks because I think we need to look at this in terms of what's going to help us and now we have an opportunity to do it so let's do it.

ENO: I think that there are tendencies in these discussions there have been components of it where the faculty on the Agenda Committee seem to feel fairly strongly in one direction and Myles has been feeling strongly in a different direction and the survey is an example of that. And there are areas where Myles has been feeling very strongly and the opposite such as the outside peer evaluation [End of Tape 1, Side A, some conversation lost]...this would cover the presidents' position as well and as you well know we have no procedure whatever for the review of the presidents and that's those procedures have been bouncing back and forth very unsuccessfully over the past cover of presidential reviews and if we can find a formula that we find to be credible that the Trustees also find to be credible we can stop having these arbitrary swings in the way that these are conducted which do nothing but create a tremendous gulf of distrust between the faculty and the Trustees.

SPECHLER: Well if the outside reviewer, as in the recent presidential review, is the price we have to pay for doing what Don wants. I am not sure exactly what the problem was there but, and what he suggests, I think the top of it is more faculty involvement on a face to face basis so we can be quite honest about the pluses and minuses, and there are always pluses too.

ENO: Oh yeah. I think one of the things that generally is going to come out is this is going to give more credibility, if we can devise a structure, to positive reappointments which is really what we want. It also, by building in a remediation mechanism, and leaving reappointments that are not consensus reappointments, not leaving them just out there for another five years. I think that this is really going to be a positive contribution to ensuring that you don't get a campus sort of moving down a slope that it can't get out of, of distrust between the administration and the faculty.

FISHER: Well, and also I think it goes along with faculty review and enhancement, realizing that all our campuses have a different approach to that but we don't want to expect anymore from our faculty as we review them and expect them to have positive performance than we expect of our administrators. So putting them on a short track for review is, this is a wonderful opportunity for us to do that and even the playing field there.

ENO: Any further comment on this issue at this time. OK, this is certainly something that will be coming, at some point, maybe not this year, it could be next year. It has to come to the UFC, it's not going to be moved past the UFC from the Agenda Committee to the Trustees and it will be subject to plenty of debate. It will probably take a couple of years to get this worked out. OK.

**AGENDA ITEM #4: REPLACEMENT OF THE
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH POLICIES COMMITTEE**

Professor Ann Gellis and Librarian Jennifer Hehman, Faculty Governance Committee
Circular U4-2003

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/UFC/circulars/02-03/U4-2003.htm>

ENO: The next item on the agenda is replacement of the University Research Policies Committee and I'm going to ask Ann Gellis and Jennifer Hehman to present this to us. Ann do you want to take the lead on this?

GELLIS: Yeah, ok. Does everybody have a copy of the proposed resolution that starts at the top of the preamble.

ENO: Actually, probably Circular U4 first, and then the proposed preamble. There are two blue documents relating to this; they're similar but not identical.

[Confusion about handouts, lots of talking]

FISHER: Do you all have one that says preamble?

ENO: The U4-2003 was referenced in the email. Oh you don't have U4?

FISHER: Right, they have the one with the preamble.

ENO: Oh, alright. It's the same thing except the resolution appears at the top of it.

[Sorting of papers]

ENO: This is what we're going to do. In fact, the document you have is going to be with a few tweaks that the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee recommends for adoption. It has a slight modification. In italics, the modified areas in italics indicate modification from Circular U4, which was posted in advance and which you all supposedly received, but somehow we don't have paper copies for today. So what we're going to do is first note where the discrepancies are between what you have and what the original document was and then we'll move on from there. The first portion of the document you have that says "Preamble" is in italics, it's been added. It wasn't in U4-2003, which is what came out of the committee. And if you turn around this document to the other side you'll see that in italics Roman numeral I is an area where there is a slight change. The original read, this concerns how ongoing work of the URPC is going to be handled with regard to a particular issue, the issue of web-based instructional materials. The original policy read, "The then current draft of the policy on web-based instructional materials will be completed by" and it went on from there and here it says, "the policy on web-based instructional materials will be completed by the Vice President for Research...working from all drafts currently under consideration." The original document you were sent envisioned only a single draft moving on for consideration in a new structure. This draft says, this draft of the policy, says any drafts under consideration now will be considered into the new structure. There was a concern that not all the ideas currently circulating in the Research Policies Committee would move on for consideration. Ann can you pick it up from there?

