

**Comments received by the University Faculty Council  
in response to President Adam W. Herbert's  
March 2007 Draft Recommendations  
on Core Campus and System School Operations**

*April 24, 2007*

Business .....	2
Education .....	12
Informatics .....	20
Journalism .....	21
Music .....	30
Nursing .....	38
SLIS .....	46
SPEA .....	48
<i>General Comments</i> .....	52

# **BUSINESS**

**From:** Schmenner, Roger W.

**Sent:** Thursday, March 29, 2007 2:37 PM

**To:** UFCOFF

**Subject:** RE: Business Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

We here in Indianapolis at the Kelley School are quite happy with the current arrangement and wish it to continue and to strengthen, as it has.

Roger Schmenner

---

**From:** Stern, Jerrold J

**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2007 8:59 PM

**To:** UFCOFF

**Cc:** Fisher, Joseph G.; Groomer, S. Michael; Hite, Peggy A.; Hopkins, Patrick E.; Parry Jr, Robert W.; Pratt, James H

**Subject:** RE: Business Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

I do not take issue with the Core Campus concept as applied to the Kelley School of Business. However, there is a statement in President Herbert's recommendations which I find confusing. On page 2, the recommendations state "[t]he dean of a Core Campus School is the academic leader of the school and has responsibility for such matters as curriculum changes and new degree programs ..." My confusion arises when I compare this statement with those below:

"[T]he ultimate responsibility for the integrity of the academic programs of the institution and the authority for university faculty governance lie with those who have tenured and tenure-probationary appointments."

Source: [www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/clinrank.htm](http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/clinrank.htm)

Document title: Clinical Ranks

by action of University Faculty Council: March 26, 1996

adopted by Board of Trustees: June 11, 1996

"The academic integrity of the school and its programs ultimately is the responsibility of tenured and tenure-probationary faculty."

Source: Bloomington Faculty Council Document B22-2007 -  
Research Scientists/Scholars

Thus, I believe the President's statement is inconsistent with university policy. Control of curriculum is a governance issue for both single campus schools and Core Campus schools. Confusion about this issue causes friction between faculty and administrators that could easily be avoided. In my view and the view of some of my colleagues, curriculum changes and new degree programs should be reviewed, discussed and voted upon by faculty committees and departments that have expertise in the area(s) of the curriculum in question prior to the time they become an action item for the entire faculty of the unit. For example, if the Indianapolis faculty of the

Kelley School of Business proposes a new masters program in taxation to be taught on the Indianapolis campus (from which graduating students would receive Kelley School of Business degrees), the proposal should be reviewed, discussed and voted upon by the Kelley School of Business Accounting Department and that department's curriculum committee, even though the Accounting Department and its committee are located in Bloomington. Ultimately, of course, the proposal should become an action item for the entire Kelley School of Business faculty. Yet, review of the proposal by the appropriate committee(s) and department(s) prior to a voting action at the unit level seems necessary to provide time for thoughtful analysis and help assure quality standards are maintained. If this perspective is agreeable to the UFC, I suggest it be considered for adoption as a policy that would guide future curriculum decisions.

Jerrold J. Stern  
Professor of Accounting  
Indiana University  
Kelley School of Business  
1309 East Tenth Street  
Bloomington, IN 47405-1701  
812-855-2648 office  
812-855-4985 fax  
Office: 550F  
[stern@indiana.edu](mailto:stern@indiana.edu)

---

From: Mackay, David B.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 12:55 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: RE: Business Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

Ted & Bart,

My observation is that the existing relationship between the Indy & Bloomington campuses has worked very well and, in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, should be retained.

David

David MacKay  
Professor of Marketing  
Kelley School of Business  
Indiana University  
1309 East Tenth Street  
Bloomington, IN 47405-1701  
ph. (812) 855-1009  
fax (812) 855-6440

---

---

**From:** Jaffee, Bruce L.  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2007 5:22 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** Core Campus Report

Bart and Ted,

The report exaggerates the current integration of the business programs and operations at IUPUI and IUB. Academic programs at the undergraduate and master's levels are separately administered in all their dimensions and the curricula are gradually diverging. Faculty hiring is completely separate. Salaries are determined separately. The only two significant commonalities occur in the tenure and promotion areas and in on-line distance offerings via Kelley Direct. Both campuses use the Kelley School of Business name. Interestingly, the Columbus branch of IUPUI does not. The operation in Indianapolis prefers to be called "Kelley – Indianapolis", with no mention of IUPUI.

The last three deans spend minimal time at the Indianapolis campus dealing with KSB-I issues. Management is done by the Associate Dean – Indianapolis. In a sense we have a modest size "department" in Indianapolis that is free riding to some extent on the reputation and soft money of Kelley – Bloomington. I have no problem with this arrangement, but I think it's a stretch to say this is an example of "the benefits of the Core Campus concept" is a stretch, especially going forward.

Bruce Jaffee

---

**From:** Sartoris, William L.  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:29 AM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** Feedback on the Core Campus Report

I am pleased to see that the report did not try to use a one size fits all and really did take into account the differences among the different schools and programs.

With regard to the Kelley School of Business, I applaud the recognition and support for maintaining the benefits that the Core Campus approach and designation have achieved. While there are some differences in specific curricular aspects to our programs on the two campuses, there has been a concerted effort over the years to keep the programs as compatible as possible to allow a seamless educational process for the students. In addition, the participation of faculty from both campuses on appropriate committees, in research, and in seminars has enhanced the cooperative effort. The fact that the Kelley School of Business is able to take advantage of the slightly different mission of the two campus locations has helped to enhance the reputation of the school in both the business and academic communities. I know that this will be a relief to many of our current students and alumni that they can continue to identify with the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University and not be restricted to identification with a particular campus.

\*\*\*\*\*

William L. Sartoris  
Professor of Finance  
Kelley School of Business  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405-1701  
Ph: 812-855-3420

Fax: 812-855-5875  
Email: [sartoris@indiana.edu](mailto:sartoris@indiana.edu)

---

**From:** Bonser-Neal, Catherine A  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2007 10:59 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** President Herbert's recommendations on the Core Campus Schools

To whom it may concern,

I support the recommendations contained in President Herbert's recommendations to the IU Board of Trustees concerning the Core Campus Schools, particularly those recommendations related to the Kelley School of Business. The Core Campus model is critical to the success of the Kelley School of Business in Indianapolis, and I agree with the President's statement that "the current structure should be continued and strengthened wherever possible."

Sincerely,

Catherine Bonser-Neal  
Associate Professor of Finance  
Kelley School of Business, Indianapolis

---

**From:** Magjuka, Richard J.  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2007 11:52 AM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Core Campus Report Feedback by April 24th

Dear Bart and Ted,

I am the founder and program chair of Kelley Direct in the Kelley School of Business. KD offers online MBA, MS and certificate programs. In any year, we have about one thousand students.

KD operates as a truly "dual-campus" program: BL and IN faculty, a tech and administrative staff on both campuses, administrative functions provided at IUPUI and career and alumni services provided at BL.

KD has been trying to make the "core campus" idea work for nine years. My conclusion: IU is not ready to truly support a "core campus" operation. Our institutional structure is rigidly built on the notion of geography and campus. KD has had to fight for every minor change which we have requested. We are always trying to have our operations on the ground reflect our "core campus" language. We have made progress but there still is a significant gap between the rhetoric and practices implied by our "core campus" structure.

If the university wishes to support viable core campus programs, then the university will have to cast its gaze inwardly to determine how it will become as flexible as the "core campus" concept implies. I do not think that the pace and scale of change within IU will be adequate to respond effectively to the marketplace realities my program confronts daily. I hope that IU does not encourage the formation of other core campus schools until IU demonstrates that it can create a flexible organizational structure.

Rich Magjuka

---

**From:** Kulsrud, William N.  
**Sent:** Tue 4/24/2007 4:09 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** Core Concept Kelley School of Business

Attached are my comments regarding the viability of the core campus concept as it applies to the Kelley School of Business.

Bill Kulsrud

William N. Kulsrud PhD, CPA  
Chairman Master of Professional Accountancy Program  
Kelley School of Business BS 4002  
Indiana University-Indianapolis  
801 West Michigan  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
**Phone: 317-274-3422**  
Fax: 317-274-3312  
E-mail: wkulsrud@iupui.edu

April 24, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

Let me preface my remarks and explain that I have been on the School of Business faculty in Indianapolis for close to 30 years. While I have occasionally taught on both the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses, I have taught primarily in Indianapolis. I live in Carmel. I am a strong supporter of Indianapolis and believe that if it is truly to be a first class city and the state is to emerge as an economic powerhouse then Indianapolis must have a great university. And that university must be independent and stand on its own. IUPUI must be the UCLA of Indiana and not University of Illinois at Chicago or University of Missouri at St. Louis (or at Kansas City). Its mission must be to serve the state of Indiana and the city of Indianapolis and in so doing, achieve a national reputation. We are on our way to that vision now but to achieve it we must be allowed to seek our own destiny. We must be autonomous. The core campus concept will never permit us to fulfill that dream because Bloomington has kept us on a tight leash and under its control. To cut the cord would eliminate the control and the possibility that power and resources would be shifted from Bloomington to Indianapolis.

Many of us know the story of Arizona State University. Historically, the University of Arizona was the major school in the state of Arizona. Arizona State was insignificant. However, over time key changes made it the largest university in the state. It began as the Normal School of Arizona in 1901, then became the Tempe State Teachers College, then the Arizona State Teachers College, and, in 1945, Arizona State College. By 1958 the college performed all the functions of a university, and received authorization by an act of the governor to become Arizona State University. All of this happened because Arizona State had a law school that graduated lawyers who became legislators and poured resources into Arizona State rather Arizona. It could happen here but the core concept stifles that possibility.

From my perspective, I have seen the School of Business in Indianapolis grow and prosper under the current structure, but I believe we can do better. With the help of the name, Indiana University—and nothing else—we have built a terrific faculty as well as an outstanding reputation for excellence in the Indianapolis area. Arguably, we could not have achieved where we are today without the Indiana University moniker. However, the progress has been excruciatingly slow. You would think that a leading university could establish a leading business school in the city's capital in a relatively short period of time. Unfortunately, the School of Business in Indianapolis is still struggling to make a name for itself. The fact of the matter is Bloomington never really wanted it to happen. Bloomington management has held the reins tightly and not given us the freedom to operate. Dean Schmenner has done a fabulous job acting as a champion for this campus but he could only do so much. And now, sadly, he is stepping down.

Perhaps the best example of these problems is the Executive MBA program. It was created in Indianapolis and had great success, but short-lived. It was ranked the top executive MBA program in the nation by Business Week (a cherished ranking) and that same year Bloomington eliminated it, presumably because it would be unable to maintain enrollments. A similar fate is awaiting Kelley Direct, the online MBA program. It has had terrific success. Created in Indianapolis in 1998, managed by an Indianapolis faculty member and primarily taught by Indianapolis faculty, it now has over 1,000 students paying almost \$900 per credit hour. Slowly but surely this program is moving to Bloomington. Watch for more to come. At one point, the School of Business held an annual reception in downtown Indianapolis for alumni of both campuses. While this seemed like a good idea, Indianapolis was never mentioned by the Dean or anyone else. It was like we didn't exist. IUPUI alumni quickly quit coming. And, we are not permitted to have our own separate alumni functions! More recently, an Indianapolis designed online Masters of Taxation program for Kelley Direct was vetoed by Bloomington notwithstanding the fact that KD has other online Masters programs that do not have the market that an MST would have. Every year something occurs that makes it clear that Indianapolis is a second class citizen.

