INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

TO: Chancellors, Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans, UFC co-chairs

FROM: Michael A. McRobbie
President

RE: Report of the Core Schools Operations Review Committee

DATE: October 6, 2008

1. I am pleased to accept the report of the Core Schools Operations Review Committee, a copy of which is attached to this memorandum. It is apparent that the committee has put a great deal of time and effort into the report, and I thank the co-chairs of the committee, Charles Bantz and Karen Hanson, and the committee members for their hard work. The report will move IU toward a clearer understanding of the core campus structure and a better set of practices for operating within that structure. The fundamental principles of transparency and communication constitute the proper foundation of relationships within the core campus structure.

2. By June 30, 2009, the Chancellor, the Provost, and the core school deans should complete the written agreements called for by the report and concerning –

    - The roles and responsibilities of the dean and associate dean
    - The promotion and tenure process
    - The fiscal relationship between the campus divisions of the schools

    a) Copies of the agreements should be provided to my office and to the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Policy.

    b) I expect a degree of variation in the agreements, reflecting the differences among the core schools in size, organization, history, and culture. However, all agreements must recognize and support the operational integrity of the schools, because they are the fundamental building blocks of the academic mission of the university.

    c) Deans should consult with their schools' faculty governance mechanisms before finalizing any agreement. Such consultation is particularly important because the committee's report was completed during the summer, when it was difficult to gather faculty and staff to obtain the feedback envisioned in my charge to the committee.

Bryan Hall 200
107 S. Indiana Avenue
Bloomington, Indiana
47405-7000
812-855-4613
Fax: 812-855-9586

University Place
Conference Center
850 W. Michigan Street
Suite 243
Indianapolis, Indiana
46202-5198
317-274-3571
Fax: 317-274-5098

iupres@indiana.edu
www.indiana.edu/~pres

  d) The Chancellor, Provost, and deans should consult with other administrative officers, including the Office of the Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, and Vice President for Planning and Policy, as needed to draft these agreements.

  e) The agreements should to the extent possible be consistent with existing policies. Where a change in policy is required, the appropriate policymaking procedures should be followed.

3. With respect to the Recommendations to Encourage Intercampus Communications and Collaboration –

  a) Core school deans should implement as quickly and extensively as practical the recommendations concerning administrative barriers for students, flexibility on student policies, and school-wide faculty committees and communication.

  b) The Chancellor and Provost should implement as quickly and extensively as practical the recommendations concerning leadership positions and annual meetings with deans on core school operations issues.

  c) The Chancellor and Provost, in consultation with Bloomington and IUPUI faculty governance, should establish the recommended standing committee, to which should be referred recommendations that require campus or university action. The committee should as a first priority address the recommendations concerning –

- duplicative student fees
- enhanced video conferencing capabilities, in consultation with the Vice President for Information Technology
- simplified library access, in consultation with the Dean of University Libraries
- intercampus research funding

  d) The co-chairs of the University Faculty Council should as a high priority resolve faculty members' status for the purpose of participating in campus- and university-level faculty governance.

4. Chancellors, Provost, and deans should apply principles of the report, as applicable, to settings beyond the core schools themselves. For example, the work of the University Graduate School and the Executive Vice President spans both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, and many of the operational principles in the report could usefully be applied to their activities.

REPORT OF THE CORE SCHOOL
OPERATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE

This report responds to the charge of President Michael McRobbie to make recommendations concerning best practices and potential improvements in the operations of Indiana University's "core schools," that is, those schools which operate on both, and only, the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses of IU. The committee finds that the schools generally operate effectively within the inevitably complex administrative structure of the core campus system, and that several of the concerns suggested in the President's charge do not require additional attention. Other areas of the charge do present obstacles to the proper and effective administration of the core schools, and they are the primary subject of this report. The committee also recommends several discrete actions by the schools, campuses, and university, which could substantially ease the challenges faced by the core schools' students, faculty, and administration.