GELLIS: well, the first...that portion at the very beginning which says preamble in the first resolution in fact we're going to move down to after the first resolution reading, "Resolved: that (i) Section 8(B)" etc. so the first part of the resolution that we're going to be talking about deals with the abolishment, dissolving the URPC and the material beginning paragraph "In 1997" talks about why we are pushing to do that and just to summarize it, as I mentioned when we met in October. The URPC has been in existence for about 6 or 7 years and it was a novel approach. The notion was to minimize the number of committees looking at research questions, policies, and so on...to have a joint committee between, where the members of the committee would be

appointed by the UFC and the Provost. Since its inception, for whatever reason, it has been incapable of making any decisions. And that's a consequence to anything that goes to this committee never comes out. And that is the sole reason why I determined and brought to this body the notion of abolishing it because it simply didn't work and we had coming up through the pipe other policies that at some point will have to be considered and reviewed. And that is the sole reason for dissolving this committee. So the first resolution that Section 8(B) of the Bylaws be deleted and that the URPC be abolished as a standing committee would remove URPC. Ok. The second...then we moved to the second portion of the resolution and that has to do with what we do with the fact that both the University's intellectual property and the conflict of interest policy have roles for this University Research Policy Committee. And we have to make some provisions for what group should make, should carry out those roles until those policies, I mean the Intellectual Property Policy and the Conflict of Interest Policy, can be modified to remove the references to the University Research Policy Committee, and either put something else in there instead or come up with another mechanism. What these resolutions do is say that until such policies are amended that where the URPC has specific role mandated in the Intellectual Property policies, that those roles would be handled by an ad hoc committee made up of two members of each Research Affairs Committees from Bloomington and Indianapolis. Both Bloomington and Indianapolis have set up Research Affairs Committees. And plus one member of the UFC Agenda Committee from one of the other campuses and that sort of small group of members would act in those situations. The situations in the Intellectual Property Policy that are mandated are the following: "URPC acts as an appeals board from decisions made by ARTI with respect to the commercialization of intellectual property" Since its birth, no one has appealed a decision to the board, to the URPC. It also is charged with reviewing the revenue sharing formulas under the Intellectual Property Policies every five years. We are in the midst of doing that and its going to get...we will come up with another solution in the next five years. The last place where they have the URPC is given specific duties is that the Vice President for Research is to consult with the URPC if there, if he/she wishes to make an exception to the terms of the Intellectual Property Policy. So in those cases where a Vice President feels that there is a need to make an exception, the Vice President will consult with this group made up of members of the Research Affairs Committees from Bloomington and Indianapolis and one member of the UFC Agenda Committee. Under the Conflict of Interest Policy basically the URPC serves more as an advisory, consulting body to the Vice President for Research and again I've tried to set up a parallel system where we will have two members from each of the Research Affairs Committee plus a member of the UFC Agenda Committee act as that advisory body until such time as we come up with what we want as a final solution. So, that's what these resolutions do, now if you look at the preamble. The preamble says "The UFC intends this policy to provide interim structure until the spring of 2003, when the Faculty Governance Committee will forward a permanent proposal for consideration." As I say, that preamble will come, and then following that will be the resolution ordering the UFC Faculty Governance Committee to present a proposal next spring for a permanent structure in order to handle the consideration of research policies.

