

## **The Many Communities of Indiana University**

**State of the University Address**

**Myles Brand**

**President**

**September 14, 1999**

Today we come together, as we have in previous years, to take account of our university and to determine our course for the future. This year, our assessment seems all the more significant because we make it on the cusp of a new century. We stand at a high vantage point, looking back over the past era, mapping out new directions for the next one.

The last time our university arrived at such a special point in time, the year was 1899. Even then, IU was not young. It had grown through an era marked by economic upheaval, civil war, and a vast westward migration. And often, during those tumultuous times, the very survival of the institution had been in question.

An IU historian described the university's situation at the turn-of-the century in these terms: "there were moments when it took all the courage and daring a president and his faculty could muster to keep classes going in the university. Had the doors ever closed, or the trustees and faculty wavered in the pursuit of the larger dreams, the institution could not have resumed operation in keeping with its ancient mandate to be the seat of superior higher education."

This is the great legacy we inherit. We surmount obstacles. We move ahead in pursuit of larger dreams. The challenges and opportunities that face us today are far different ones than those that faced IU a century ago. But I firmly believe that the dedication of all those who love this university and work for its success has not waned. Our institution's spirit is constantly replenished and renewed by the curiosity and creativity of the students who come from Indiana and around the world to study with us. This is why I look to the new century at Indiana University with such optimism. Of course, our survival is no longer at issue. Instead, we can fully engage our energies in achieving that "ancient mandate" to be "the seat of superior higher education." Every day at IU, on each of our campuses, every faculty and staff member, every administrator, and every student is part of that quest.

I know that the traditions and values IU has relied on in the past will serve us well in the coming era. These values include an unshakable commitment to learning and discovery, to academic integrity, to advancing the common good, to accessibility for all qualified students. Indeed, it is in part because the future will differ greatly from the past, and will do so in ways we cannot now predict, that these values must be our compass. They are the guideposts that will keep us on

course as we navigate the currents of change in the new millennium. I have unshakable faith that our creativity and talent for innovation will put these values into action in a way that advances IU's reputation for excellence across the nation and around the world.

*My vision for Indiana University is to be a great, progressive world-class academic institution for the 21<sup>st</sup> century through a commitment to the traditional values of a public university.* I have sometimes signaled this vision with the phrase 'America's New Public University'. But however one articulates it, it is a vision based on past success and oriented toward the future. In actual terms, my vision entails moving Indiana University into the top tier of all public universities.

Today, I would like us to join together in anticipating the major challenges we will face in the next several years. These challenges can best be understood by thinking about Indiana University as comprising a number of interlocking communities. The degree to which we acknowledge the nature of the challenges embedded in our various communities, the extent to which we actively pursue strategies to overcome these challenges, will determine whether IU will, in fact, enhance its excellence and take its appropriate place among the best public universities. Building a more dynamic awareness of the university as a collection of interdependent communities may well be the crucial challenge to our future success, but let me return to that point after considering some others.

To begin, it is clear that Indiana University must sustain and enhance the success of its communities of scholars. The leaders in these communities are the faculty. Others participate—students, including graduate and post-doctoral students, support and research staff, and administrators—but it is the faculty who set the agenda and bear responsibility for developing the conditions for success. It is the faculty who do the most important work of the university.

Universities are special places. There is no other social institution quite like them. Despite all the current rhetoric about the corporatizing of the academy and all the recent pressure for fiscal accountability and efficiency, the modern research university is not a business, in traditional terms. Universities differ from corporations, in part, because one of their primary missions is discovering new knowledge and then sharing it for the benefit of all. While corporate laboratories also engage in research, they do so with the expectation of near-term profitable applications. Basic research at universities is not tempered by these constraints of immediate application; rather, universities not only permit, but encourage the long view, in which sometimes the only result is a better understanding of the natural or social world.

Indiana University has long been the home for significant scholarly achievement in the humanities, the arts, and the social, behavioral, and natural sciences. While the two large campuses, IU Bloomington and IUPUI, are most centrally involved in research, all of our campuses have important roles to play as members of the larger IU scholarly community. Expectations for faculty members at the smaller campuses are tempered in terms of *quantity* of research, since a large portion of their time must be devoted to direct instruction. But there should be no tempering of the *quality* of research. Good is sometimes the rival of the best, and we must never be satisfied with anything less than excellence.