Background

In June 2006, then-President Adam W. Herbert tasked a committee of former senior administrators of Indiana University, chaired by Dean Emeritus Charles Bonser, to conduct a review of the structure and operations of the University's "system" schools (those that conduct programs on campuses throughout the IU system) and its core campus schools. At the May 2007 meeting of the Board of Trustees, President Herbert reported to the Board that he had accepted the report of the committee, which recommended the termination of the system school organization by June 30, 2008 (with the exception of the School of Social Work), and the retention of the core school organization. System schools would become core schools, that is, they would have substantial faculty and operations on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The core schools include the School of Education, School of Informatics, School of Journalism, Kelley School of Business, School of Nursing, School of Library and Information Science, School of Social Work (which is also a system school), and School of Public and Environmental Affairs. By June 30, 2008, the former system schools were to work out specific agreements with their units on the regional campuses to determine the nature and extent of their continuing relationship.

The Bonser committee also recommended that the core schools develop a specific, written understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of the dean of the school and the campus and school administrative staff on the campus at which the dean is not resident. The committee recommended that the agreements assure that the dean have final authority within the school (consistent with customary faculty governance) in the following areas:
- Administrative leadership for curriculum changes and new degree programs;
- Faculty affairs, including recruiting, appointments, evaluation, promotion and tenure, and professional development;
- Accreditation and program evaluation;
- Alumni affairs and development activities;
- Budget development, faculty salaries, and cross-campus financial issues;
- Teaching policies; and
- Developing opportunities and incentives for intercampus collaboration in teaching, research, and service activities.

Rather than undertake this effort on a school-by-school basis, President McRobbie appointed the present Core School Operations Review Committee to identify the operational challenges for core schools and to recommend ways to address them. The committee membership included the deans of each of the core schools, and a faculty member from each core school from the campus on which the dean is not resident (appointed by the dean and who is not an administrator), the Bloomington Provost, the IUPUI Chancellor, the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, the Vice President for Diversity,

Equity, and Multicultural Affairs. The Provost and Chancellor served as co-chairs. The President's charge included the following instructions:

> These policies and procedures need to reflect two key priorities – (i) to ensure that the Dean is able to manage the school for which he or she is responsible in a coherent manner with appropriate authority, and (ii) to ensure the individual campus components of a school are responsive to the mission and priorities of the campuses, and where relevant, to the external constituency of the campuses.

The President's charge also included several specific areas for the committee's consideration, and these are addressed below.

The committee began its work by surveying the core school deans on each of the areas identified in the President's charge. The results of the survey were shared with all committee members, and they became the basis for the committee's deliberations. The committee met three times, using videoconferencing to permit participation from both Bloomington and Indianapolis, and adopted this report through an iterative drafting process.

Schools of Social Work and Nursing

In the course of the committee's deliberations, it became apparent that the School of Social Work and School of Nursing do not fit easily into the core school model that is the foundation of this report. The School of Social Work, in particular, is not strictly speaking a core school at all, but rather remained as a system school in the reorganization. More importantly, it does not function as a core school, and many of the recommendations herein would be extremely problematic for the operations of the School of Social Work. The School of Nursing is a mixed model: a core school in many areas of the relationship between the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, and a main-campus model in other areas, including promotion and tenure. For these two schools, therefore, the following recommendations should be regarded as primarily advisory. The general principles of transparency and explicit agreements on roles and responsibilities are clearly applicable (Nursing and Social Work, for example, have developed written agreements with the regional campuses, as have the other core schools), but many of the more specific principles and recommendations are inapplicable or may even be counterproductive.

Nomenclature

It is perhaps indicative of the challenge of maintaining a single school organization within the context of two robust campus organizations that there is no common nomenclature for important aspects of the core campus/core school concept. This report uses the following terminology:

- A core school's operations on a particular campus is called "a division" of the school.
- The campus or division at which the dean is not primarily resident is called the "non-dean-resident" (NDR) campus or division.
- The associate dean who is the senior administrator of the NDR division is called the "NDR associate dean," or NDR-AD.

These terms lack elegance, but they simplify the discussion in the report.

Observations

1. There is a range of degrees of comfort with the core campus concept across the core schools. For some schools, the two-campus relationships operate quite smoothly and the inevitable challenges are handled with a minimum of tension. For others, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the core campus concept itself. The committee takes the following structural conditions as given:

- The university has adopted the core campus concept for the schools of Education, Informatics, Journalism, the Kelley School of Business, Nursing, SLIS, Social Work, and SPEA.
- State support and university funding are managed separately by each campus, and this is reflected in the principle of responsibility center management (RCM). Thus, the revenues and expenses of the divisions of the schools on each campus must be budgeted separately and may not be freely comingled or transferred.

- Likewise, academic appointments, tenure, and degrees are campus-specific and require approval through the relevant campus procedures.