ENO: And all of that section, that italicized section would be moved down because it does not apply to the dissolution of the URPC, which is not an interim dissolution...it will never raise its head again. Instead it will occur after the first small Roman Number ii and before the paragraph that begins, "Under the University's Intellectual Property Policy" and so forth. And I might note also there was one further, one word change suggested in the Agenda Committee that we want to

recommend to our own change on this. The very first line of the preamble would read, “The UFC intends this policy to provide interim provisions” rather than “interim structures” “interim provisions until the spring of 2003.” Discussion of this transparently clear document. [Laughter]

MALE SPEAKER: Ann, no doubt your legal mind has worked through the intricacies of this, but for mind of a French teacher, could you please explain to me the logic of dissolving a committee and then appointing an ad hoc committee that will carry on the duties of that committee until you decide what to do with that committee and suggest something else. Why not just keep the URPC, or whatever this acronym is, until such time as this solution is made?

GELLIS: The problem is that the University Research Policy Committee cannot make any decisions.

MALE SPEAKER: No committee really makes decisions...

GELLIS: They can't make even recommendations.

MALE SPEAKER: They cannot?

GELLIS: No, they cannot do, they don't make it from beginning to end. So if in fact we had to pass a policy of something that required immediate attention. Suppose the federal government said everybody's got to have this provision in their policies [coughing]. There would be no way to have an action on changing the Conflict of Interest Policy without going through the URPC. The URPC and that would be the end. Nothing would...in fact nothing has happened. Even when a push with respect to the web-based instructional materials, what they finally did was pass two policies and let everybody else decide which one they liked. That's after two and a half years of discussion. I mean, so that's one reason. The only reason I would...if it were nice and neat what I would say is you abolish this committee and you decide how you want to treat these matters in the future. The reason for the ad hoc committees is, we have to amend the Intellectual Property Policy first to get rid of the URPC and getting the changes to the Intellectual Property Policy and the Conflict of Interest Policies through faculty governance and up to the Trustees will take a length of time that we may have need for somebody to take action. Suppose someone has a disagreement with ARTI and says ARTI says no we're not going to develop your product, or we're only going to develop it in this way. If they were to use this mechanism that is in the Intellectual Property Policy to go to the URPC for a vote as an appeals. We have to have something there that will, some body to act. Realizing this is half-ass backwards, but I can't seem to think of how else to do it without breaking. It seems to me that the clearest thing that is important from the side of administration and the faculty governance is to say we need, that the URPC does not work, and we need to come up with a solution.

ENO: Let me just, before...let me just distinguish two things in here to make it clear we have a dysfunctional committee. It's been dysfunctional for a number of years and we're confident it can't function. We also have two new committees that have been formed on the major campuses, Research Affairs Committees, they are pure normal faculty governance committees. They are the committees we would normally had used had we been constructing this process from the start because we never had Research Affairs Committees. For some reason faculty governance has

never taken control of research policy. We had constructed this very odd beast—the URPC. Not only is it in itself right now because of the personnel and the issues in its history, it is dysfunctional, but we would never have it recreated. We wouldn't want this committee in there in the first place now that we figured out how to do this right.

FISHER: Because it's not a faculty committee as such.

ENO: It's not, it's a very strange hybrid. I'm sorry I was interrupting Rosann and Marty.

SPIRO: well, I think you maybe just answered my question. It obviously sounds its personnel kinds of issues and you know I think I said something a couple weeks ago at BFC about organizing activities to be performed not around people. Do you have the power...it sounds like we do not have the power to relieve these people of their responsibilities.

GELLIS: It ends up being around personnel because it's clearly structural because I have changed, we have changed the membership. We've added, we've subtracted, we've done any number of redesigns and nothing makes it any different so it is something about the nature of the committee structure itself that causes it to be unable to act in any fashion.

SPIRO: And the structure cannot be amended easily so that we could?

ENO: We would have to amend all the way on up if we did it.