There is continuing animosity between some Bloomington and Indianapolis faculty. This is true despite the fact that Indianapolis faculty are reviewed by the same promotion and tenure committee as Bloomington faculty. Bloomington faculty have long felt that they were superior. At national meetings, Bloomington faculty make it a point to say that, "oh, so and so is not really at IU but in Indianapolis." This parochial attitude does not serve the IUPUI campus well nor the city of Indianapolis nor the state. Recently, I was talking to a faculty member in the School of Business at Oklahoma State University which has adopted the same model as IU and IUPUI. OSU now has an OSU-Stillwater and an OSU-Tulsa. When talking, he was unaware that I was at IUPUI. His sentiments echoed what we have heard for years from the Bloomington faculty. The people in Tulsa—like those in Indianapolis—are not part of the main campus regardless of what they do. This attitude was the same even when faculty were in departments in Bloomington (rather than being in a separate Indianapolis department).

Arguably, the core concept might work if there was no Bloomington paranoia about what might happen if Indianapolis was free to conduct “Kelley” business. A true leader would capitalize on the strengths of both locations. Both locations could contribute to the greatness of the school. However, that has not happened in the 30 years I have been here and the prospects do not look any better. The Kelley School of Business-Indianapolis needs to separate itself from Bloomington and adopt the law school model. Because the Indianapolis law school did this long ago, the citizens of Indianapolis recognizes that there is a great law school here in the city. It has not happened with the School of Business and will not happen until we abandon the core campus concept and adopt the law school model.

Sincerely,

William N. Kulsrud  
Associate Professor of Accounting  
Chair Master of Professional Accountancy

---

**From:** Jamison Jr, Robert W  
**Sent:** Tue 4/24/2007 1:12 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Cc:** Schmenner, Roger W.  
**Subject:**

Professors Ted Miller and Bart Ng  
Co-Secretaries, University Faculty Council

Dear Professors Miller and Ng:

Please accept my feedback on the core campus initiative. Feel free to get in touch with me if I can be of any further service on this matter.

Sincerely,

*Robert W. Jamison*

Robert W. Jamison  
Professor of Accounting  
Kelley School of Business Indianapolis  
801 W. Michigan St.  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
317-274-4936 direct  
317-274-3312 fax  
[rjamison@iupui.edu](mailto:rjamison@iupui.edu)



**Robert W. Jamison**  
Professor of Accounting  
Indiana University, Kelley School of Business - Indianapolis  
BS 4001, 801 W. Michigan St  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
(317) 274-4936  
Fax (317) 274-3312  
*rjamison@iupui.edu*

April 24, 2007

To whom it may concern:

I want to express my concerns that the core campus design would likely lead to a weakening of the Kelley School of Business Indianapolis. This statement has no origin in any treatment that I have received by any of the administrators on either campus. I arrived as a visiting Professor in 1998 and received a tenure contract near the beginning of my second semester that year.

I received a strong recommendation for my current position as a tenured Professor from the Kelley School of Business Faculty Review Committee in 1998. That committee consists of five members from the Bloomington campus and one from Indianapolis. I have served on that committee and have not been aware of any overt treatment of Kelley School of Business Indianapolis faculty as second class citizens. That committee, which also recommends candidates for awards for research, teaching and service, has considered the Indianapolis faculty in a fair and evenhanded manner. I have personal knowledge that the current and the immediate prior dean of the Kelley School of Business Indianapolis have been supportive of the promotion and tenure of several Indianapolis faculty. Thus I do not perceive that the core campus concept would perpetuate any injustice dealt to the Indianapolis faculty by the Kelley School of Business at Bloomington. However, it would create a contrived and awkward structure which would not likely improve the quality of business education in Indianapolis or in the state of Indiana.

There have been few organizations which have prospered by consolidating and centralizing management to remote locations. The core campus concept would essentially turn the Kelley School of Business into a conglomerate, in which management is separated from a substantial portion of the operations both by distance and by mission.

One practical barrier that cannot be eliminated is the 55 mile distance between the two campuses. A second practical barrier is the difference in focus between a residential business school and a city campus with a much more varied student body. The primary missions of the Kelley School of Business Bloomington appear to be a residential undergraduate program, a residential MBA program and a Ph.D. program devoted to the study of theory and research technique. In contrast, Indianapolis has practical evening undergraduate and graduate programs in which a substantial portion of the students are part-time.

Bloomington must focus on the needs of students who are able to devote several years of their time to full-time education. Although the number of such students is growing in Indianapolis, it cannot ever be expected to be the primary mission of this campus. The Indianapolis portion of the school has much more in common with the professionally oriented faculty in several other schools in Indianapolis than it does with the largely liberal arts oriented departments and schools in Bloomington. Although Bloomington faculty and administrators can play important consultative roles on Indianapolis policies and programs, they cannot be expected to provide as effective management as would an on-site administrator, who reports directly to IUPUI committees and officials. Would the business school at UCLA report to a Dean in Berkeley? While Kelley School of Business Indianapolis has not yet reached the stature of the business school at UCLA, it would seem foolhardy to constrain our efforts to do so.

There are some specific instances that indicate the divergence between the two campuses. Recently, the Academic council of Kelley School of Business voted down a distance education Master's of Science in Taxation program that could have been a major contributor to the reputation of the accounting programs in the nationwide and international arenas. It is difficult to fault them on this position, since it has little if any, relevance to the interests of any of the Business faculty at Bloomington. However, it has a good fit with the programs at Indianapolis.

The Bloomington campus focuses promotion tenure and award based on journal rankings. This strategy is not viewed as one that is receptive to new and original ideas. The president of the American Accounting Association, which is the primary academic organization for accounting educators, has recently issued a statement decrying the use of journal rankings. His point was that the narrowing of acceptable research outlets inhibits creative dissemination of knowledge.

The appropriate objectives of the business schools at both campuses might be better met by operating as two separate units, cooperating on programs, such as distance education, where such cooperation fosters synergy. However, the interposition of an absentee dean, and all of the administrative functionaries between the local business school and the local administration could hardly be expected to accommodate the needs of most of the core programs.

In my opinion, the quality of the faculty at Kelley School of Business Indianapolis would not suffer as a result of separation of the administrative functions. I have served on both the Kelley School of Business Faculty Review Committee and the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Indianapolis campus sets the standard at least as high as the Bloomington campus for the promotion and tenure decisions. The foci differ somewhat between the two schools, the primary emphasis in Bloomington being publication in highly ranked journals. The IUPUI campus considers grants, civic engagement and other aspect which are of little interest to the Bloomington campus.

The current structure has served Indianapolis well. The Indy campus has nationally recognized scholars. One of our colleagues has received significant national attention for a research project that tackles one of the most important issues in today's business climate. However, this same research project was rejected by a journal that is considered the highest "ranked" journal in his field. Thus it might be the case that using ranked journals to evaluate research has some merit with respect to consistency and quality of publication, it is not likely to reward creative endeavors that reach in new directions. Nor is it likely to recognize the efforts put forth by the Indianapolis faculty in the Main Street Initiative, service on boards and other activities that form a vital part of the missions of the Kelley School of Business Indianapolis.

If the current structure has become unworkable, the Indiana University Law School at Indianapolis has provided an excellent role model for the business school. Under its own deanship, the Law School has become competitive with its Bloomington counterpart. In terms of quality, the Indianapolis business school has accomplished much of the same. If the city of Indianapolis deserves a first-rate law school within an easy walk of the capital, does it not deserve a business school of the same caliber in proximity to the business hub of the state? I believe that it does. I propose that we move forward with a streamlined structure that will facilitate our drive for excellence. I fear that the core campus concept will have the opposite effect.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Jamison, CPA, Ph.D.  
Professor of Accounting

# **EDUCATION**

**From:** Gonzalez, Gerardo M.

**Sent:** Thursday, March 29, 2007 6:08 PM

**To:** UFCOFF

**Subject:** UFCOFF Request for Input on Education Core Campus Recommendations

Dear Ted and Bart:

I am writing in response to your request for input on the recommendations President Herbert made to the Board of Trustees regarding the School of Education Core Campus operations. Working in a Core Campus environment sometimes can be so frustrating that I must admit I'm guilty of at times wondering if we might not all be better off without a Core Campus arrangement. In each case when I felt that way, however, once I step away from the immediate source of frustration and am able to reflect more objectively on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the Core Campus, I've always come to the same conclusion: The Core Campus is good for the School of Education and good for Indiana University.

Every study ever done on the Core Campus arrangement, including the recent Bonser Report and an internal 2004 report of the School of Education Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), has concluded that the benefits of having Core Campus schools outweigh the drawbacks. Indeed, I can point to a myriad of specific instances where being a Core Campus School has made it possible for the School of Education on both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses to achieve goals and perform at a level that would not be possible without a Core Campus arrangement. For instance, a multi-million dollar grant we recently received through the Reading First federal initiative to improve reading instruction in high-need schools made it possible to generate sufficient professional development graduate tuition to help the School of Education on both campuses offset the budget cuts of the last two years. Without these funds, we would have experienced a budget deficit on both campuses. Not only were we able to serve high-need schools in Indianapolis and rural areas, but both campuses benefited in the process.

When I interview candidates for faculty positions on either campus, I consistently hear that one of the attractions for them to come to IU is having access to a vibrant urban environment as well as a traditional, residential research campus. There have even been instances where faculty members being recruited by other institutions have been able to transfer their tenure from one campus to the other within the School of Education in order to more closely align their primary research interests with what the campus has to offer. As such, we've been able to retain some outstanding faculty who otherwise may have left IU. These campus transfers have occurred both from IUB to IUPUI and from IUPUI to IUB.

In addition, several of our academic programs, including our educational leadership program which is ranked among the very best in the country, are truly Core Campus programs. That is, they have a fully integrated faculty who teach on both campuses, vote on tenure and promotion jointly, work on committees with graduate students, and otherwise function as a single faculty. These programs would be significantly weakened if they were broken apart and the faculty was separated. Moreover, if these programs were broken apart there's a real potential for internal competition and duplication of effort that would lead to a rapid erosion of program quality and reputation.

The examples above are just a few of the reasons why I feel that the Core Campus arrangement is good for the School of Education and good for IU. However, there are significant and growing problems that must be addressed if the Core Campus is to remain a viable concept and realize its full potential. First among these is the need to clarify the role and responsibilities of the Core Campus School Dean. Without question, ambiguity has been growing and sometimes deliberate

action has been taken recently to undermine the role of Core Campus Dean. A Core Campus school cannot function effectively unless there are clear lines of authority and responsibility vested in the Dean to recommend new degrees, appoint associate deans and other school personnel, make budgetary decisions, and otherwise act as the chief academic officer of the school. It must be made very clear that regardless of campus location the Dean is the person ultimately responsible and accountable for all operations of a Core Campus school and should be consulted as well as involved in all major decisions impacting the school. Of course, a Dean can and should delegate some of the responsibilities of his or her office to appropriate personnel within the unit. But there should be no misunderstanding or miscommunication from central campus administration regarding who is ultimately responsible for the overall operations and performance of the unit. President Herbert has recommended specific steps to reaffirm that the Dean of a Core Campus School is the academic leader of the school and I support these actions.

Beyond the fundamental principle of clear lines of authority and responsibility for the Dean, there are numerous structural factors that must be addressed in order to reduce the existent barriers to a fully functioning Core Campus school. Many of these barriers are identified in the School of Education LRPC study document

<http://profile.educ.indiana.edu/Portals/28/Policy%20Council/Committees/LRP%20Report%202004.pdf> referenced above. I will not attempt to repeat all the LRPC recommendations here but some of the more salient concerns are worth mentioning:

- Course load expectations set by central administration are different on the two campuses
- There is significant ambiguity about IRB protocols when students work across campuses
- The class schedules are different in Indianapolis and Bloomington; the Fall semester begins on different dates
- Students who are enrolled at both campuses in the same semester are charged student fees on each campus
- There are different campus protocols for presenting faculty tenure cases
- The General Education requirements on both campuses are different, which can make it difficult for articulation within and across institutions
- Financial aid policies and restrictions vary somewhat across campuses and can be troublesome for students taking courses on both campuses
- Course scheduling is handled differently on each campus and therefore assigning classroom space for courses taught on both campuses can be cumbersome
- Mechanisms for accounting and transferring funds from one campus to another when fees are collected on both campuses also are cumbersome

Eliminating these barriers will require a substantial commitment on the part of the administration and in some cases possibly action by the Board of Trustees. Nevertheless, they are surmountable if there's a will and leadership support for the Core Campus concept.