We viewed changes in these conditions to be outside of the scope of this committee's charge.

2. The challenges of the core school organization are real. It is difficult to implement and advance the idea of One School when some of the most fundamental aspects of policy and management – budget, tenure and promotion, degrees – are divided between two larger organizations, the core campuses. Management and leadership within this structure will never be simple or automatic, and so the University's commitment to the core campus organization requires that all participants at the campus and school level make the extra effort to work within that organizational structure.

3. There is also a range among the core schools in the degrees of difference among each school's campus divisions. In some schools, the missions are very distinctive, while in others there is very little difference. Likewise, there is a range of difference, based on mission, in the duties and expectations of faculty, student preparation, faculty compensation, governance structures, and other characteristics. There are clearly some advantages to parallelism among core schools, just as there is among departments or campuses – faculty and administrators know better what is expected of them and the grass-is-greener phenomenon is minimized. However, given the range of difference among the core schools, it is clear that uniformity is neither achievable nor desirable. Rather, the most urgent operational mandate must be that all of the individuals involved communicate regularly with each other concerning plans and decisions, in a spirit of cooperation for the advancement of the school and university as a whole.

4. The committee has not pursued additional fact-finding or made recommendations (except incidentally) concerning a number of issues in the President's charge to the committee, because they did not appear to the committee to require resolution at the university level. The committee does not mean to suggest or imply that these issues are either unimportant or easily resolved. In fact, they are clearly issues of great importance to the faculty and students of each school. Rather, university-level resolution is impractical for a number of reasons, as follows:

- *Differences in tuition and fees across campuses within a core school.* The differences in tuition and fees, where they exist, are driven primarily by the "market" for students and programs of study. Also, the legal prohibition on co-mingling funds between campuses precludes more than incidental cross-subsidization of programs. Both of these are out of the control of university policy. There are, however, instances in which students taking courses on both campuses must pay redundant fees, and such redundancy should be terminated.
- *Differences in faculty salaries within core schools across campuses.* Individual faculty salaries are of course dominated by individual factors such as accomplishment, seniority, and by intra- and extramural comparative salaries. The primary *collective* determinant is the resources available to each campus, and the prohibition on cross-subsidization across campuses precludes a university policy that would equalize those resources. Salary setting must therefore remain a matter for individual school's determination.
- *Unequal burdens of faculty governance.* This did not appear to the committee to present a serious obstacle for the future of the core schools. As it involves a delicate trade-off between voice and burden, specific university-level guidance does not seem practical.
- *Differences across campuses within core schools concerning criteria for promotion and tenure, expectations and achievement in scholarly productivity, teaching load, the obtaining of grants, and the differential qualifications of students.* The nature and extent of the differences between the campus divisions of the core schools differ widely among the schools. In addition, these matters are at the heart of each school's and their divisions' identity, mission, and organization. It is neither practical nor appropriate to impose general rules concerning these matters that would apply to all schools.

  School administrations should seek to maintain an aggregate balance of incentives and opportunities for faculty at each of their divisions, so that distinctions in either division or campus mission do not preclude the possibility of comparable reward in both relative and absolute terms. Further, core schools are encouraged to develop goals and structures that

are best realized through the combined and complementary work of all school divisions. The mechanics of this balance are best determined by individual schools.

- *Difficulties concerning the transfer of students between campuses.* These difficulties overwhelmingly involve intramural policies and requirements of each school, rather than university policy. A spirit of flexibility and cooperation and an objective of facilitating transfer must govern each core school's policies and administration. The difference between Bloomington and IUPUI academic calendars presents the most fundamental difficulty in transfers between campuses, and the campuses should explore opportunities to reduce those differences.

While the committee does not recommend specific policies to address the above issues, they would be positively affected by several of the following principles.

I. Recommended Principles for Core School Administration

In its deliberations, the committee identified a relatively small number of areas that require serious attention. Because circumstances differ substantially among the schools, the committee concluded that general principles make more sense than specific rules.

The committee recommends that these principles and the discussion of areas of potential conflict be shared widely with administrators and faculty of the core schools. Equally important, prospective deans from outside the institution, who may not fully appreciate the unique core campus concept, should be provided with the principles and discussion, and be offered opportunities to discuss them with other deans and senior administrators.