FISHER: We really don't want to have that administrative kind of committee in the future because we're going to have two functional committees soon and the issue is what to do in the meantime. There's also a second issue with the URPC that has to do with an IUPUI standpoint that we feel that the composition of the URPC is not representative, IUPUI is very underrepresented on that committee.

GELLIS: There are by statute, there are 5 members from IUPUI, 5 members from Bloomington, and I think 2 regional members.

FISHER: I thought there were 18 members from Bloomington the last time I looked.

ENO: No that's the graduate council

GELLIS: We have equal representation from Indianapolis and Bloomington. Bob Brenner has been on the committee, Kenny Cruz.

FISHER: I stand corrected, I got it confused with the other committee.

ENO: Marty brought up the Graduate School

FISHER: Yeah, I got all confused.

ENO: Marty and then Peter.

SPECHLER: Well, Bob says it's the history and the issues. Rosann says it the structure. Ann says it's not the people. What is it that's preventing this committee from making decisions? Even the US Congress eventually makes decisions.

GELLIS: Marty if I knew the answer I would have fixed it a long time ago. I have tried everything and I don't say...I say it is probably the structure although I'm not in a position to tell

you why. I don't know but maybe because it's a university-wide committee that makes it difficult for it to come to any agreement on anything. But from the very beginning it has, no policy that has gone it, comes out.

IADICOLA: I was just going to comment following Marty in terms of the structure issue. Obviously you're creating a committee that the committee structure doesn't seem to be different although it's smaller in number. You're putting two from IUPUI, two from Bloomington, as opposed to five from IUPUI and five from Bloomington, as opposed to two it's one. It seems that maybe it's not that issue but where the people are coming from that are portioning that structure.

GELLIS: And let me make it clear that this ad hoc committee, first of all you're right it does have a different make up in that it's all faculty as opposed to a mix. So that's one change. The other change is that once we decide how we want these issues handled in the future those ad hoc committees are going to go away. So this is simply a temporary interim stage while we're in the process of getting the IPP policy and the Conflict of Interest Policy changed and taking that through to the Trustees.

IADICOLA: So there would be no other issue or policy that would have to be decided by a committee of this type that combines the interests of the different universities.

GELLIS: I think what we want to do is treat research policy questions in the same manner we treat every other kind of policy question that involves the faculty. And that is we normally have the campus committees discuss the policies, write them, make changes what have you. And they eventually make their way to the UFC Agenda Committee and then either to a committee of the UFC or perhaps directly out from the Agenda Committee to the UFC as a whole. There may be some other areas that are under the jurisdiction of the URPC, and here I'm referring specifically to monitoring ARTI, that we may want to handle in a different fashion than...that we may want to have a monitor, faculty, or some group monitor what ARTI does and we may, which may dictate some kind of other entity as well. But it seems to me that what the model of putting the faculty and administration together into one committee for all of the campuses has not panned out.

ENO: I would think ultimately what's most likely to come out of this is a structure that parallels the other structures where we have our two campus Research Affairs Committee and we finally wind up doing this as a University Faculty Council committee with standard representational distribution the way all of our committee have it. And the legislation perks up from one of the local committees to the UFC committee and it reaches the UFC. There's really no reason this hasn't happened before. Somehow this group and all predecessor groups just never noticed that we didn't control research policy and it seems like it has to do with our business. So we're now fixing it in a herky-jerky way, we have to undo some of the stuff we did before. We have to vote on this and we have to vote on it in two pieces. The first part of this legislation is a Bylaws change which requires a two-thirds vote. It's the part that starts from "In 1997" and runs through the first resolution "Resolved" little Roman Numerals I and II. That requires a two-thirds vote. The second part which sets up interim provisions starts with the italicized preamble and goes to the end of the document. That needs to be passed by a majority vote. So why don't we break it out and start with the Bylaws change that in fact will dissolve the URPC. Anyone want to make a

motion, I guess this is a motion that comes from the committee so it's already moved. Any further discussion on the Bylaws change? All in favor please say 'Aye'. [AYE]. All opposed. [No oppositions]. And on the new structure is there any further discussion? All in favor please say 'Aye'. [AYE]. Opposed? [No oppositions]. Ok, they both carry. We'll be revisiting this perhaps next term since we're charged to do it next term so you can expect to have a more thorough discussion and posthumous assessment of the URPC, post mortem.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSITY DIRECTIONS AND CRITERIA
FOR PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH**
(General Discussion)