In sum, as the School of Education's LRPC report says the Core Campus "It's a great idea but..." Consistent with the findings in the Bonser report, the School of Education's LRPC found general agreement that the Core Campus concept enhances opportunities among faculty and graduate students for engagement, collaboration, and professional growth that are not available to each campus separately, but there are a variety of practical and structural barriers that interfere with its full implementation. Not the least of these barriers is that the very difficult challenge of managing complex Core Campus programs becomes an impossible task if the central campus administration is not fully supportive of the concept. I am concerned that there has been a systematic erosion of support for the Core Campus idea recently. As a result, there's growing ambiguity about the role of the Core Campus School Dean and the extent to which academic units should endeavor to reduce the existing structural barriers to full implementation of the Core Campus concept.

I believe the recommendations made by President Herbert clarify expectations, authority and responsibilities of the Core Campus School Dean and can help identify and eliminate the practical, everyday barriers that stand in the way of cooperation and integration of programs across the two campuses. Such actions would potentially reinvigorate the Core Campus status of the School of Education and, therefore, I fully support them.

I hope these comments are helpful. If you have any questions or I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Gerardo

Gerardo M. Gonzalez  
University Dean  
School of Education  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
[gonzalez@indiana.edu](mailto:gonzalez@indiana.edu)

---

From: Plucker, Jonathan Alan  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:19 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: FW: Education Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

I would like to provide some feedback on two issues. First, removing the title of university dean needs more justification. I see a major difference in roles between deans with system-wide and single-campus responsibilities. Why not a title differentiation?

Second, the recommendation regarding core campus issues within Education is a bit naïve. I have had several students try to take the occasional course at IUPUI to lessen their commuting time from Indy to Bloomington. I'll spare you the gory details, but it was a painful process for all involved. In the end, all decided it would be easier to continue driving to IUB for every course rather than navigate the IU bureaucracy to be able to take IUPUI courses. If we will ever have a true core campus, these student issues have to be taken care of. The president's report gives the impression that education faculty haven't been working on these issues as much as they have -- this is my 10th year at IU, and we've discussed ways to improve the core campus incessantly throughout this time. At a recent dean's cabinet meeting, it was noted that IUPUI education faculty find the core campus to be "a joke." Most IUB faculty feel the same way. In recent faculty discussions, the general attitude was "Why are we still trying to do this?" I believe the president's report greatly exaggerates faculty attitudes (on both campuses) about the desire to continue the core campus.

Also, assuming that the "order" to fix the core campus concept within education stands, the education dean's cabinet created a detailed list of things that would need to be addressed for a core campus to become a reality regarding the SOE. Many of the issues dealt with IU system administrative issues that faculty and students on both campuses believe should be addressed before a serious discussion can begin within the ed school. My understanding is that the president's office

had an opportunity to see this list; regardless, the recommendations should be incorporated into the president's report, since many of the proposed changes are beyond the ability of the school to change.

Jonathan Plucker

---

**From:** Conner, Jennifer Marie  
**Sent:** Friday, April 20, 2007 2:06 PM  
**To:** Ng, Bartholomew S; Miller, Theodore K.  
**Subject:** Core Campus Response

Dear Bart and Ted,

I write to you in response to your request for our faculty's input on the School of Education core campus relationship. Since our faculty articulated our position regarding this relationship in a document dated February 28<sup>th</sup> (see attachment), two documents have been disseminated that more clearly outline the positions held by President Herbert and Dean Gonzalez. Today our faculty had a preliminary discussion about these new documents and concluded that we need more time to fully understand them and their implications. In the meantime, we support our original recommendations as articulated in our faculty response of February 28<sup>th</sup>.

Sincerely,

Jenny Conner and Signe Kastberg  
IUPUI SOE Faculty Co-Chairs

Jenny Conner, Ph.D.  
Assistant Clinical Professor  
School of Education  
Indiana University, Indianapolis  
902 West New York Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5155  
317-278-7323  
Fax: 317-274-6864

---

Indiana University School of Education, IUPUI

### **Faculty Response to Core Campus Issues**

February 21, 2007

Approved February 28, 2007 (24 approved, 0 reject, 2 abstained)

Faculty in the School of Education at IUPUI recognize the multiple benefits that accrue to both the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses as a result of our core campus relationship, and believe that these mutually beneficial activities should continue. However, this relationship also poses unique challenges that need to be addressed in order to make the relationship manageable, equitable, and sustainable. The IUPUI

campus has grown, matured, and undergone significant positive changes in recent years. The School of Education is deeply embedded within the fabric of IUPUI as an active participant in its changing dynamics and urban mission. Our time and resources have been spread thin and we must continuously align our work with our mission, vision, and values.

For the past four years the faculty at IUPUI have been engaged in a long-term review of the core campus relationship (For an analysis of the core campus relationship conducted in 2003 and included in *The Review of IU's Core Campus and System School Operations Report* see <http://profile.educ.indiana.edu/Portals/28/Policy%20Council/Committees/LRP%20Report%202004.pdf> ). This review has led us to conclude that since the distinct programmatic advantages of the present system are beneficial to both campuses, the core campus arrangement should be strengthened and preserved through a significant administrative restructuring that would allow for realignment and increased equity, integration, and viability. The proposed changes to the existing structure are as follows

1. Change the Role and Title of the Executive Associate Dean

The roles and responsibilities of the Executive Associate Dean position have grown significantly in recent years to the point that the position is virtually untenable. The position requires triple responsibilities related to IU-Bloomington, IUPUI, and joint Bloomington-IUPUI activities, not to mention national, state, and community level responsibilities. With the growth of IUPUI, the demands of the Executive Associate Dean have increased in the areas of public relations and involvement in a wide array of external affairs. We request changing the title of the Executive Associate Dean of the IU School of Education at Indianapolis to Dean of the IU School of Education at Indianapolis. We believe this proposed change in role and title better promotes the school's profile and better positions the school's leadership to interact with internal and external audiences.

2. Change the Promotion and Tenure Process

The promotion and tenure process for the faculty in the School of Education at IUPUI needs to be adjusted to be more equitable. We recommend having dossiers reviewed first by a primary committee. Each department would organize their own primary committees comprised of relevant faculty from each campus. These committees would make recommendations involving IUPUI faculty members to the Executive Associate Dean at IUPUI. At the next level, a unit committee of IUPUI faculty would consider IUPUI cases across departments and would in turn make recommendations to the Executive Associate Dean at IUPUI. Once the Executive Associate Dean at IUPUI made a decision, a candidate's dossier would be *forwarded to the Dean of the Indiana University School of Education for recommendation* \*. The dossier would then be returned to the IUPUI campus committee for a final decision. This change would allow the candidates from each campus to construct their dossiers to match their respective campus.



Currently, IUPUI candidates design their dossiers to match those of their IUB colleagues and then must revise them to meet IUPUI requirements after the second layer of review.

3. Restructure Core Campus Committees

The IUPUI School of Education faculty are much smaller in number than the Bloomington faculty, yet we serve double duty regarding committee involvement at both IU-B and IUPUI. The agendas of core campus committees are often dominated by Bloomington campus concerns. Faculty representatives from each campus should only serve on core campus committees that regularly deal with issues related to both campuses. Core campus committee meeting agendas should be studied and members surveyed to ascertain the extent to which each committee functions as a core campus committee. This change would reduce the burden of committee work for the IUPUI faculty and provide more opportunities for us to serve on IUPUI campus committees.

4. Program Review

All undergraduate and most graduate programs reflect the unique mission of the campus offering the program. With the exception of core campus programs such as counseling, HESA, and educational leadership, the programs are designed, delivered and evaluated by faculty on the campus offering the program. Therefore, the process for reviewing and approving changes to the programs should rest with the individual campuses with final approval being granted by the system-wide Education Council.

5. Doctoral Program

Without doctoral programs at IUPUI it is difficult to attract and retain highly productive research faculty and doctoral students. The Dean of the School of Education should fully support the development of advanced degree programs, specifically doctoral programs, on the IUPUI campus. In addition, doctoral faculty at IUB should be encouraged to alert doctoral students at IUB of the expertise available through their IUPUI colleagues for mentoring, research opportunities, and committee advising.

6. Alumni Relations

The Constituency Relations Task Force study conducted in 2006 by the IU Alumni Association recommends that all IUPUI academic units should have campus-based alumni relations programming, including core campus units. Further, the study specifically names the School of Education at IUPUI as one of only two units left on the IUPUI campus that do not have specific campus-based alumni relations programming. (The Kelley School of Business is the other unit, but it is already implementing a plan to create IUPUI-based programming). Currently, the School of Education's alumni relations activities are based heavily upon the needs and interests of Bloomington alumni. As the IUPUI campus has grown, so has its national reputation and standing within the higher education community. With a total of more than 12,000 alumni - of which approximately

82% live in Indiana and 62% live in central Indiana - it is imperative that the School of Education at IUPUI engage and serve its alumni with programming specifically designed for their needs and interests. Therefore, adopting a model that has worked very well for SPEA's core campus arrangement, we request that an IUPUI-based alumni volunteer council be created and charged with developing alumni relations for the School of Education. This council would report to and receive funding from the IU School of Education Alumni Association board, and work in collaboration with the IUPUI Office of Alumni Relations to directly serve Education IUPUI alumni.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the core campus relationship in order to address aspects that have proven to be problematic. By addressing these areas of concern, we believe that the relationship will become more productive and remain viable.

---

From: Burrello, Leonard C.  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2007 8:16 AM  
To: Miller, Theodore K.  
Cc: Gonzalez, Gerardo M.; Murtadha, Khaula H.; McCarthy, Martha  
Subject: Response to Core Campus

Dear Ted and Bart:

I have been a faculty member here for 31 years and have always found the core campus relationship for the School of Education both invaluable and frustrating.

As Chair of the School of Education's Faculty Affairs Committee in 1979, we met with then President Ryan to discuss how faculty from Bloomington are credited with teaching at IUPUI. He resolved that matter in ten minutes. Today if a Bloomington faculty member teaches at IUPUI in the summer, they receive a different compensation package in summer. And finally, on budget, our adjuncts who teach on both campuses receive different levels of compensation.

For students dual fees for dual enrollees in anyone semester is a major problem for us.

We have found that faculty across both campuses gives us access to program development opportunities that alone we could not achieve. The student mix across urban and suburban and rural Indiana is the best mix for us. It puts our students into the state's context of education politically and economically.

Frankly, our problem is faculty distribution on the core campus. IUPUI had 3 full time faculty members on their budget when I arrived in 1976, since 1990 we have had only one or two. And one is the executive associate dean. For the faculty we recruit there, we promise a core campus experience. They are crucial to both campuses. Faculty from Bloomington have moved their practice to IUPUI to give us a clinical and research professor there currently. But the issue remains one of distribution.

IUPUI has never recovered the lines they need to carry their campus programs alone. We need to do it together especially in a market of extreme competition from Ball State and Indiana Wesleyan or we create another competitor for one another.

The combined core campus team is meeting today to re-establish our relationship and identity. We will share our deliberations with you in the near future.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond to you.

The best to the both of you,

Leonard

# **INFORMATICS**

Dear colleagues

Recently, a colleague with an appointment in Informatics at IU-SB gave a presentation on campus. I had occasion to discuss program and structure with him, and the picture that emerged was very unclear, including that his tenure seemed to be completely dependent upon another department. I got the impression that much remains to make Informatics viable, and I fear that "home ruling" the program to IU-SB is not necessarily the most likely way to produce a viable program. What Informatics is there has an impact on what it is here in Bloomington and at IUPUI, so we have an interest. Also, we are currently training PhDs in informatics, and viable programs at the IU branch campuses are an important source of future employment for them.

