Core Campus and System School Operations

March 2007

The current structure of schools and programs within Indiana University grew out of the restructuring of the university in the middle 1970s. The structure created at that time included campus-based programs in the arts and sciences accompanied by professional programs, many of which were linked across two or more campuses. Those linkages facilitated the growth of professional programs more quickly and with more explicit attention to quality than would likely have been the case had each been created as a stand alone program.

In the intervening years many of these programs matured, as have the smaller campuses in general, to the point that the utility of earlier organizational structures were called into question. The concept of a core campus school – a single academic entity which is geographically dispersed on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses – appears to remain valid, at least on the basis of information gathered in the review.

The Regional Campuses and the System Schools

The IU system schools—aside from the School of Medicine, which was excluded from the review, and the School of Social Work, which is discussed below—that operate on the regional campuses appear to be headed toward more of a federation structure than a system. Reorganizations are being considered on some of the campuses that could result in the withdrawal of a system school from that regional campus. If such reorganizations should occur, school federation councils are a possible alternative to preserve desirable levels of program coordination.

The School of Social Work, a system school which has broad support in all quarters, is an exception. The importance of a university-wide school to the accreditation of each campus program plays a significant role in garnering this support. Consequently, no structural changes are recommended for the School of Social Work.

Schools of Public and Environmental Affairs, Nursing and Informatics

Proposed Action

For SPEA, Nursing, and Informatics, the present system school structure will be replaced by a set of agreements between each campus and each school. The agreements will be developed by the campus chancellors and the school deans, working with the school faculty on that campus. These agreements should then be codified in memoranda of understanding that include transition steps, if needed. In particular, the memoranda should address changes, if any, proposed in the manner in which degrees are awarded, and the specifics of financial issues.

There is no particular template for these agreements, and, in each case, the proposed relationship should allow the program to develop –or remain unchanged—based on its nature and history, as well as the needs of the campus, School and local constituencies. Written agreements should be in place by June 2008.

The designation "system school" will end June 30, 2008. Programs that are now part of system schools and who choose to terminate that relationship will be named in ways that make clear the independent status of the campus program.

The Core Campus Schools

On balance, evidence suggests that the IUB / IUPUI relationship, while not without costs, yields significant benefits to both campuses, to the university and to our constituents.   The goal is for each professional program on each campus to achieve the best it possibly can, and integration enhances the opportunities for each.. It is particularly the case that the strengths of the programs in one school have the propensity to increase the national ranking of programs on the sister campus

Leadership of the Core Campus Schools

Proposed Action

The concept of a "Core Campus School" is reaffirmed as an academic unit that carries out its basic mission at both IUB and IUPUI under the broad academic leadership of a single dean. Each dean will work with the respective campus administrations and is subject to the same campus policies and procedures as any single-campus-based dean.

The 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;
- 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
- Opportunities and incentives for intercampus research collaboration.

The Deans of the Core Campus Schools and their faculties should explore, with the leadership of the two campuses, where impediments to collaborations exist and how further program integration can be facilitated.

The title of University Dean will cease to be used on July 1, 2007. As described above, those who currently hold the title, University Dean, and head a Core-Campus School will have the same roles and responsibilities as a single-campus-based dean, and will have the title, Dean.

School-specific Strategies for the Core Campus Schools

The Schools of Business, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing and Public and Environmental Affairs:

Proposed Action

The IUB/IUPUI operations of the schools of Business, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing and Public and Environmental Affairs have proven to be very successful and have demonstrated the benefits of the Core Campus concept. The current structure should be continued and strengthened wherever possible.

The School of Education:

With regard to the School of Education, the advantages of the Core Campus structure have been noted, in general terms. Specific examples have been provided by faculty and administrators. However, as described in the 2004 report of the Long-Range Planning Committee, there continue to be unresolved differences between IUB and IUPUI on the integration, coordination, and direction of the School. Accordingly,

Proposed Action

The Dean of the School of Education should work with the leadership of the two campuses to reinvigorate the core campus status of the school, to remove ambiguities where possible and to clarify expectations, authority, and responsibilities. These discussions should result in a written agreement by June 30, 2008.

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.

The School of Journalism:

The Indianapolis community offers significant opportunities for students and faculty in journalism and public relations to interact with large business, government and sports organizations. These opportunities are at present underutilized. To facilitate the development of high-quality programs in journalism, which take advantage of the Indianapolis environment, the following structure is proposed:

Proposed Action

There is evidence that, with new leadership in the IUB School of Journalism, there are significant potential benefits resulting from a core campus structure. For this reason, there should be an effort by the School of Journalism and the IUPUI / Bloomington Administrations and the respective faculties to develop a reinvigorated and strengthened cooperative core campus program. For example, it is natural for an IUPUI-based professional masters program to have an emphasis in political or sports journalism and/or public relations. . These discussions should result in a written agreement by June 30, 2008.

Operational Matters

In addition to the very substantive areas identified above (such as curriculum, promotion and tenure, etc.), there are operational matters which affect individual students, or groups of students, faculty and staff whose activities involve multiple campuses. It is common for these matters to be resolved in individual cases, although sometimes with considerable effort, but collectively they pose a barrier to achieving the full benefits of multi-campus linkages. Accordingly,

Proposed Action

> The core campus schools operating in both Bloomington and at IUPUI should work with the administrations (campus based and central) to identify and eliminate the practical, everyday barriers (many identified in the report) that stand in the way of cooperation and integration. This will require the deans and their faculties, the campus financial offices, the academic leadership of the campuses, and the President to work together toward these ends:
>
> - to specify the requirements for a successful relationship and
> - to help provide the tools needed.
>
> Major operational issues should be identified and remediation plans developed by June 30, 2008.

Examples of concerns that should be addressed include:

- Structural barriers for core campus faculty and students arising in meeting scheduling, course scheduling and master calendar scheduling can be improved to provide better options for the students. Each dean must establish a mechanism for fostering and implementing core school integration and harmonization.

- The deans, chancellor/provost and university budget office must develop consistent budgetary policies and procedures that encourage budget administration that facilitates adequate flexibility so that budgets do not inhibit innovation and program creativity within a core campus school. This should include developing mechanisms for funding cross-campus activities.

- Additional and more integrated use of seamless, jointly-delivered programs, such as distance learning and "blended" academic programs.

- Consider the detailed recommendations listed in the Report of the Long-Range Planning Committee of the School of 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

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 italicized text represents a change made on 3/2/07 to the document to align it with University policy.

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