A. Transparency

Overarching Principle of Transparency

It is clear from the committee's deliberations that many difficulties can be resolved by (1) up-front clarity about roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority; (2) communication of roles and responsibilities to the persons whose roles and responsibilities are involved (*e.g.*, deans, associate deans) and the persons who are affected by the roles and responsibilities (*e.g.*, faculty members); and (3) regular and ongoing communication among administrators on both campuses. It is easy, given the many and varied demands on administrators' and faculty members' time, to leave each of these elements of transparency to take care of themselves in a tacit, informal, or ad hoc manner. Like other aspects of the core campus structure, however, these require explicit attention. This is one of the special challenges facing administrators and faculty in core schools.

B. Roles and Responsibilities of the NDR Associate Dean

Principles

Ultimate program authority at the school level rests with the Dean of the school. Ultimate responsibility for setting budgets, promotion and tenure, appointment of faculty and senior school administrators, and the approval or formal discontinuation of degree programs rests with each core campus. School and campus administrators must take care not to circumvent or replace the dean's, provost's, or chancellor's appropriate authority.

To avoid misunderstandings of appropriate roles, explicit understandings should be reached between the dean and the provost or chancellor on operational areas that are especially important or that are susceptible to lack of clarity or confusion in roles. The default position should always be communication and involvement. The dean must secure agreement with the division's provost or chancellor on the required areas of understanding with the campus administration.

Similarly, the dean and NDR-AD must determine and clearly define reporting lines, areas of decisional authority, and levels of consultation – subject to the dean's ultimate responsibility for the management of the school and the special importance of decanal involvement in budget, promotion and tenure, and degrees. Not only the dean and NDR-AD, but also campus officials, faculty, staff, and students, need to know who makes the decisions affecting them and to whom to turn with questions or concerns.

To the extent practical, these sets of understandings should be in writing, for the purpose of preserving institutional memory and clearly communicating roles and responsibilities to others. Such agreements must be understood to preserve flexibility to account for unusual or unanticipated circumstances.

Decisions by the dean concerning a division of the school should respect that division's campus mission with regard to program and promotion and tenure. Likewise, faculty course load and salaries should be consistent with campus mission and resources.

Required areas for specific understandings

The above agreements should cover the areas identified by the Bonser committee and reprinted above (pp. 1-2). Specifically, they should address –

- Relationship between dean and NDR-AD with respect to –
  - Curricular changes
  - Proposals for new degrees and programs
  - Recruitment and advancement of all academic personnel
  - Hiring and management of non-academic personnel
  - Class schedules
  - Instructional assignments
  - External relations
  - Requests for sabbatical leave
  - Promotion and tenure advice
  - Mentoring of faculty
  - Grievances
  - Terminations of non-tenure track faculty
  - Salary review
  - Legal, regulatory, and compliance matters.
- Relationships with campus administration with respect to –
  - Review of school goals by campus administration
  - Representation of the school at NDR campus-level meetings
  - Campus expectations for decanal involvement in campus events
  - Appointment process for NDR-AD
  - Subjects on which the dean is to be contacted directly or included in communications, and those which the NDR-AD will represent the school on the NDR campus
- Relationships with external audiences with respect to –
  - Accreditation, compliance activities, and governmental approvals
  - Representation of the school as a whole and the NDR division
  - Involvement of campus administration in decanal activity in the community
  - Development opportunities
  - State relations
  - Community outreach.

It is important that individuals affected by the above policies – including, as appropriate, faculty, students, and staff – understand the roles of the dean and NDR-AD. In particular, the schools must ensure that faculty members clearly understand the roles of dean and NDR-AD in the promotion and tenure process, and the areas in which faculty members should turn first to the NRD-AD, and to whom they can address issues that are not resolved at the division level.

C. The Promotion and Tenure Processes

Principles

Requirements and expectations for promotion and tenure in each division should reflect the campus missions.

The procedural path and the decisional and advisory roles of all reviewing committees and individuals on both campuses (in particular the dean and NDR-AD) should be clear to individuals who are or expect to be under review.

The primary responsibility for providing advice and guidance lies with the promotion and tenure committee (or committee members) and administrators who reside on the individual's home campus. It is the responsibility of the dean to ensure that such advice and guidance is provided.

An individual should need to prepare only one version of his or her dossier which will be considered at all levels within the university.