I am scheduled to discuss these issues with Mike Dunn before he retires, and it may well be that the envisioned agreements to be concluded by our new Dean are the best approach; I don't know enough to say. But you asked for feedback....

David Hakken  
Information Ethnographer  
Professor of Social Informatics  
Director of International Activities  
School of Informatics  
Room 1033 Eigenmann Hall  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47406  
[dhakken@indiana.edu](mailto:dhakken@indiana.edu)

812-856-1869 office; 812-391-2966

<http://www.informatics.indiana.edu/research/profiles/dhakken.asp>

"Creating intellectual property is the essence of what we do at Microsoft..."--Microsoft press release, August, 2005

# **JOURNALISM**

I support the President's recommendations regarding the School of Journalism, although they are quite general and brief.

David H. Weaver  
Roy W. Howard Research Professor  
School of Journalism, Indiana University, Ernie Pyle Hall 200-I  
940 East 7th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405-7108 U.S.A.

Fax: 812-855-0901  
Office: 812-855-1703 or 9247  
e-mail: [weaver@indiana.edu](mailto:weaver@indiana.edu)  
<http://www.journalism.indiana.edu/people/list.php?ID=16>

---

April 13, 2007

President Adam Herbert  
107 South Indiana Avenue  
Bryan Hall 200  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Dear President Herbert:

I am writing in response to your recommendation to the Board of Trustees that journalism at IUPUI remain with the Bloomington program.

On behalf of the faculty at IUPUI, I ask that you reverse your recommendation and allow the IUPUI Journalism School to merge with the School of Liberal Arts.

In your remarks to the Board of Trustees, you stated, "The concept of a core campus school – a single academic entity which is geographically dispersed on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses – appears to remain valid, at least on the basis of information gathered in the review." There are, however, serious flaws in the information-gathering process of that review by the Bonser committee. The committee did not seek information or opinions from any of the IUPUI faculty in journalism. The information presented in the review reflected only the opinion of the Bloomington dean, Brad Hamm.

IUPUI journalism faculty have followed a university procedure for the process to merge, a process that was started by Chancellor Bantz and was endorsed at the beginning by Dean Hamm. Even though it appears from his comments in the review report that Dean Hamm has changed his opinion, he has not communicated anything about the relationship of the two schools to the IUPUI faculty. The IUPUI school has been cut off from

communication with the Bloomington school for almost two years and has not been invited to any activities—including faculty meetings—by the dean appointed to lead both campuses.

In the budget planning meeting in spring 2006, Dean Hamm publicly supported Chancellor Bantz's desire to merge the IUPUI program with an IUPUI school. I was directed to proceed. Dean Hamm did not object to Chancellor Bantz's plans or engage the IUPUI faculty in any discussion about whether a merger would be in the best interests of the Indianapolis school. IUPUI faculty have never had the opportunity to bring the matter before Bloomington colleagues in a general faculty meeting. If Dean Hamm wanted us to remain with the Bloomington program, he should have made his intentions known at the beginning of this process, not at the end.

After the directive from Dean Hamm and Chancellor Bantz to begin the search for a merger partner, we explored five different schools. We selected the School of Liberal Arts and began discussions with Dean White in August, 2006. As of November 2006, the School of Liberal Arts faculty had voted 100 to 1 to accept us. The IUPUI Faculty Council unanimously endorsed the merger. All that remained was your decision and that of the Board of Trustees. To our surprise you recommended that we remain associated with Bloomington, a program that since the appointment of Dean Hamm has effectively severed its ties with its IUPUI faculty and excluded faculty members from all matters pertaining to the school.

When the IUPUI deans were invited to have dinner with the Board of Trustees in Bloomington in spring of 2006, you remarked that you had asked your Chancellors to examine the organizational structure of their respective campuses. Chancellor Bantz had already done that in the case of journalism. He had already told Dean Hamm that he intended to merge journalism into a larger program and his preference was the School of Liberal Arts.

The School of Journalism at IUPUI was formed in 1981 under the condition that Bloomington resources not be used to develop the IUPUI program. The IUPUI program was originally formed with reallocated campus funds and was underfunded at the time responsibility center management was first implemented. While this has been an impediment to the stability and growth of IUPUI journalism, we have managed our limited resources well.

The contribution from Bloomington to the development of our faculty since 1982 has been support for faculty travel; advice, feedback and support of research activities; and competitive faculty summer fellowships. IUPUI students have been allowed to apply to the scholarship pool in Bloomington but rarely have been awarded scholarships that were not specifically tied to the IUPUI campus. Since 1982, only three School of Journalism faculty meetings have been conducted at IUPUI. In the early days of the Riley Chair, an endowed chair in the School of Journalism, occupants taught occasionally at IUPUI. That has not happened since the early 1990s because Bloomington has said its teaching demands on the Riley Chair occupant have increased. Though our Indianapolis faculty

repeatedly requested to be assigned to master's and doctoral committees in Bloomington, it did not happen in any meaningful way.

As curriculum changes were implemented over the years, there was never an accommodation to the unique characteristics of the IUPUI campus. The difference in needs of students who attend a traditional residential campus and those at an urban campus are significant. Those differences need to be addressed in curriculum. Looking at this issue from the opposite perspective, the opportunities available to an urban campus also should be reflected in curriculum.

Before Dean Hamm, the relationship with Bloomington faculty, while not close, was cordial and collegial. Since Dean Hamm joined the faculty, the two programs have operated independently of one another. This situation was neither created nor desired by the IUPUI faculty.

The impacts of Dean Hamm's action to disassociate the IUPUI school from the Bloomington school are significant for faculty members at IUPUI, who have been:

- Excluded from faculty meetings
- Excluded from personnel decisions
- Excluded from curriculum revisions
- Excluded from participation in any school activities of any kind
- Excluded from mention in two issues of the alumni magazine
- Excluded from consideration for a journalism teaching award
- Excluded from receiving minutes of any business activity of the school
- Excluded from committee assignments

In addition, the graduate committee of the School in Bloomington has refused to consider new course proposals and refused to admit Indianapolis-based graduate students to the master's program, leaving in disarray our long-standing practice of offering master's students the opportunity to complete all their coursework at IUPUI.

In other words, the journalism faculty at IUPUI has been isolated from its faculty home, and IUPUI faculty members have had no voice in this, or any other, process.

We reacted to our isolation by moving forward with the merger directed by Chancellor Bantz and endorsed by Dean Hamm. This process resulted in a difficult load on our faculty and staff, which had to sort out the details of curriculum revision and a merger in addition to normal duties. Faculty met over the summer of 2006 whether they were on salary or not. We had numerous meetings in fall semester 2006 with staff and faculty of the School of Liberal Arts. As talks progressed, both entities realized the best future development of journalism was to join the ranks of Liberal Arts.

All of this notwithstanding, the IUPUI faculty carried on with the business of educating students. In the past two years, while the school has been excluded by Bloomington, enrollment in journalism has doubled and new courses and new curricular paths for students have been created. Two new student organizations have formed. A series of new programs, including the Mary I. Benedict Critical Issues Series for high school

journalism students, have emerged. All of this was accomplished without any assistance – or interest – from the School of Journalism in Bloomington.

In the last two years, we have increased our focus in Public Relations. We have an interdisciplinary Master's Degree ready for implementation in PR Management with a focus on health and life sciences, a distinct emphasis of the IUPUI campus. We have negotiated courses in that curriculum with the Kelly School of Business and with Communication Studies in the School of Liberal Arts. Thus, we do have a mission that fits our resources and the focus and mission of the campus.

As we look toward a final decision, we should focus on the future of Journalism at IUPUI and reach a decision that most effectively supports the vision and future of this institution and Indiana as a whole. Some key points:

- a. Despite being cut off from support by Dean Hamm, the IUPUI Journalism program has doubled its enrollment over the past two years. Moreover, with fall 2007 numbers coming in, it appears this will be a continuing trend. We currently report 163 Journalism majors (81 at this time in 2005) with freshman enrollment appearing at this point to show an increase of 150 percent for fall 2007. (This does not count students who will be in University College until they qualify as Journalism majors!) We currently anticipate that enrollment by fall 2008 will be more than 250. In addition, as a continuing measure of our growth in quality, fully 75 percent of our incoming freshman class will graduate in the top third of their high school class. Our minority enrollment continues to improve, with fall 2007 figures at 18.2 percent.
- b. Without guidance or support from the School in Bloomington, we have developed a thriving concentration in public relations at IUPUI. We currently estimate that fully 40 percent of all Journalism students are public relations students. Reflective of this is a fast-growing Public Relations Student Society of America chapter and a student-run public relations agency – Jaguar Communications.
- c. Without guidance or support from the School in Bloomington, we have already moved forward with a graduate degree in public relations. The graduate degree in public relations has two tracks to support local economic development issues: the first as a general management track to prepare graduates for management positions in public relations; and the second in Health Care and Life Sciences to dovetail with the university's and region's focus on that area for economic development.
- d. We have, without guidance or assistance from the School in Bloomington, but with initial authorization, re-shaped our curriculum for both journalism and public relations to reflect more accurately the real world of working journalists and public relations professionals. These changes have been fully endorsed by professionals and students alike, and are set to be put in place as soon as an appropriate academic home is found.



While the School in Bloomington has ignored us for the past 21 months, we have moved vigorously forward. The future is extremely bright for journalism at IUPUI so long as we are allowed to continue on our current path. Some additional considerations:

- a. The School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI has been extremely supportive and we have begun to develop excellent partnerships in the School, including partnering with the Department of Communication Studies on the graduate degree and on JagRadio, the student radio effort at IUPUI that was taken into Journalism in the spring of 2005. There are many other excellent synergies available to us if we are allowed to proceed in this direction.
- b. Our focus is on developing students/graduates ready for the future of our professions. We are well on our way to doing that. Going back to the school in Bloomington will be a step backward for this reason: We recognize that most of our students are residents of the area and will remain so for the foreseeable future. They are looking for employment in the Indianapolis metropolitan market first, and, second, in the state and region. We are feeding a local and state economic engine that mandates us to be sensitive to the needs of this employment base, which we have done by designing custom courses to supplement our basic journalism curriculum. Bloomington's enrollment is divided between in-state and out-of-state students who historically have not remained in the state.
- c. We have a heavy focus in integration of media and on the uses of technology throughout our curriculum at IUPUI. We have cooperative programs with other departments on the IUPUI campus to advance our technology.
- d. Our program has demonstrated a dynamism and growth potential without the need for the School of Journalism in Bloomington to provide any supervision or support. The Bloomington school will simply add another layer of bureaucracy and administration to encumber the process. Our student news organizations—the established *Sagamore* and the fledgling JagRadio—are working now to broaden their reach into the Central Indiana campus of Ivy Tech and into the area high schools through both publishing platforms. We believe Ivy Tech and the area high schools are where our greatest enrollment growth is coming from and we want to establish relationships there before students ever enter IUPUI.

As the report you commissioned, “A Review of IU’s Core Campus and System School Operations,” makes clear, the Core Campus model is predicated on cooperation and perceived mutual benefits. In the case of Journalism, unfortunately, there has been a lack of cooperation and, at least for faculty on the Indianapolis campus, it is perceived that more benefits in growth and development will accrue from a merger with the School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI. The report notes, “If the relevant parties do not favor integration, we should not force ‘marriages with a shotgun.’” To continue the Core Campus model for the School of Journalism is to force a “marriage” that will not work, and is counter to the recommendations of the Bonser Committee.