ENO: We are coming to the last element of our agenda. This is an unusual one because it is an open discussion. We are in the process of finding a new president. The search committee has not yet met. The Trustees have announced what they want to do before they start searching is meet with constituencies in the university to learn more about the direction the university should take and therefore the profile the new president should fit. They are interested in this information not only in abstract ways but because they need to instruct the search firm what kind of person they want the firm to go beat the bushes for. This is one venue for us to have this discussion. The Trustees already are and will continue to discuss this with varieties of groups on all the campuses; we thought it would be useful to have this discussion among ourselves and in record in the minutes. With that, I'll open the floor to discussion. What features of the university direction that we now have should we preserve? What directions might we want to change? What implications does that have for a new Chief Executive? Marty?

SPECHLER: Of course, this is a very sensitive matter and whatever we say might be taken as a reflection of one or another appointment having been made in the last few years. I wouldn't go as far as Mike Leonard did in a very biting column in today's local paper, but let me put it this way: everyone recognizes that Herman Wells was the greatest president at Indiana University over the last several decades. I don't think any of the subsequent presidents would deny that. Let's ask why he was so successful. I think that one of the things was his personal touch. He was obviously very interested in what his faculty were doing in their teaching and their research. He knew even the relatively insignificant faculty. I believe that kind of personal touch is very much valued in the state of Indiana. It is of course much more difficult today to do that on eight campuses. The effort is always appreciated, though. Another characteristic of Herman Wells was that he was appointed from inside. People knew him; they knew his pluses and his deficiencies. I'm led to believe that our search committees are not thoroughly investigating some of the deficiencies or negatives about the appointees, which would serve to replace intimate knowledge of the candidates. The university knew Herman. Subsequent appointments in many schools and at many levels were from the outside. I believe that these headhunters and the people who write letters tend to emphasize the positives about people. It's rather difficult to get a good knowledge of the person's deficiencies and weaknesses. We all have them; I think we need to know what those are. I think it's difficult to get people to say negative things about people on their campus. That's okay; it is difficult. We have to seek it out. Does this candidate regularly consult with the faculty? Is this candidate autocratic, to use Mike Leonard's term which I would not endorse in its application. He is on the right track. How do we find that out? I think it has to be done face to face by sending members of the search committee and not

outsiders to the previous place of employment of these people and to find out both the pluses and minuses on a confidential basis. I think we've been surprised sometimes by the personal characteristics of the people who have been appointed. Again, this is not in reference to any particular person.

ENO: I must take issue with your suggestion that there are insignificant faculty members. (Laughter)

SPECHLER: I wasn't referring to you, Bob. (Laughter)

COFFIN: There is a structural issue that makes Indiana University different from a lot of the other institutions in the country which will make it a unique challenge for anybody who takes that position whether they are an internal or external candidate. That's the fact that we have one of the more bizarre organizational structures that any university has. I think one of the things that a number of us have been concerned about over the last several years has been whether there was going to be pressure to simplify the organizational structure of the university, which equates to reducing the ability of the other campuses to pursue their own paths. I think that's an issue that the university has to address as a university. I don't know what the right answer to it is, but I do know that it's a question that's going to keep coming up. It comes up in all kinds of areas, not just in transferability of credit, but in structure of degree programs and in many faculty issues. I think that if we don't ensure that the search committee focuses very clearly on that kind of a governance issue we could get somebody who doesn't understand the complexities, is unable to deal with the complexities, and as a result ends up irritating the hell out of everybody on every campus rather than just most people on some campuses. (Laughter)

RAO: I think we need somebody who has dealt with different types of organizational structures and understands that "one size fits all" really doesn't work. Our problems are different and we will need to adopt different leadership styles and structures. You need to look at past personal experience to see if they have exposure to issues like that. That's the best I can suggest when looking at past history.