Recommended area for specific action

- The two campuses have different requirements or expectations for the length of the personal statements in promotion and tenure dossiers, and there is a widespread perception that multiple dossiers or dossier formats are required. The two divisions of each core school and the campuses should work together to achieve a single dossier format, including a personal statement that will be wholly acceptable on both campuses, and to communicate it clearly to persons under review.

D. Fiscal Relationship Between the Campus Divisions of the Core Schools

Principles

The dean is responsible for the fiscal stewardship of his or her school, and so all aspects of the school's finances and its financial relationship with each campus must always be totally transparent to the dean. The dean must personally approve the budgets submitted to each campus.

The dean and NDR-AD must reach an express understanding of the fiscal and budgetary areas and/or amounts for which the dean needs to (a) decide, (b) be notified in advance, and (c) be specifically notified but after the fact, as well as (d) those which do not require notification.

The agreement must specify what constitutes major fiscal or budgetary issues for the school which should be discussed by campus or university administrators with the NDR-AD only when the dean is invited to participate in the discussion. If the dean chooses to have the NDR-AD represent the school in individual circumstances beyond the areas defined in the formal agreement, the dean should communicate this to the NDR-AD and the relevant campus officials. All such agreements must be consistent with Indiana law and university policy on campus budgeting.

The agreement must address whether the dean is directly involved in decisions that involve multiple-year commitments of substantial resources, including tenured and tenure-stream hiring, multi-year contract hiring, and faculty salaries and other compensation.

Recommended areas for specific understandings
- Budget preparation and approval
  o Transparency of campus budget to dean

- o   Participation of dean in campus budget process
- o   Setting tuition
- o   Setting fees
- o   Participation in budget hearings.
- Hiring of non-academic staff
- Meetings with finance and administration officers
- Audit responsibility
- Commitment of non-personnel resources
- Allocation of shared and common-good expenses across campuses (for example, decanal and other school-wide staff salaries and expenses) across divisions.

II. Recommendations to Encourage Intercampus Communication and Collaboration

The following recommendations are specific, concrete steps that schools, campuses, and the university can take to ease communication and collaboration within schools, across the core campuses.

Students

- Within core schools, administrative barriers to joint programs between campuses should be identified and addressed as a high priority.
- Core schools should adopt an explicit policy of flexibility in applying academic and non-academic requirements, policies, and administrative practices in order to facilitate inter-campus activity. Adjustments of non-essential requirements, as long as they do not undermine the academic integrity of a program, should be freely granted.
- In particular, school divisions and campuses should avoid charging fees that are duplicative of fees already paid by a visiting student on the home campus.
- The campus administrations should study opportunities to coordinate the academic calendars on the core campuses, understanding that different commencement dates, conflicts with local school calendars, and the continuation of multiple school calendars (*e.g.*, medicine, law, dentistry) are unavoidable.

Faculty

- Deans and faculties should be creative and flexible in order to facilitate the creation and operation of school-wide faculty committees for school-wide issues.
- Deans should ensure that there is regular school-wide communication to assure broad awareness of faculty and other important searches, appointments, promotions, honors, and faculty activities.
- To support school-wide committees, school-wide participation in lectures and conferences, and other inter-campus communication, the University should ensure that high-quality video conferencing equipment, bandwidth, and technical support is provided to core schools for a wide variety of uses. The objective is to make video participation seamless, familiar, and frequent.
- Faculty members with appointments in core schools should have ready access to library resources on both campuses without the need for special adjunct appointments on their non-resident campus.
- The Bloomington, IUPUI, and University Faculty Councils should as a high priority resolve questions regarding faculty members' status for the purpose of participating in campus- and university-level faculty governance.
- The campus offices of research should actively solicit and expedite proposals for the $1 million intercampus research fund that President McRobbie announced at his inauguration.

Administration

- The implementation of the foregoing recommendations will fall mainly to the Provost of the Bloomington campus and the Chancellor of the IUPUI campus. They should form a joint standing committee of administrators and faculty to identify and recommend solutions to operational issues arising from the core school organization.
- A record and spirit of transparency and collaboration should be regarded as an essential quality of all individuals in leadership positions within the core schools.
- The dean of each core school should meet annually with the chancellor or provost of the NDR campus for the express purpose of discussing core school operations issues. A similar meeting between the dean and the NDR-AD would be equally beneficial.
- In-person participation in school-wide academic, professional, recognition, and social events should be encouraged by making physical transportation between the campuses readily available at modest cost to the schools. For example, keeping in mind the challenges of energy sustainability, the University could consider making vans and buses available for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

THE CORE SCHOOL OPERATIONS REVIEW
COMMITTEE
Karen Hanson and Charles Bantz, Co-chairs

APPENDICES

President McRobbie's Charge to the Committee

1. Following the submission in early 2007 of the Bonser Report to President Herbert, he approved of most of the recommendations of this report and this decision was subsequently endorsed by the Trustees at their June, 2007, meeting.