The President of Indiana University has a duty to be fair to the goals and objectives of all of the campuses making up Indiana University. Therefore, I trust you will change your mind and endorse the IUPUI journalism program's merger with the School of Liberal Arts. To do otherwise would be to counter the wishes of your Chancellor, and the wishes of the faculty of the IUPUI campus, and counter to the best interests of IUPUI and Indiana University.

Sincerely,

James W. Brown, Ph.D.

Professor and Executive Associate Dean

Copies to: Charles Bantz, Chancellor  
Dean Sukhatme, Dean of Faculties  
Dean Hamm, Dean of Journalism  
Bob White, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts  
Bart Ng, President IUPUI Faculty Council  
Ted Miller, President Bloomington Faculty Council  
Michael McRobbie, President Designate

---

From: White, Robert W.  
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2007 3:58 PM  
To: Brown, James W; HERBERT  
Cc: Bantz, Charles R; Sukhatme, Uday P; Hamm, Brad Jay; Ng, Bartholomew S;  
Miller, Theodore K.; McRobbie, Michael A.; White, Robert W.  
Subject: RE: Response to your recommendation to the Board of Trustees

Dear President Herbert,

I write to lend my support to moving the School of Journalism on the IUPUI campus into the IU School of Liberal Arts, also on the IUPUI campus. Journalism would become one of twelve Liberal Arts departments. As Dean James Brown indicates, this move has the support of the faculty in both schools, as well as the support of the Indianapolis Faculty Council.

There are many benefits to be realized from the proposed change. Liberal Arts is the home of a large Department of English (55+ faculty) and a developing Department of Communication Studies (20+/- faculty), while Journalism on our campus is very small (four faculty members). The collaborations that will be allowed by the move will benefit the faculty and students in Journalism, English, and Communication Studies. Liberal Arts, in terms of credit hours

taught, is the largest school on the IUPUI campus. We have the second largest number of full-time faculty members (+/- 210). We have an infrastructure in place that will allow for enhanced faculty, staff, and student opportunities and support.

Thank you for considering Dean Brown's suggestion.

Sincerely,

Bob White.

Dean, Indiana University School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI  
Cavanaugh Hall 441  
425 University Boulevard  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
USA

Phone: 317-274-8448  
e-mail: [rwwwhite@iupui.edu](mailto:rwwwhite@iupui.edu)

---

BRADLEY J. HAMM  
DEAN  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

APRIL 24, 2007

Thank you for the opportunity to address this note the University Faculty Council.

I strongly support the president's recommendations on the multi-campus and core-campus schools. It is important to remember the president's commitment is to act in the best interest of Indiana University, and his report reflects that mission.

The president wisely appointed a committee of senior IU leaders in 2006 to study the situation, and the members have reached the conclusions evident in the report. Any multi-campus and core campus approach may have some weaknesses, but the president and the committee have reaffirmed the core idea that unity across campuses greatly strengthens IU as a whole and is the best model for the future.

Journalism is just one part of the core campus model. The School of Journalism is one of the oldest in the nation, and the building in Bloomington is named for the famous war correspondent and Indiana legend Ernie Pyle.

**A BRIEF HISTORY:** The journalism program at IUPUI has existed since the 1980s under the leadership of an associate dean. The hope was that the IUPUI program would grow naturally in quality and quantity throughout the years along with the university and the city. There is no doubt that IUPUI certainly has good students, good faculty and good alumni in journalism. But the program remained very small throughout the 1990s and

2000s, especially when compared with the progress made within the overall university and other emerging journalism programs nationwide.

The IUPUI associate dean has cited over the past few years a number of factors he believes limited the growth of the program, mainly decisions by administration, faculty and staff on both campuses in Bloomington and Indianapolis over the past decade. I reviewed a number of these examples shortly after my arrival in July 2005 as the new dean and found the people mentioned actually expressed a shared commitment to the same goals and hopes for a strong, vibrant IUPUI program. I believe the commitment remains strong.

By 2005, at the time of a search for a new dean in the School of Journalism, many observers had concluded a significant change was needed in the direction of the IUPUI program. This conclusion was reflected in two main ways.

First, the university's search committee for the new journalism dean — recognizing the long-standing desire for a growing, distinct program in Indianapolis — declared as one of its top five goals for the future to “Maximize the Potential of IUPUI.”

Second, Chancellor Bantz, on behalf of IUPUI, decided the program was too small as a unit on campus (an associate dean overseeing three full-time faculty, two of whom in Fall 2005 were on sabbatical) and should be merged with another program. He notified me of this decision shortly after I arrived in Indiana and I respect both his reasons and his decision on behalf of IUPUI.

In 2006, the president announced the appointment of a committee of IU leaders to re-examine the multi-campus and core campus model across all schools, including in journalism. Shortly afterward, IUPUI began the significant move to merge journalism with liberal arts, though no one in the School of Journalism outside of IUPUI was included in the process. In the same week in December that the president's committee delivered its report and recommendations to the Board of Trustees, IUPUI scheduled a vote to subsume journalism education within liberal arts.

The move, though, was premature and unfortunately left the journalism school in an awkward position because the university president and Board of Trustees officially determine issues such as these, and they were in the process of reviewing the larger issue of all multi-campus and core campus programs across Indiana University. I believe all parties would have been better served by simply waiting a few months for the president's committee and the president to complete the university review and meet with trustees.

**CONCLUSION:** Our shared goal is to build the quality, quantity and distinctiveness of journalism education in Indianapolis to best serve students, the university, the state and the journalism field.

It is challenging to survey the university structure and determine what is best for the whole, but the president and his committee of Indiana University leaders have faithfully done so, and I appreciate their hard work and timely decisions.

The president and his committee have made among their recommendations to the Board of Trustees that the core campus model continue to exist in Journalism. The conclusion is that future changes designed to grow a distinct program at IUPUI are best made within an already nationally known School of Journalism — rather than separated from it. The president believes this approach is best for journalism education within the state and best for Indiana University as a whole. I agree with the president and his committee.

Thank you for your time.

# MUSIC

**From:** Rees, Fred J  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2007 2:19 AM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** RE: Music Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

Dear Ted Miller and Bart Ng (et al),

Ted and Bart, I state facts that involve the Indiana University School of Music Program at IUPUI regarding the apparent separation of our unit from the Jacobs School of Music in Bloomington and, I hope, logical points that are worthy of consideration. For me, and I think that I can say the same for our music faculty, there is no interest in provoking a rancorous argument between the Jacobs School and us. I personally and professionally have a lot of respect for the Jacobs School of Music. The work that has been done to build the Jacobs School has been marvelous over the decades. I come from its tradition as I dare say all of our faculty, with a number of them its graduates. So please, do not assume that my challenges are to suggest discreditation of its work. In my 30+ years of academic life on three continents, I have learned that 99+% of disagreements between people have to do with a lack of communication (I will leave you [pl.] to ask me for a citation on my statistics).

At the March 2007 meeting of the IU Board of Trustees, I formally heard, as representative for our faculty, that we were to be separated from the Jacobs School of Music by May of this year (if approved by the Trustees) with conditions that are ambiguous.

The faculty of the School of Music Program Program at IUPUI was never invited, requested or otherwise involved in discussions about our "separation" from the Jacobs School of Music. Through our Director, Dr. G. David Peters, we were informed in academic unit meetings that Dean Richards from the Jacobs School, who happened to be attending a convention in Chicago in mid-December 2006 when Director Peters came across him, that our Program was to be separated. In February of 2007, Director Peters received an email from one of the Associate Deans informing us that we were to be separated from the Jacobs School of Music. Director Peters conveyed this information to us in one of our faculty meetings.

This point forces me to address part of the President's published "Proposed Actions" at the March 2007 meeting of the IU Board of Trustees. Based upon page 4 of the President's Recommendations to the Board of Trustees (Circular U12-2007), there are several questions that I must raise on behalf of our music faculty at IUPUI.

1. It was stated in a passage prior to the Proposed Actions that "The IUPUI School of Music and the Jacobs School of Music in Bloomington have not had a formal core campus relationship." If we did not, then why do we appear in the last published Bulletin of the School of Music as a full-fledged Program, with both of our graduate degree programs and course listings under its aegis? Also, why was it necessary for us to appear before its IPC to have our MS in Music Therapy program approved - that involved at least three formal meetings with its faculty and took three years to get approved through them? Why also, in all the years that the Music Program was at IUPUI, going back to the late 1980s, was the Jacobs School of Music involved in the hiring of our faculty and monitoring of our programs?
2. It is unclear, except through innuendo and at best, second-hand information, what it means that "Recent events have indicated that it is now appropriate for the IUPUI program to operate independently." Can someone explain?

3. As far as "Proposed Actions" from the President, we have no idea why they have been stated, since we have been no part of this process.

a) Why are we being separated from the Jacobs School of Music?

b) If we are being separated, then where does the Jacobs School of Music have authority for deciding what programs we are to retain, eliminate or add, as stated in the proposal? This is a matter of curriculum and resides with the faculty of a given academic unit. If we are still under the authority of the Jacobs School of Music, then we would like to know about it.

c) This point also brings into view the statement that we "will not be expanded to include conservatory programs similar to those offered by the Jacobs School of Music." We do not understand what President Herbert means by "conservatory" programs. We can only assume that a "conservatory" program is the training of a clarinet major or prospective conductor for a classical musical career. If this is what is intended, then we thoroughly support the concern about the statement in the first sentence in this section. We want to educate music students for this century. However, if it means that we cannot offer an undergraduate major in music technology or music business or provide opportunity for that rare individual who has multiple talents to engage in advanced musical instruction, then we have a problem with this classification. It also violates point b) here and a fundamental right of a faculty unit.

On behalf of the Jacobs School of Music at IUPUI Program as IFC member and faculty member, I find it difficult to understand how actions are taken within a university upon faculty units in which they have no participation in decisions on its future. We would welcome UCOFF and Indiana University to explain.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred J. Rees

Dr. Fred J. Rees, Professor of Music  
Member for Music, IFC  
Head, Graduate Studies  
Indiana University School of Music at IUPUI  
535 W. Michigan Street, IT 389  
Indianapolis, IN 46202 USA  
tel: 317.274.4610  
fax: 317.278.2590  
email: [frees@iupui.edu](mailto:frees@iupui.edu)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
Jacobs School of Music

---

M E M O R A N D U M

<b>To:</b> University Faculty Council; Ted Miller, Bart Eng, Co-Secretaries	<b>From:</b> School of Music Council, IUB Jacobs School of Music; Brian Horne, Secretary
	<b>Date:</b> April 5, 2007
<b>Re:</b> Response to UFC circular U12-2007	<b>E-mail:</b> <a href="mailto:blhorne@indiana.edu">blhorne@indiana.edu</a>

In its capacity as the legislative body representing all twenty-two departments in the Jacobs School, the School of Music Council endorses President Adam Herbert's recommendation to the Board of Trustees that the IUB Jacobs School of Music and the IUPUI music program should become independent entities. The Council's rationale, along with a request for changes in terminology and wording in the recommendation as it will be presented to the Board, is outlined in the following paragraphs.

The portion of the President's recommendations relative to this separation is excerpted below (U12-2007, page 4):

**The Jacobs School of Music and the IUPUI School of Music:**

The IUPUI School of Music and the Jacobs School of Music in Bloomington have not had a formal core campus relationship; however, the Jacobs School has reviewed proposals related to the faculty and curriculum at IUPUI on a regular basis. Recent events have indicated that it is now appropriate for the IUPUI program to operate independently. Accordingly,

**Proposed Action**

The Indiana University Jacobs School of Music and the IUPUI School of Music programs shall operate as independent programs. The music program at IUPUI will retain the current masters degrees in Music Technology and Music Therapy. Future masters programs will have similar technical or health-related emphases. The current minor in music for undergraduates and courses in music appreciation at IUPUI are appropriate; however the undergraduate options will not be expanded to include conservatory programs similar to those offered by the Jacobs School of Music.