ENO: I think these are very important structural point. Myles had a very clear structural vision for the university. Myles never wanted this to be referred to as a system. It's more centralized than that and he wanted it to resemble the one university concept and he himself was a very strong chief executive. That's the way he operates. That reinforced our commitment to a central mission with all campuses contributing in ways that were designed to be complimentary but not necessarily autonomous. It's not necessarily the model that we want to have nor is it the one that most other states follow.

ROSS: I like what I'm hearing from others here. I came to the university in 1969 as an unfocused student and I've been here since. I don't think that we're different than everybody else; everybody else is different just as we are different. I think we can deal with somebody who doesn't know everything about Indiana University or about Indiana as long as that individual is willing to listen to us and learn something before they act.

YOKOM: Coming from a regional campus, it would be nice to have that person take an interest in the regional campuses. We would like to have someone who has some genuine interest in what we are doing. We don't want them there a whole lot... (Laughter) but we want them to know what a great campus we are and have them really show some interest in who we are.

VINOD: The reality is that Myles came to IUSB a sum total of about four times. It was generally when things boiled over and he had to show up. One was when the last chancellor was not being reappointed. What I do know is that as far as the President of Indiana University is concerned, the principal areas of focus will always be Bloomington and Indianapolis. The other regional campuses will be visited as they boil over. That's the way it is and I'm not sure that it's going to change as much as we would like. I think it would be good in the overall interests of the state and the university that some thought be given to that. I came at the end of Thomas Ehrlich's tenure. I think that he did more for the regional campuses than Brand has. He allowed us to join the graduate faculty, for example, and the impression is that Ehrlich was more respected by the regional campuses than Brand was. It would be hard for me to recount exactly what happened, but I think perception is more potent than reality in this case. I had heard suggestion to move toward the SUNY model, with a Super-Chancellor or Super-President dedicated to campus and internal matters but I doubt much that the Board of Trustees are going to go that way. I think we need somebody who has a better idea of what the regional campuses are and eventually that enrollment at the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses is not going to grow any greater than it already is and that system growth will have to come from the regional campuses. I think that acknowledgement is something we would like to see from the new president.

SPECHLER: These expressions of discontent from the smaller campuses are disturbing but I don't hear the same thing on the Indianapolis campus. Why? I believe it's because we have a wonderful Chancellor who has run the operation very successfully and with the full confidence of the faculty. If that's so, maybe we aren't looking for a person who is a President and a Super-Chancellor and a fireman. Maybe that's too much for one individual. What functions can the President and the President alone fulfill? I think that means going to the legislature and going after big money. Fundraising, whether public or private, is the one thing only the President of Indiana University can do. What that would mean is that we have to find a person who is good at finding chancellors like Gerry Bepko. There are a number of good chancellors around the system. Perhaps we should allow the regional chancellors to run their operations in consultation with their faculty. In other words, have a president who is the chief representative and fundraiser for the university and then have some kind of provost to handle the executive functions of the university in consultation with potentiated chancellors on each campus.

ENO: You said the key word: "provost."

WARD: I'm not sure I'd agree entirely with the idea that there's a great deal of content on the Indianapolis campus. I'd like to see that Indianapolis is viewed as more than a medical center. I think there is a tendency to look at that...

End of Tape 1. Some conversation was lost.

WARD: I think there is still a sense that faculty members who are not in the medical school or are not at Bloomington are second-class citizens somehow. I'm not sure how you address that. I think it's partially the chancellor's job to do that but I think the President must also be sensitive to that issue.