2. Given this, it is now timely to review policies and procedures concerning the operations of core schools. These policies and procedures need to reflect two key priorities - (i) to ensure that the Dean is able to manage the school for which he or she is responsible in a coherent manner with appropriate authority, and (ii) to ensure the individual campus components of a school are responsive to the mission and priorities of the campuses, and where relevant, to the external constituency of the campuses. This review will also provide an opportunity where appropriate, to bring a greater consistency to these policies and procedures and will allow schools to learn from the "best practices" taking place in other schools.

3. To this end, I am establishing the Core School Operations Review Committee to be co-chaired by Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson. Its other members will be Vice President Neil Theobald and the Deans of the core schools - Education, Informatics, Journalism, the Kelley School of Business, Nursing, SLIS, Social Work and SPEA. John Applegate will staff this committee.

4. I ask that the Deans each also appoint one additional faculty member to this committee from their school. This should be, where possible, a faculty member in their school who is not an administrator and who is from a campus other than the one on which the Dean is based. The Deans should also ensure there are mechanisms within their schools to allow feedback from faculty and staff on the issues this committee will be considering.

5. As well as the more general issues described in 2, I ask that the Committee also consider the following more specific issues:

> (a). Most schools based on one campus, have an associate dean on the other campus responsible for daily management of the component of the school on that campus. Bearing in mind the need of the Dean of a core school to have ultimate authority concerning the management of a school, how much autonomy and in what areas (e.g. budgets, curricular matters, faculty and staff hiring, development, alumni relations, public relations, marketing, etc) does an associate dean need to manage effectively?

> (b). Are there issues concerning the management of the budgets of core schools across campuses that need attention?

> (c). Where there are differences in tuitions and fees within a core school across campuses, what effect does this have on the management of these schools?

> (d). Are there significant differences in faculty salaries within core schools across campuses? Where there are, what are the reasons for these? Are there issues here that need to be addressed?

> (e). How is participation in faculty governance sustained within a core school across campuses? Does this result in unequal burdens on faculty members across campuses? Are there ways to improve this?

> (f). Are there differences across campuses within core schools concerning criteria for promotion and tenure, expectations and achievement in scholarly productivity, teaching load, the obtaining of grants, and the differential qualifications of students? Do these cause any difficulties? If so, how can these be resolved?

(g). Are there issues concerning the transfer of students between campuses? If so, how can these be resolved?

(h). Are there issues at the campus or University level that cause difficulties for core campus schools in executing their missions in the most effective and efficient ways? If so, what are they and what can be done to remove them?

6. I would like a report form this committee by the end of the Spring Semester.

Committee Members

Karen Hanson, Co-chair	Executive Vice President and Provost, Bloomington
Charles Bantz, Co-chair	Executive Vice President and Chancellor, IUPUI
Neil Theobald	Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Edwin Marshall	Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs
Gerardo Gonzalez	Dean, School of Education
Charles R. Barman	Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education, IUPUI
Robert B. Schnabel	Dean, School of Informatics
Steven Mannheimer	Professor of Informatics, IUPUI
Bradley Hamm	Dean, School of Journalism
Ulf Jonas Bjork	Professor of Journalism, IUPUI
Daniel C. Smith	Dean, Kelley School of Business
Kenneth A. Carow	Professor of Business, IUPUI
Marion Broome	Dean, School of Nursing
Patricia Allen	Clinical Assistant Professor of Nursing, Bloomington
Blaise Cronin	Dean, School of Library and Information Sciences
Jean L. Preer	Professor of Library & Information Science, IUPUI
Michael Patchner	Dean, School of Social Work
Sabrina W. Sullenberger	Assistant Professor of Social Work, Bloomington
C. Kurt Zorn	Interim Dean, School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Kenna Quinet	Associate Professor of Public & Environmental Affairs, IUPUI
John S. Applegate, Staff	Presidential Fellow and Walter W. Foskett Professor of Law