In endorsing this recommendation, the School of Music Council asks the UFC to request that all references in the recommendation to the "IUPUI School of Music" be changed to "IUPUI music program." Use of the designation "School" to describe the IUPUI program is incorrect (this is not the name of the current program) and potentially misleading. The Council strongly believes that the IUPUI music program should not become a school of music, and that it has neither the facilities, the critical mass of tenured/tenure-track faculty, nor the academic resources necessary to do so.

The Council also requests the UFC to urge that the last clause of the final sentence of the recommendation be changed from "however the undergraduate options will not be expanded to include conservatory programs similar to those offered by the Jacobs School of Music," to "however the undergraduate and graduate options will not be expanded to include degree or diploma programs similar to those offered by the Jacobs School of Music."



The Council's endorsement of the President's recommendation is based on the following considerations:

- The music program at IUPUI has grown significantly since its inception in 1984, and its growth has taken it far beyond the scope originally envisaged (the offering of non-major courses for the general population of IUPUI undergraduate students) when it was initiated as an administrative unit of the IUB Jacobs School of Music.
- Part of the growth of the program is reflected in (a) the Master of Science degree program in music technology; (b) the new Master of Science in Music Therapy; (c) the IUPUI music program faculty's desire for the eventual offering of bachelor's and doctoral degrees in music technology; and (d) the addition of several tenured or tenure-track faculty in these areas, and in performance.
- The missions of the IUB Jacobs School of Music and the IUPUI music program are completely different. As the nature of the M.S. degrees indicate, the music program has developed a particular focus on music technology, both as a way to establish itself within the context of the strengths of the IUPUI campus, and to distinguish it from the degree programs and curriculum of the IUB Jacobs School of Music. This distinction also appropriately reflects the mission differentiation between the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses.
- Given this differentiation of mission, the IUPUI music program should seek separate accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and/or other appropriate national accreditation organizations, and should not form an adjunct part of the IUB Jacobs School of Music NASM accreditation.
- In the original arrangement between IUB and IUPUI, all course and degree approvals initiated by the IUPUI music program, and all appointments to IUPUI music program tenure-track faculty positions, were to be approved by the administration of the IUB Jacobs School of Music and/or by the appropriate faculty committees in Bloomington. Over time this has proved to be an impractical and unworkable arrangement. On its own initiative, the IUPUI music program has established its own Instructional Policy Committee for the approval of new courses and degrees, without any involvement by the Jacobs School Instructional Policy Committee; and, through the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties, has initiated, completed, and hired tenure-track faculty without the involvement of the Jacobs School.
- The budgets of the IUPUI music program and the IUB Jacobs School of Music are already completely separate.

For these and other reasons the School of Music Council believes that the IUPUI music program is effectively already independent of the Jacobs School and ought to be made officially independent. The Council therefore endorses President Herbert's recommendation to the Board of Trustees, with the changes suggested above.

---

Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 11:29:52 -0400  
From: "Rees, Fred J" <frees@iupui.edu>  
To: "Bart S. Ng" <bng@math.iupui.edu>

Let me respond to the individual bullets:

- **The music program at IUPUI has grown significantly...**

It is probably true that our music program has expanded well past its modest origins as a kind of institutional outreach of music appreciation courses for non-music majors by the then Bloomington School of Music. Having arrived at IUPUI in the Fall of 1999, I was unaware of any substantive change to which this bullet refers since we already had the MS Music Tech degree program on the books since 1993 as well as the music minor and numerous music appreciation courses. It should be noted that the Dean of the IUB School of Music during the 1990s was Charles Webb, who was instrumental (no pun intended) in establishing the MSMT program on our campus. Since the IUPUI music program's inception during the mid-1980s, it was always listed as a School of Music (including signage at the Mary Cable Building). IUB SOM never raised any question about our name until we met with the senior deans in 2003, where we expressed our desire to establish an MS Music Therapy degree and eventually proposed an undergraduate BSMT and a PhD degree program in music technology. Furthermore, the senior deans were, for inexplicable reasons, annoyed apparently, when they were called to our campus in the IUPUI program review of our School of Music that our university requires of every academic unit (I think every five years??). We did quite well in our review, by the way. At this point, we were informed that we were not a School of Music but a program of the Jacobs School of Music. There was quite a bit of nonsense when we moved into our new quarters three years ago about the signage on the ICTC marquee outside our building. Bloomington wanted us to have it read Music Program under the academic programs, all of which had School of this and that on them. We thought that name was ridiculous, and wound up being labeled just Music (as you would see it outside our building today).

- **Part of the growth ...**

Why our growth in degree offerings and faculty is a point for separation is certainly bizarre. I would think that our growth, as long as it is based on sound education and high academic standards would be something of which the IUB SOM would wish to a part. Making it a part of an argument for separation does not make any sense.

- **The missions of the IUB Jacobs School of Music ...**

The matter of mission differentiation between IUPUI and Jacobs does not seem to bother the other Schools that have affiliated programs between the two campuses, whether core schools or not. This is a trumped up excuse for separation.

- **Given this differentiation of mission ...**

Why does differentiation of mission have anything to do with school program accreditation? I

am sure that there are peer accreditation agencies for many of the other disciplines on our campus that are also affiliated with Bloomington programs. Why should we not be an adjunct part of the IUB School of Music? Certainly not for these reasons, as we have been under the Jacobs School of Music accreditation since our inception in the 1980s.

- **In the original arrangement ...**

There are several errors in this section. First of all, the Jacobs school was actively involved in approving ALL of IUPUI tenured and tenure-track music faculty to the present. No tenured or tenure-track IUPUI music faculty have been hired without Dean Richards' approval. Also, all of our courses and degrees have been approved by the Jacobs Instruction Policy Committee to-date. Our faculty has made numerous visits to Jacobs over the past few years for course and degree approvals. Even when we established our own IPC committee, all minutes of our activities were sent immediately to Jacobs. Our IPC did not supersede the Jacobs IPC. It was conceived, however, because the Jacobs School was so slow at responding to our new program and course proposals. During the past five years, our Director at IUPUI went from being a non-member of the Jacobs School of Music faculty to being a visiting member and then a voting member. He was informed last fall that he needed no longer to attend Jacobs' faculty meetings.

I would add that the Jacobs School administration has been exceptionally slow at responding to just about any communications that any of us initiated with it. I have witnessed our Director needing to make numerous telephone calls and email messages on any administrative, faculty or curricular matter to get some kind of response from the Jacobs School. We have done our best to stay in contact and to communicate with it over the years that I have been at IUPUI.

- **The budgets of the IUPUI music program ...**

It is true that we have separate budgets. But this has been true since the IUPUI Music program was started and was never an issue until this Council Response. Why is it suddenly a major point for separation since, again, like every other IUPUI program affiliated with IUB, it works on a separate budget and does not appear to have been an issue with other IUPUI academic units?

**For these and other reasons ...**

What other reasons? This document is fraught with misinformation and questionable logic, Bart. I should mention that Dave Peters saw this memo for the first time from me just a few minutes ago. This process depicts the dismissive way in which the Jacobs School of Music leadership has been treating us. I do not understand why President Herbert is so eager to facilitate this separation.

Fred

Dr. F. J. Rees,  
Professor of Music  
Head of Graduate Studies  
Indiana University School of Music at IUPUI  
535 W. Michigan Street, IT 389  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-3120, USA  
tel: 1.317.274.4610  
fax: 1.317.278.2590

---

**From:** Peters, George D  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 24, 2007 11:04 AM  
**To:** HERBERT  
**Cc:** Richards, Gwyn; Miller, Theodore K.; Ng, Bartholomew S; McRobbie, Michael A.; Sukhatme, Uday P; Bantz, Charles R  
**Subject:** IUPUI School of Music Request - "Core Schools" Recommendation

April 23, 2007

President Adam Herbert  
107 South Indiana Avenue  
Bryan Hall 200  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405

Dear President Herbert:

I am writing in response to your recommendation to the Indiana University Board of Trustees on "core schools," specifically regarding the School of Music (SOM) at IUB and IUPUI. On behalf of the SOM faculty at IUPUI, I ask that you defer your recommendation to separate our program from the Jacobs School of Music until such time as we can determine the effects this action may take on critical issues related to accreditation and restructuring our academic unit within the IUPUI and the university communities.

We agree that the creation of two independent schools is appropriate in the near future. We agree that our two campuses have clearly defined and different roles as defined in our campus mission differentiations. We know that we have developed a viable, independent administrative structure for our School of Music to support our unique, contemporary courses and degrees. We have followed our clearly stated mission that is aligned with the IUPUI campus and distinctive from the Jacobs School of Music at IUB.

The IUPUI SOM faculty leads national and international research and development of distance learning in music, Internet-on-line graduate music degrees, use of the Internet2 for music performance and learning, and advanced research in music therapy. We know that our IUPUI music faculty has expertise in music technology and music therapy not found in Bloomington or other corners of the world with 100% of our graduate courses and over 30% of our undergraduate courses offered on-line.

These successes should not overshadow our goals to enhance the aesthetic and artistic environment of the IUPUI campus and our city. We engage over 4000 students in music courses each year. We attract over 14,000 audience members to concerts, recitals, music events and sponsored programs each year. We offer outreach to the city-center with our IUPUI Music Academy and "Tuition-free conservatory" program for nearly 500 students each year. We engage our community with music and arts opportunities. We have a music faculty of scholars, researchers and artist performers that engage and inspire our

student population. With over 40 music faculty (full and part-time), the IUPUI SOM has defined its role for the future.

Our IUPUI music faculty has gone on record objecting to the manner in which the Bonser committee and others on the IUB campus gathered information to make decisions regarding the future of core schools. Our IUPUI faculty were not contacted nor consulted in the nearly year-long process that formed the basis of your recommendations. Several of our faculty would prefer to remain connected to the IUB as a core school. These opinions were never heard.

We now look forward to the future. We welcome the possibilities of restructuring the IUPUI academic units for the arts at IUPUI. We need time to engage the supporters of the arts in Indiana in substantive discussions to create an expanded presence of our School of Music within Indiana University with a school that embraces “contemporary and performing arts.” Such an academic unit should embrace music therapy, music technologies, and other contemporary technologies found in dance, music theatre, cinema studies and new media.

Our School of Music has followed a conservative path in serving its students and community populations. We have operated within our budget, while doubling the size of our program offerings within the last five years. The net result has been success in defining new horizons for music and the arts.

We know that the State of Indiana needs an expanded arts presence. By delaying your recommendation to separate our SOM unit from the Jacobs School of Music, we will have time to formulate a contemporary arts program for the future. We have the experience and the technologies only available at IUPUI that can change how we teach, how we perform, and how we conduct research in terms of music and contemporary arts.

Rushing to administrative decisions may cause us to lose a unique opportunity for our students and our university.

Sincerely,

G. David Peters

CC: Charles Bantz, Chancellor  
Uday Sukhatme, Dean of Faculties  
Michael McRobbie, President Designate  
Bart Ng, President, IUPUI Faculty Council  
Ted Miller, President, Bloomington Faculty Council  
Gwyn Richards, Dean, Jacobs School of Music

# **NURSING**

From: Reising, Deanna L.  
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 1:11 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Cc: Reising, Deanna L.  
Subject: FW: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

Please see response attached.

Deanna L. Reising, PhD, APRN-BC  
Associate Professor  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
1033 East Third Street  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
(812)855-1728  
Fax: (812)855-6986  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~iubnurse/>

March 28, 2007

## **Response to University Faculty Council on Core Campus and System School Operations**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the circular above. I am a tenured Associate Professor at Indiana University School of Nursing on the Bloomington Campus. I am the highest ranking non-administrative faculty member on my campus, and am 1 of only 2 tenured non-administrative faculty, and 1 of 2 doctorally prepared non-administrative faculty. I also hold two degrees from Indiana University: A Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree (1986) and a Doctor of Philosophy degree (1999—the 2<sup>nd</sup> grad from nursing for this degree). I was on the IU Northwest campus faculty from 1989-1991, and have been on the IU Bloomington campus as faculty in the School of Nursing since 1991. The Bloomington campus School of Nursing offers the BSN program only.

