

A GUIDE FOR FACULTY DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED IU RESTRUCTURING PLAN

SOURCE DOCUMENTS

- [1] *Presidential Report on Leadership and Structure: Preparing Indiana University for Future Distinction*: <<http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/presreport.htm>>
- [2] *A Board Of Trustees Conversational Response To The Resolutions Approved By The Faculty Of IU Bloomington And The Board's Agenda For A Future Of Distinction*: <<http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/trusteeresponse.htm>>

PURPOSE OF PLANNING MEETINGS OF SCHOOL FACULTY ASSEMBLIES

- Provide an opportunity for IUPUI faculty to discuss how the proposed restructuring plan (outlined in [1] and [2]) will impact IUPUI and the various schools on campus.
- Prepare faculty to help draft an *IUPUI Faculty Response* to the proposed restructuring plan for Indiana University during the January 30, 2006, Special Faculty Meeting.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRUSTEES

During a Special Board Meeting held at IU Bloomington on January 14, 2006, the IU Board of Trustees formally approved the following changes in the university's administrative leadership structure:

1. The position of *Chancellor* on the Bloomington campus was eliminated, establishing the President as the leader of the campus and creating the new position of *Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bloomington* that will serve as the chief academic officer of the Bloomington campus.
2. The title and duties of the *Vice President for Long-Range Planning and Chancellor, IUPUI* were changed to *Executive Vice President and Chancellor, IUPUI*.

According to the President, these two changes are meant to put the chief executive officer of Indiana University (the President) on the Bloomington campus and his "second-in-command" (Executive Vice President) on the Indianapolis campus. However, even a casual reading of the Position Descriptions of the *Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bloomington* and *Executive Vice President and Chancellor, IUPUI* (contained in [1]) would suggest that the IUPUI Chancellor's position has been diminished rather than elevated.

THE ISSUES

It should be noted that the Trustees have yet to take any formal action to adopt the specifics of the proposed restructuring plan outlined in [1] and [2]. They even went so far as to say that they “intend to enlist the faculty, administration, staff, Foundation, alumni and other interested parties in the discussion of [the restructuring plan]” in the coming months, albeit at an accelerated pace. However, many of the proposed changes, some of which are explicitly spelled out while others are implied, are worrisome for IUPUI:

- They focus on making IU Bloomington a world-class research university while IUPUI is a research university only with respect to its existing strengths.
- Location of authority over graduate programs with the IUB Provost, with no acknowledgement of IUPUI’s role in graduate education anywhere in [1] or [2].
- Management of international programs, a university-wide function, will be subsumed under the office of the IUB Provost.
- Relocation of reporting authority of the Kelley School of Business from the IUPUI chancellor to the IUB Provost.
- Separation of the fortunes of the School of Medicine from the larger IUPUI campus.
- The IUPUI Chancellor will now be reduced to the President’s liaison to the School of Medicine on our campus. This is in stark contrast to the Trustees’ announcement made on December 9, 2005, after Dr. Craig Brater was appointed Vice President for Life Sciences. It was stated then that as Dean of the School of Medicine, “he will continue reporting to IUPUI Chancellor Charles Bantz [...]. In his additional role as vice president for life sciences, Dr. Brater will report to [President] Herbert.”
- The IUPUI Chancellor’s portfolio seems to have been shifted to one of overseeing undergraduate education on all IU campuses (except perhaps Bloomington).
- Most significantly, the Trustees and the President seem to have rejected the concept of a core campus and appear to believe that the Bloomington campus should once again be considered the flagship of the University.

POINTS TO CONSIDER IN OUR RESPONSE

Broadly, we need to address how the proposed restructuring will prevent IUPUI from fulfilling its mission as stated in our mission statement recently approved by the Trustees:

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), a partnership between Indiana and Purdue Universities, is Indiana's urban research and academic health sciences campus. IUPUI's mission is to advance the State of Indiana and the intellectual growth of its citizens to the highest levels nationally and internationally through research and creative activity, teaching and learning, and civic engagement. By offering a distinctive range of bachelor's, master's, professional

and Ph.D. degrees, IUPUI promotes the educational, cultural, and economic development of central Indiana and beyond through innovative collaborations, external partnerships, and a strong commitment to diversity.

Other points that need to be raised:

- The proposed changes seem to be based on a flawed premise that IU can support only one complete research campus and that the state can support only two.
- The proposed changes are anticompetitive and rewards inefficiency. All IUPUI faculty want is a level playing field on which to realize our legitimate and worthy aspiration.

As a faculty we should insist on the following from the university leadership:

- Any restructuring plan must be built on the premise that fair internal competition is healthy, and we must eliminate inefficient regulation from the top that inhibits innovation and subsidizes inefficiency. It is the energetic and entrepreneurial faculty working within a framework of sound leadership and proper incentives that make a research university, not the granting of special status to any campus or group of faculty. Hence the elimination of the designation of “flagship” campus for any campus of Indiana University.
- There should be no institutional constraints that limit legitimate and worthy aspirations for research or graduate education on the IUPUI campus. Hence, the location of graduate programs on IU campuses must reflect the needs of communities served rather than regulatory preferences of the university leadership or competing campuses.
- Financial arrangements that keep dollars generated through research grants (e.g., indirect costs) on the campus and in the academic unit where the faculty obtaining the research funding is located.
- Transparent financial arrangements to track the flow of research dollars, indirect costs, state contributions, and foundation funds throughout Indiana University.
- Decentralization of university support functions, e.g., financial, public relations, development, alumni affairs, so that complete support is available on each campus without going through IUB offices.
- Elimination of the inherent conflict of interests in the Office of the President that has been made worse by the President’s assuming the duty as Chief Executive Office of the Bloomington campus. The Board of Trustees must take up seriously its own suggestion that “we must reexamine whether we are one university or a university system.”
- Location of the President’s office and residence to Indianapolis.

- A Board of Trustees and university leadership that will treat all units of Indiana University equally, and are willing to leverage the unique assets and opportunities in Indianapolis in a way that will make Indiana University as a whole much more effective for the state and the nation.

THINGS THE TRUSTEES CAN DO TO IMPROVE IU

Finally, in your discussions, I would also like the faculty to come up a list of “**10 or 20 things that the Trustees can do to improve Indiana University.**” This is a request made to me by Trustee Steve Ferguson when I spoke to him last Wednesday and we certainly don’t want to disappoint him!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In drafting this document, I have relied heavily on the input of many colleagues from whom I have plagiarized liberally and shamelessly. The victims should have no trouble in identifying their own writing (likely in a much less elegant form after my clumsy editing) in this document. I thank them all for their generosity!

Keep in mind that this is only a guide. So please do not feel that you need to be constrained in any way in your discussions.