COFFIN: This goes back to the structural issue. What Marty was talking about is a more decentralized university and I think we have not had that vision under the leadership of either Brand or Ehrlich. In a sense, Marty, you're proposing an answer to the question I was raising: what ought to be the structure of the institution? There are probably a lot of people around the system who would disagree with the notion that yours is the appropriate structure. We need to answer that first.

BALDWIN: This is the question that has been nagging me for months. Are the basic things that are wrong with Indiana University a product of its structure? I think so. That's why I brought up earlier that we should put up a blockade on restructuring until we have a new president such that we can give them a chance to look at the structure of the university, Byzantine though it is, and figure out a way to make it work. They may need a refresher course in Medieval Greek to understand some of it, though. (Laughter) Put that in the job description. One particular thing that bothers me and others in Indianapolis is that the President of the university is chief spokesman for the university and the Bloomington campus....

FISHER: And that gets confused.

BALDWIN: Why the intercollegiate athletics at Bloomington reports to the President and not the Bloomington Chancellor is a prime example of muddy waters. Who fires Bobby Knight? The President, not the Chancellor. That is a campus thing. What needs to happen is that the campus administration needs to become geographically separate from the university administration. Get out of the same building. I have suggested a vacant lot in Martinsville. (Laughter) In other statewide systems, like SUNY, which seem to work more smoothly, the statewide offices are separate and in the SUNY example they are in downtown Albany, not on the SUNY-Albany campus. Albany is just an equal campus.

SPIRO: The only way that you're going to change this provided that you want to move the President off of a physical campus and you want the President to be a fundraiser, you have to move that person some place in Indianapolis. That's the only way it will ever change. If they are in Bloomington, they are necessarily the number one leader on the campus. I agree with you one hundred percent, but maybe not Martinsville. (Laughter)

K. WALKER: I certainly think Byzantine is the right word. Before we start going on about SUNY, I will say that my mother is a very high-powered administrator in that system and we look very pretty next to what I hear from her. It's the same sort of thing; we will always hear the good news. No one will share the grit. Unless you get some stories that are less than beautiful about somebody, they are probably not a strong administrator or leader. I think that's part of the problem with the search committee: either we don't want to go there or we go there too soon and spoil the water, eliminating someone because of something that should probably be cleared up. There are always two sides to a story, if not ten. I think it's part of the process. You're going to

run into those discussions with anybody who is of value. The SUNY system just had someone embezzle two million dollars and they have had a turnover rate of key administrators that is enormous. Before we start looking at other models, I think we need to talk to people in the middle of those situations.

BALDWIN: My point is that now is the time to look at those sorts of things or we're not going to do it.

K. WALKER: At the last BFC meeting, we had a review of what each layer does and what the structure is.

ALLEN: I don't think we're going to solve the structural problems here, but I think in terms relative to this search, we have to understand how any candidate views that structure that exists. I think a lot of it is the personality and the attitudes of the person at the top. Do they envision this as a system or not? That's a beginning. Overthrowing the system is not. If any group is interested in changing the structure, they must seek to understand what the candidate's focus and vision is for the university.

ENO: One of the things I think Myles felt and still feels about the university is that higher education in Indiana is in a precarious position. We have two Big Ten universities on a very small population base and an extremely small budget. It's not going to change in the foreseeable future because the state would have to transform its economy to do it and the Life Science Initiative is just starting (laughter). One of the implicit rationales in Myles' drive to centralize rather than grant specific autonomies in such a model as that of Wisconsin is that unless you have a highly coordinated plan to appeal to the state and respond to legislators' interests and to compete with Purdue's simpler structure on a similar level, it was necessary to have a strategy and tactics that could be easily grasped, coordinated, and conveyed by Trustees to the legislature, and always have everybody on the same page. This is a recurrent theme of Myles' administration. I believe that there are good reasons behind that. The question is how good are those and how good are the counterarguments that have been put aside to pursue this more centralized agenda?

