Notes from an Informal Meeting
of Faculty Representatives of Policy Council
with Charles Bonser Regarding Inter-Campus Collaboration
July 12, 2006
10:00-11:15 A.M.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

The following are summaries of speaker contributions

Members Present: Bichelmeyer, Helfenbein, Korth, Lopez, Rogan. **Alternates:** Hossler. **Dean's Staff Present: Staff Representative: Student Representatives: Visitors:** Bonser

    I.   Discussion of Multi-Campus Collaboration

The purpose of this meeting was to allow Dr. Bonser the opportunity to discuss multi-campus collaboration between the Indiana University campuses. Bonser shared that the president created a team to evaluate the operations and attitudes toward the multi-campus system. A detailed questionnaire was sent to all deans regarding budgets, promotion and tenure, academic program changes, involvement between campuses, etc. The committee has also met individually with many of the deans involved with the multi-campus system. The committee will be meeting next week in Indianapolis to begin the process of drafting a report. Bonser complemented the School of Education for its excellence in multi-campus collaboration, especially with the creation and work of the Education Council.

Bonser asked about the faculty's feelings about the effects of the cross-campus responsibility on the other missions and goals of the school.

Korth described the task force created to reexamine the university's involvement with charter schools. She found that the multi-campus system allowed them to understand how charter schools might affect other campuses. Technology facilities were available at each campus for inter-campus communications.

Bichelmeyer pointed out that the Charter School Task Force was unique due to the number of campuses involved. Generally, the work of the school only includes participants from Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Columbus. Bichelmeyer believes getting input form IUPUI and other campuses is valuable, but sometimes the value is not worth the effort. Committee load for IUPUI may be greater due to the need for IUPUI representation on every shared committee. She also pointed out that it might be more strategic for Indianapolis representation to be limited to major committees and task forces, rather than every standing committee.

Rogan agreed that committee load does sometimes stretch IUPUI faculty members, and many times the agendas are heavily IUB-oriented. However, she also recognized the importance of IUPUI faculty members having a voice on many of the committees.

Bonser asked whether the state licensing requirements would cause a need for a stronger link between the Schools of Education, as opposed to the needs of other schools that have no such requirement.

Hossler described that the needs may be becoming more important due to pressure from the legislature and the Commission for Higher Education for seamless transferability.

Helfenbein said that research collaboration and public policy work are statewide in scope, but competing efforts are not helpful to the mission of the school.

Lopez pointed out that many multi-campus issues vary by program. In his department, there is frequent cross-campus collaboration.

Bonser asked whether there was interest among the Bloomington and Indianapolis faculty in strengthening ties with regional campuses.

Regional campus collaboration depends on demand. Lopez described how there is conversations in Educational Leadership to expand their doctoral programs to IPFW, because there is a demand in that area. They may need to utilize nontraditional teaching methods, such as distance education or online courses, to create such a program.

Bichelmeyer agreed, but elaborated that there is a need to identify where needs are similar and where they are different. For example, IUPUI undergraduate programs tend to be more accessible to nontraditional students, while IUB programs are focused for residential students.

Bonser asked whether campus units in Bloomington and Indianapolis contribute equally to the policy development of the school.

Rogan answered that contributions from IUPUI have improved, partially due to inclusion on committees and the growth in the number of faculty members at IUPUI.

Korth reiterated that the committee work continues to be Bloomington-centered, especially in Policy Council.

Lopez explained that by spending time on both campuses, he has learned that tension regarding this topic often makes it difficult to discuss. Some resentment exists from IUPUI faculty that they are not equal. There is a need to be able to discuss this matter between both faculties.

Rogan explained that Indianapolis has developed their own identity and exemplary programs, along with rigorous research and grant activity. Yet we are still perceived as just a teaching unit.

Bichelmeyer said that we have had representation on all committees without thinking about when representation should be appropriate. She pointed out that the current multi-campus system is IUB-centric.

Korth recalled a tense moment at a meeting where an assumption was made that IUB was a research campus, and IUPUI was not. She discussed that IUB faculty do not know what kind of research is going on at the IUPUI campus.

Bichelmeyer stated that the multi-campus collaboration is administrative and service oriented, but not research oriented. She claimed there was more collaboration in the past, because a bus service existed between the campuses. She used the faculty retreat which normally includes faculty from Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Columbus as an example of an opportunity for interaction among faculties. Last year, however, the meetings were separated due to the need of IUPUI faculty to discuss issues pertaining only to them.

Lopez described past occurrences when faculties from two different IU campuses are competing for the same grants. He believes that there needs to be more conversation about sharing opportunities to work together.

Bonser asked whether there are tangible results from having the core campus connection.

Korth gave the examples of democratic purpose of and having multiple perspectives for issues such as charter schools.

Bonser elaborated by asking what would be lost if the core campus connection was severed.

Lopez responded that the Educational Leadership program would be affected, because the majority of masters students are currently at IUPUI. He also pointed out that many of the issues that they discuss are important to urban education. Bichelmeyer echoed that there would be a lot lost programmatically. Hossler said that severing the core campus connection would lead to competition among the campuses.

Bichelmeyer described that there are several administrative issues at the IU level that discourage cross-campus collaboration. Factors such as accreditation and personalities are lead to cross-campus collaboration, or the lack of.

Bonser asked whether IUPUI faculty felt they had an active involvement in doctoral education. Rogan responded that this is dependent on the department and individual involvement. However, many of the IUPUI faculty members are currently actively involved with doctoral students and desire to increase their involvement in doctoral

education. The School of Education at IUPUI has developed a proposal for an interdisciplinary doctoral program.

Bonser asked how the average faculty member regards their multi-campus responsibilities.

Bichelmeyer stated that Bloomington faculty do not usually have to know whether they are involved in a multi-campus responsibility or not, because meetings take place in Bloomington. IUPUI carries the brunt of the cross-campus responsibility.

Helfenbein described a sense among IUPUI faculty that there is some pressure to be involved, but they would rather be a part of the cross-campus connection, rather than not to have a part at all.

Bonser asked whether there is local support for the multi-campus connection.

Korth stated she believed that the connection may be most important for undergraduates, because the majority of IUB undergraduates get hired in urban school districts.

Rogan described the hard work that IUPUI has done to create strong relations with the Indianapolis Public Schools and township schools. The IPS Superintendent and many administrators and staff feel that IUPUI is "their" campus. We need to ensure that Bloomington involvement in Indianapolis schools is coordinated with us at IUPUI in an open and collaborative fashion.

Bonser asked whether the multi-campus structure impedes efforts at IUPUI.

In response, Rogan stated that when collaboration makes sense, it is worth the time and effort. Helfenbein agreed that he was not aware of impediments, but there may be a sense that there is resistance from Bloomington. Rogan clarified that there has been resistance in regards to doctoral programs.

Helfenbein described a situation where graduate students work on the Indianapolis campus, and students have been encouraged by Bloomington faculty not to go to Indianapolis. In addition, Bichelmeyer described some of the administrative bureaucracy that graduate students must go through when they are getting paid at IUPUI and receiving tuition remission at IUB. Students should be able to work and take classes on different classes with ease. Rogan also agreed that it is also difficult for Indianapolis students to take classes on the Bloomington campus.

Bonser asked the faculty about the benefits and costs of the multi-campus system, and whether it was worthwhile. The faculty members agreed that it is worthwhile, but that there are improvements that can be made. Helfenbein and Lopez both claimed that the relationship between IUB and IUPUI was part of the reason they chose to work here.

Bonser thanked all faculty members for their input and encouraged further comments to be forwarded to him.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.