I wish to respond directly to the main points that affect the School of Nursing. I am the immediate past chair of the School's University Nursing Faculty Oversight Committee (system), and no one volunteered to replace me. I am also Co-Chair of the BFC Student Affairs Committee with my colleague from Geography, Sara Pryor.

### **Issue: Regional Campuses and the System Schools**

The most recent purported reasons for the structure in the School of Nursing were to:

1. Ensure integrity of the BSN curriculum—the only curriculum that is shared across all campuses—developed and approved by system wide faculty
2. Promote an efficacious means for faculty development

*I am in favor of disbanding the system wide school structure for the School of Nursing for the following reasons:*

### Faculty Time and Effort

- ✓ A system structure adds another governance structure that further stretches faculty time for other governance structures (campus wide committees and local nursing campus committees). This is particularly difficult for nursing faculty at IUB because we are a part of the corridor, which has its own governance structure in nursing, while having approximately only 10 full time faculty to act as representatives on committees.
- ✓ There are two system wide structures for Nursing, neither of which has produced substantive outcomes or changes despite changes to the governance committee structure and faculty feedback.

### Community Responsiveness

- ✓ One major premise for disbanding is so that each campus can meet its own region's needs. This is core to nursing programs, especially on non-IUB campuses, who truly provide the nursing workforce for their region, including advanced practice nurses who require master's degrees.
- ✓ As each campus has already moved toward being more responsive to more autonomy, the benefits to the community for most, if not all, regional campuses have already been achieved.

### Administrative Structure/Operations/Budget

- ✓ The current administrative structure for the School of Nursing creates arduous and unnecessary layering.
- ✓ "Core" administration that lies at IUPUI have responsibility but not true authority for the system School of Nursing, creating a dissonance in role delineation.
- ✓ IUPUI often assumes the fiscal cost for functions of the system school, but it receives no special monies to operate the "system."
- ✓ Each campus maintains its own budget allowing it flexibility to respond to community and programmatic needs.

### Curricular Issues

- ✓ The BSN curriculum is the only curriculum that the entire system approved. It was developed to obtain similar year-end outcomes and facilitate cross campus transfer as requested by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. However, the far majority of transfers requested involve the IUB and IUPUI campuses.
- ✓ As evidenced by prior e-mail "discussion," there is a significant, and long-standing culture of paternalism, or rather for our mostly female faculty—maternalism, regarding authority and control over the graduate curriculum. As with undergraduate programs, there is a need for campus autonomy in graduate programs to respond to regional community needs. Curricular integrity is protected by the faculty from the granting campus, and should be assumed as quality just as any other program is assumed to be of quality.

### **Issue: Core Campus Schools**

IUB/IUPUC/IUPUI enjoys a collaborative relationship termed “Corridor.” Historically, this structure existed because IUB did not graduate students—all students for their BSN degrees finished at IUPUI. IUB now has students finish four years, but IUPUI retains degree granting authority as provided by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

*I am in favor of continuing the core campus “Corridor” concept while the system is disbanding. However, I believe the structure of having students complete a degree on one campus and another campus having degree granting authority is not a best practice in higher education, and needs investigation. Reasons for continuing “Corridor” structure for now:*

- ✓ The structure provides for strong, collaborative faculty governance.
- ✓ IUB faculty had input into the decision of administrator search processes and selection.
- ✓ IUB faculty are more familiar with the promotion and tenure guidelines of the IUPUI campus.
- ✓ Collaborative efforts on curricular development and design across the core campuses is strengthened.
- ✓ Administrators across IUB and IUPUI campuses collaborate on issues regarding student transferability to the benefit of students.
- ✓ IUB faculty have access to both IUB and IUPUI faculty development programs.
- ✓ The work of completing accreditation reports is distributed across two campuses rather than one.
- ✓ The recent designation of the NLN Center for Excellence reflects the excellence of faculty within the Corridor structure.
- ✓ Budgets are separate for IUB and IUPUI, allowing each administrator flexibility to meet the needs of her individual campus.
- ✓ Students enjoy the ability to transfer between IUB and IUPUI if a life circumstance causes them to relocate.
- ✓ IUB offers each course only once a year, and IUPUI each semester. If a student fails a course at IUB, s/he would have to wait an entire year to retake the course and get back into sequence. If s/he can transfer to IUPUI the wait and delay is only one semester.

*However, the issue of IUPUI granting IUB degrees is problematic because:*

- ✓ IUB is about to “graduate” its 3<sup>rd</sup> class in May 2007. If licensure exam results from the 3<sup>rd</sup> group are significantly high as with the past 2 groups, the IUB faculty will have more than sufficiently demonstrated its ability to implement a high quality program.
- ✓ It is confusing to explain to prospective students and parents how and why IUPUI is involved in degree granting of IUB students when students never interact with anyone at IUPUI.
- ✓ IUB School of Nursing is consistently faced with overcoming misperceptions about the program because it is not viewed as “autonomous.” Indeed, there are still lingering faculty are not even aware that a School of Nursing exists at IUB,



and more who are unaware that students no longer must transfer to IUPUI to complete their degree.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to respond.

---

**From:** Sims, Sharon L.  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 9:32 AM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** feedback on system school document

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback on this document. It seems to me the logic of the document breaks down when it lays out the nature of the negotiation between campuses. It is unclear to me what campuses are supposed to be negotiating for in this instance. If there is no system school, what is there to negotiate about? Regional campuses are led to believe they can have some kind of ongoing relationship with the core campus—but there is no clarity on what that might be, and if, in fact, there is any practical reason to have such a relationship. This will not be helpful as we go forward with this change—open ended negotiations about nothing in particular seem a waste of time and energy. Perhaps I'm misreading the document—if that is the case, I would appreciate hearing that from you. Thanks again for the opportunity to respond.

Sharon L. Sims, RN, PhD  
Professor and Chair  
Family Health Nursing Department  
IU School of Nursing  
317-274-4300

---

**From:** Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] **On Behalf Of** Schlapman, Nancy J  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:18 AM  
**To:** IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
**Subject:** Kokomo

The IU Kokomo School of Nursing faculty have had much discussion and much input into the assessment group that gathered the data for the trustees. We strongly wish to be autonomous from the "system" concept. We are independently accredited, we function from our own budget, we have our own P & T campus-wide committee, and more than any other reason, we have our own catchment area with specific needs that we must and want to meet. Dean Cass has spent the 13 years she has been here as Dean preparing this campus and the IUK School of Nursing to reach a growth point of autonomy. And, I believe, under her leadership, WE HAVE ARRIVED. Thank you.  
Nancy Schlapman

---

From: Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] On  
Behalf Of Rawl, Susan M.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 12:06 PM  
To: IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Subject: Re: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School  
Report

I support President Herbert's recommendation and consider it to be long overdue. Simplification of the IU system will allow each of our SON's to be more responsive to the needs of students and health care organizations in their respective regions. The regional schools, IUPUI and IUB have different missions and constituencies and each school's ability to excel and "bloom where they are planted" has been hampered by system complexity. Mission differentiation was undertaken for a reason and while this change will bring its own challenges, I believe there will be rewards for all in the long run.

Susan M. Rawl, PhD, RN  
Associate Professor  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
1111 Middle Drive, NU 340H  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202  
Tel. 317-278-2217  
Fax 317-278-2021  
Email: srawl@iupui.edu

---

From: Fisher, Mary L.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 9:39 AM  
To: UFCOFF; IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Cc: HERBERT; McRobbie, Michael A.  
Subject: RE: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School  
Report

Everyone - I was the one who made comments in yesterday's UFC meeting. I will share my concerns about the document (not as an administrator but as a faculty who has a right to express my opinion) with all to start the dialogue. I hope we can find time to have a dialogue about these concerns before the document is acted on by the Trustees. I realize there may be many perspectives.

The document disbands the system school. Many of us have both positive and negative feelings about this. My first concern is a process one: that the faculty has not been consulted about this at all. I feel a nursing faculty dialogue about the implications is needed well before the Trustees act.

Each campus can opt in or out of the larger school enterprise based on this document. The commission on higher education expects us to have one seamless undergraduate program for articulation and transfer purposes. This has been difficult enough in our current structure and I believe it would be impossible in a separated school. There simply would be no incentive for collaboration.

The emergence of MSN program plans at regional campuses has implications for the integrity of the IUSON MSN degree. If completely

separate, according to this document, the majors would have to clearly be labeled as coming from their own campus and not as a part of the ranked school. That has to be clearly articulated to students so they know what degree they are getting. "Truth in advertising" so to speak. That provision is absolutely necessary if the break up of the system school is to occur, in my opinion since I have concerns about quality in the current efforts by some campuses. I also have problems with regional campuses setting up MSN programs in direct competition with IUPUI majors and putting those majors in jeopardy. There has to be some coordination and collaboration about these efforts beyond administrative arrangements without faculty input.

People want to retain the name but not the constraints of compliance with the standards of the system school and the graduate faculty policies established. I find this disturbing, given my experience of working with a few regional faculty who have been advising graduate students without understanding the curriculum expectations.

Mary L. Fisher, PhD, RN, CNA, BC  
Professor and Department Chair  
Environments for Health  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
1111 Middle Dr., NU 485  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5107  
Phone: 317-278-2524  
Fax: 317-274-2411  
[mlfisher@iupui.edu](mailto:mlfisher@iupui.edu)

---

From: Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] On Behalf Of Delunas, Linda Rae  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 10:31 AM  
To: IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Subject: Re: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

Geez Mary, with all due respect I am very disturbed about your statements re: the regional campuses and quality. I think it has always been the "elephant in the room" that IUPUI faculty (pardon me for generalizing here but no more than lumping "the regionals") question the quality delivered on the regionals. In fact, it might be this very fact that would cause the regionals to want to separate from "the ranked school".

You make sweeping statements about "a few regional faculty who have been advising graduate students without understanding the curriculum expectations" yet I wonder what real, sustained effort is made to include/educate/collaborate with these faculty on such issues. Your suggestion that the regionals would be unable to develop quality Master's programs (I quote you... "I have concerns about quality in the current efforts by some campuses") is disheartening at best, elitist at worst.

The President made it clear in the document he presented to the Board of Trustees that if regionals want to separate from the system that their name would have to clearly indicate that (for instance, IU

Northwest School of Nursing rather than IU School of Nursing, Northwest) so that should soothe the egos of those who fear the regionals will drag them down.

As far as your statement "I also have problems with regional campuses setting up MSN programs in direct competition with IUPUI majors" I find it very interesting that this was not a concern of IUPUI when it came to the Distance Ed option for the RN-BSN completion, which (although it won't be "marketed" statewide) is certainly an option for anyone in the state.

Perhaps you don't realize how your words sound to us out here in the far reaches of the state (dare I say "those of us truly in the trenches"?).  
Disappointing....

Linda R. Delunas, PhD, RN, CNE  
Associate Professor, School of Nursing  
Faculty Assistant to the Chancellor  
Indiana University Northwest  
3400 Broadway  
Gary, IN 46408  
<http://www.iun.edu/~nurlrd>

---

From: Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] On Behalf Of Schlapman, Nancy J  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:28 AM  
To: IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Subject: Re: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

You go Linda!! FINALLY, the "poorly prepared, poor quality" IU campuses are seeing the elitism and snobbiness of the IUPUI nursing faculty. The Board of Trustees has finally listened as well. By the way, my understanding is that what went out from the Board is a "done deal" not up for a vote.  
Nancy

---

From: Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] On Behalf Of Broome, Marion E  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 1:25 PM  
To: IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Subject: Re: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

Hi all,

I would like to ask that everyone take a deep breath and not respond any further to this emotionally charged discussion. I am truly sorry this has happened as so many of the faculty and deans have been working very hard all year to collaborate, strengthen our programs, individually and as a whole, and further the quality education we offer for nursing students at all levels in the state of IN. The system deans have been working with each other to decide how this will work best for

each campus. In fact, we have tried to provide time for consideration of the best option for each campus as the agreements are developed- always keeping in mind what is best for students throughout the state.