SPECHLER: In contrast to my friend, I don't believe it productive to ask a prospective presidential candidate from the outside to enunciate a specific vision for Indiana University because we are so Byzantine. That would be asking the impossible. In fact, it would be encouraging the idea that there can be an *a priori* solution to the dilemmas we have been wrestling with these many years. On the contrary, what we want to know more about is the personality and experience of the person we are looking at and their ability to hold back from an all-encompassing vision until they talk to the various stakeholders around the system. That was the advantage of strategic directions, may they rest in peace; it did involve asking the stakeholders. We have since abandoned that. We need to know what kind of person this is. Are the really interested in scientific research? Are the really interested in people? Can they talk to donors and legislators on whatever level they find themselves?

FISHER: This is a more negative approach, but I do think it needs to be said. I think we need a president who would never say "if it's good for IUPUI it must be bad for the university." We

shouldn't be pitting individual campuses against the whole. If we're going to have a unity model, that unity needs to be positive and recognize individual campus needs. We need to minimize the idea that it is threatening to one campus or the whole system if another campus is doing well. We should all be able to excel within our mission and make the university as a whole bigger and better. I am particularly sensitive to that statement. I don't want anyone who would think that as the president.

ENO: I want to pick up on Kim's comment on the configuration of the upper levels. On the Bloomington campus, we have an interesting discussion that dovetails with this current issue in that our Chancellor has proposed reconfiguring upper administration such that we add a Provost position to be the Dean of Faculties and a budget officer, leaving the Chancellor to do more active external fundraising and interaction with the legislature and the community. That's a model that's somewhat closer to IUPUI, which has had a very successful run in terms of the profile of its chancellors. It implies in it an increased role for the Bloomington Chancellor in competition with the President. It tends to edge right into where Myles has configured the role of the President. In a way, Myles accommodated Gerry because Gerry was already in place. It invites similar growth in the roles of chancellors at regional campuses as well. What needs to be done is to install a chief academic officer with considerable power and budget authority that is focused on academics. Marty mentioned having a Provost in addition to having a President who would interact with the legislature and donors. We don't have a system provost; we have a Vice-President for Academic Affairs, who is also the Bloomington Chancellor. It has never functioned as a system-wide provost; maybe that's a good thing. As a result, the upper administration has invested all of its chief academic officer vision in the President. If the President is going to be doing more interaction with the legislature and more fundraising, that's going to take away from the academic focus. What happens then is we will have a fundraiser/lobbyist for President, a Chief Financial Officer, and a Vice President for Management, but no true academic officer in the central administration. Whatever faults he has and whatever disagreement we have with some of his conclusions, Myles did focus very strongly on the academic mission. If the Trustees decide to reconfigure, we must have someone with authority, budget power, and academic focus at the center of administration and not leave the administration to people who are chiefly concerned with non-academic affairs. I think Kim's point from the BFC meeting was that before we get a Provost, we have to figure out how that person will fit with the Chancellor and how the Chancellor will fit with the President. We have another issue with Associate Provost that those of you from other campuses don't even want to hear about. These have to fit together and the academic mission has to be at the center.

K. WALKER: The Vice-President for Academic Affairs position has changed in recent years and that is a missing component.

ENO: I think it was structurally missing before; now it's just completely missing.

BALDWIN: I have another question: what are you going to do with this conversation?
(Laughter) Are we going to send it to the search committee or the Trustees?

ENO: We had a comparable instance in Bloomington with the Provost position where we expedited that portion of the minutes, which is contrary to our religion (laughter). We can do the

same thing with this conversation and we can put it up on the UFC website and let colleagues know it's there.

FISHER: Can we do that for the Trustees as well?

ENO: They do receive that as well. Thank you very much; we are adjourned an hour early.

Adjournment 3:00 PM
Robert Eno, UFC Co-Secretary
Mary Fisher, UFC Co-Secretary