The system deans meet again next week (usual schedule) and we can discuss how to best proceed. If faculty feel a need to have a meeting of the whole, please communicate with your campus dean-we can do it by teleconference like we usually do. Please feel free to forward me any concerns or questions. I would encourage everyone to remember that emails can and will likely be passed on to our colleagues outside of nursing and that, given that, we should all present as professional an image as possible. Thanks.

Marion

Marion E. Broome, Ph.D., R.N., FAAN  
University Dean and Distinguished Professor  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
Editor, Nursing Outlook: Official Journal of the  
American Academy of Nursing  
1111 Middle Dr. NU 132  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
317-274-1486  
317-278-1842

---

From: Nursing Faculty [mailto:IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU] On  
Behalf Of Fisher, Mary L.  
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 8:57 AM  
To: IU-NURSING-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU  
Subject: Re: Nursing Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School  
Report

Linda - I apologize for the obvious hurt my statement has caused. I assure you that I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues at all IUSON campuses as has been evidenced by my working relationships with them over the years. I do have the issues I stated in my piece, that are due mainly to a flawed communication with faculty in the schools involved in this system school review process. As I stated, there are strong feelings on all sides of the system school issue, not just in nursing, but also in other schools affected by the President's proposal.

I have been actively involved in these concerns as a UFC Agenda Committee member for the last couple of years. In case you could not tell from my piece, I am in favor of the breakup, under the stipulations in the proposal.

Mary L. Fisher, PhD, RN, CNAA, BC  
Professor and Department Chair  
Environments for Health  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
1111 Middle Dr., NU 485  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5107  
Phone: 317-278-2524  
Fax: 317-274-2411  
mlfisher@iupui.edu

## SLIS

From: Paolillo, John C.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:13 AM  
To: UFCOFF  
Cc: Paolillo, John C.  
Subject: Re: SLIS Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

Dear UFC,

I have a couple of informational requests pertaining to these recommendations.

According to the message below, there should be 5 pp in the referenced document, but I find only four. Also I found no specific reference to SLIS regarding recommendations, as your message had indicated. Am I viewing the correct version of the document? If not, could you please update the reference?

Second, the university structure is not explained in this document, and since the implementation/meaning of the core/system distinction is handled idiosyncratically in each school, it is very difficult to interpret what the recommendations are or what their consequences would be. Could you provide a brief synopsis of university structure (which schools are on which campuses, what designations are given to each school, dean, etc.), and a definition of terms such as "system school", "university dean", and the like? This would help a great deal in providing the feedback you ask for.

Thanks,

John Paolillo  
Associate Professor  
Informatics and SLIS

---

From: Shaw, Debora Jane  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 11:36 AM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: Re: SLIS Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

Ted and Bart,

I have no concerns about the representation of SLIS in the report.  
Thanks for inviting comment from our faculty.

Ralf

---

---

From: Rosenbaum, Howard S.  
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 12:49 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: Re: SLIS Faculty: Feedback Requested on Core Campus Report

Ted and Bart,

I'm an Associate prof in SLIS, Director of the Master in Information Science degree program and chair of our Faculty Policy Committee. I should say at the outset that I only speak here for myself.

The idea of a "Core Campus School" with a "single campus dean" as the academic leader of the school makes very good sense for SLIS and is a model that we have been refining for several years under the leadership of Blaise Cronin. It is working well for us.

And of course I agree with the statement that "The current structure should be continued and strengthened wherever possible."

Thanks.

Howard Rosenbaum

---

## **SPEA**

**From:** Bingham, Lisa Blomgren  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 7:46 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** Core Campus and System Schools

SPEA IUB needs to report to the Provost for the Bloomington Campus, not to Indianapolis. Otherwise, I concur with the report.

---

**From:** Candler, Gaylord George  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 10:06 PM  
**To:** UFCOFF  
**Subject:** FW: SPEA Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

I have to agree with the recommendations of the Systems School Report, at least as regards SPEA.

10-20 years ago the system seemed to feature too much central control. This resulted in cultural incompatibilities, as Bloomington's research culture was applied to regional campuses with a stronger teaching focus.

Currently, especially under Dean Merget, the situation is reversed. The disinterest in the regional campuses is palpable. The regional campuses can also be too small to justify national searches for Campus Deans, resulting in the possibility of poorly managed, independent units without effective oversight. In South Bend we have seen four of our last five hires leave prior to achieving tenure. The only survivor might have left if it had not been for family ties in the area, and at least one of the two tenured faculty is clearly estranged from the unit. No one has questioned either this high faculty attrition, or glaring oddities in program management that have contributed to it.

SPEA also suffers from the irrational results of organizational creep. While the environment and public affairs (not to mention environmental science) haven't necessarily meshed well in Bloomington, the title of the school is especially inappropriate in South Bend where we teach no environmental classes, and where criminal justice accounts for a large majority of our students.

One can also fairly ask whether the current combination of criminal justice, health services management and public management (which more accurately reflects the nature of our BSPA and MPA than does public affairs) necessarily makes the most effective unit for each of these three subject areas. Criminal Justice would seem to have more in common with sociology or even psychology; health services management would seem to have more in common with business management; and public management would seem to have more in common with business, political science, or even sociology.



If one overlooks the four faculty who have left SPEA over the past three years, the six tenure track faculty who remain are split in our preferences for the future. To the best of my knowledge no one expresses a desire to maintain the link to the system school, neither (clearly) the four who have left recently, nor any of us who remain.

With regards to what to do with an IUSB-SPEA separated from the system school, two faculty have administrative positions with course release/stipends, and have been honest about their strongly stated preference, and aggressive lobbying for the status quo (an independent School of Criminal Justice, Public Affairs and Health Services Management under a Dean) to maintain these personal benefits. Two other faculty are in their first year at SPEA, and generally express a desire for the status quo consistent with this strongly expressed view of the two senior faculty who constitute the leadership team in the unit. Two others see benefits in splitting up SPEA's parts and placing them in other units.

Dr. G. G. Candler  
School of Public and Environmental Affairs  
Indiana University -- South Bend  
<http://mypage.iusb.edu/~gcandler/>

---

From: Picardal, Flynn W.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 1:33 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: FW: SPEA Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

With respect to SPEA's governance and the Core Campus recommendations, I strongly support the suggested restructuring over what is now in place. Indeed, I would prefer that the recommendations went further. I don't have many interactions with colleagues at IUPUI and see, albeit from a limited perspective, little benefit to linking SPEA-IUB with SPEA-IUPUI as Core Campuses. I would prefer that both units operate independently. In summary, I support the recommendation but wish that it went even further.

Flynn Picardal  
SPEA-IUB

---

From: Brian Fife [mailto:fifeb@ipfw.edu]  
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2007 8:43 PM  
To: UFCOFF  
Subject: Re: SPEA Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

Dear Professors Miller and Ng:

Thank you for soliciting feedback on President Herbert's recommendations to the Board of Trustees. As a SPEA faculty member at IPFW, I believe that the recommendations concerning the Division of Public and Environmental Affairs at IPFW are highly intuitive. In my ten years at IPFW, many issues, including promotion and tenure and the creation of a new master's degree, have been decentralized. I believe that Dean Astrid Merget's emphasis on the School's common mission

across the campuses while preserving individual campus identities has proven to be both effective and equitable. Thus, the president's recommendations seemingly codify a process that has been underway for a number of years.

If a cooperative spirit pervades during the implementation phase of the president's plan, particularly with regard to degrees, course numbers, and course titles, then I expect that all constituencies, especially the students in Indiana's public higher education system, will be well served and the transition will be relatively seamless.

Sincerely,

Brian L. Fife  
Professor of Public Affairs  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

---

**From:** Perry, James L.  
**Sent:** Friday, March 30, 2007 6:59 AM  
**To:** Ng, Bartholomew S; Miller, Theodore K.  
**Subject:** RE: SPEA Faculty: Feedback Requested on System School Report

Bart and Ted,

I am away so I won't be talking with colleagues about the report, but I did discuss it with Chuck Bonser before I left the country last fall. On the whole, I believe President Herbert's recommendations take us in the right directions, both for the schools involved and IU generally.

I have a few observations about the specifics of the President's recommendations.

1. The recommendations seem largely based on where systems schools have been headed in recent years. It notes that many schools are moving toward a federated structure and away from more tightly coupled organizational arrangements. I would prefer to see some statement of goals or principles that represent the larger interests of Indiana University and citizens of Indiana. In the absence of some overarching goals or principles, I suspect we may re-visit these issues again much sooner than we now expect.
2. The recommendation is silent about to whom professional deans on the core campus will report. The previous system where several of the University Deans reported to the IUPUI Chancellor does not seem workable given the emphasis on a core campus structure. The one person with jurisdiction for IUB and IUPUI would seem to be the Vice President for Academic Affairs and IUB Provost. I believe the President's recommendation should be explicit about reporting lines for the new general structure. Perhaps this issue has already been resolved, but if it has not, then now is the time to clarify reporting.
3. I was a bit surprised by the recommendation regarding Journalism. My last communications with stakeholders at IUPUI (albeit almost a year ago) indicated that IUB had abandoned the core campus structure and journalism at IUPUI, with encouragement from Chancellor Bantz, was searching for a partner on the IUPUI campus. I don't know the current

situation, but if the President's recommendation is a non-starter with the parties involved (including the new dean in Bloomington), then I think the proposal should be modified to reflect current realities.

4. I think it may be useful to include some mechanism for review of disputes between core campus deans and campuses. I can envision some campuses wanting to remain part of a system school, but being confronted with unreasonable requirements to maintain their status. There needs to be a way to resolved such disputes should they arise.
5. There should be some procedure for review of the final agreements before they commence in 2008. I'm not sure who the body is, but I would expect that the University Faculty Council might be the body that gives the proposed agreements a review just as it is doing with the President's recommendation.

Let me know if you need any elaboration.

Jim

James L. Perry  
Fulbright-Yonsei Distinguished Lecturer  
Department of Public Administration  
Yonsei University  
Seoul, Korea

and

Chancellor's Professor  
School of Public and Environmental Affairs  
Indiana University

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

**From:** Spechler, Martin

**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2007 10:25 AM

**To:** Kish, Kelly

**Subject:** core campus and system schools

Bart, while for many purposes each school can arrange its own relationship with units on other campuses, I think the core campus school idea can give us some stability and opportunity to combine for research, hires (especially spousal hires), internships, and specialty teaching. Dean Bonser's rather impressive report has been unfairly neglected by the President's mostly perfunctory recommendations to the Trustees. Of course we must study this matter more closely, which the UFC has not done. Leaving aside Ted Miller's hostility to cooperation with IUPUI ("There is no core campus!"), there are many cooperative elements which can be exploited for the benefit of both campuses. These must be regularized at the campus level, not just by schools. For example, to make strong hires in our Bloomington campus, it is often necessary to arrange to accommodate a spouse. This has been awkward in the past, but with the core campus school, the Dean could make the necessary arrangements.

As for abolishing the system concept, I don't think SPEA or Nursing has been adequately consulted. The system concept strengthens the competitive position of the smaller campuses' programs, I would think, and makes them more attractive to possible hires.

Finally, the core campus concept lends legitimacy to IUPUI as one of the two largest research campuses in the IU system. We should not allow IUB to cast us off, as some would like to do.

Martin

Martin Spechler  
4418 Sheffield Drive  
Bloomington, IN 47408