Research is resource intensive. Thus, the most consequential challenge facing our scholarly communities lies in developing the resource base necessary for substantial improvement. In the next several years retirements of distinguished faculty members in several key areas will add to that challenge. In Bloomington, to name a few examples, we will see key retirements in music, chemistry and English. Attracting new faculty members, including first-rate senior scholars and artists, will take a concerted effort. And it will be costly, especially in the sciences and medicine, where startup funds are considerable.

We have enjoyed some notable successes that will help us meet these challenges. New funding has resulted from competitively won federal grants and contracts. Partnerships with the private sector are beginning to bear fruit. And private donors, alumni, and friends of the university, are rising to the occasion, especially through endowments for chairs and professorships.

The state of Indiana has traditionally provided a comparatively low level of support for higher education. Given that approximately 30 percent of IU's funding derives from the state, this area is an important one. For the last twenty years, the average percentage increase per student in state operating funds compares favorably with those of other Big Ten universities; but because the base was initially low before that time, IU continues to lose ground. In fact, IU is presently ninth among the Big Ten public institutions in state support per student.

Thus, we have become more aggressive in our state relations. The result has been noteworthy. Base budget funds increased substantially this year. Combined with policy changes by the Board of Trustees and internal allocations, these increases permitted good salary increments on the Bloomington campus, where compensation for faculty does not compare well to that of our peer institutions. This year's salary increments for IUB faculty averaged almost triple the CPI. Moreover, the legislature's allocation of one-time funding for capital projects was the best in the history of the university at almost \$170 million—triple that normally received even when the economy is good. In addition, the IU Cyclotron, which is associated with the IUB Physics Department, received \$10 million to extend its research capabilities to medical applications. Federal funds are also being added to this project. And finally, Governor O'Bannon established the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Research Fund, which provides \$50 million for research in biomedicine and technology. I take special pride in this project, since I initiated it and advocated strongly for it. As a direct investment in university research, the creation of this fund is a landmark event for the state of Indiana.

One element of our current state strategy is our increased emphasis on partnering with the business community. IU can play a key role in reorienting our state's economy for the twenty-first century, and it is in our best interest to take that role seriously. Indiana is highly dependent on manufacturing. But manufacturing alone will not yield good economic growth. The healthcare industry and information technology are the growth areas of the future for Indiana. Through partnerships with the private sector, IU can both convince the state to invest in higher education and help to ensure our own funding base. For example, it was IU's partnership with the Indiana Health Industry Forum, a statewide coalition of health industry companies that enabled us to argue successfully for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Research Fund.

IU's most high profile business alliance remains Clarian Health Partners. In the face of sweeping changes in the health care industry, changes that have threatened the very survival of academic medical centers across the nation, IU developed a direct partnership with a private corporation. The consolidation of IU's hospitals with Methodist Hospital remains the largest single merger in Indiana history. At a time when many academic medical centers are struggling and requiring substantial subsidies from other parts of their home universities, Clarian has been able to remain fiscally sound. Nonetheless, this partnership continues to experience challenges as it brings together two cultures of physicians: one engaged in private practice and another engaged in academic medicine. This is typical for such mergers, and Clarian is handling this difficult situation better than others.

Funding from external sources has also improved nicely. We have an aggressive goal. In federal funding, we aim to at least double the rate of inflationary growth each year. For the past several years, that goal has been achieved, and we are on target again this year. For 1998-99, our total, university-wide grants and contracts were \$234 million. That is more than double our 1989-'90 totals (\$113 million) and marks a 31 percent increase over 1993-'94 totals (\$179 million). Notable success, in particular, has been achieved by the School of Medicine, which attracted \$115 million in 1998-99. This constitutes a 150% increase over the 1989-90 totals ( \$46 million) and a 53% increase over 1993-'94 totals (\$75 million). The fact that many of these awards were highly competitive NIH grants is yet another indication that the school is rapidly approaching top ten status among public university medical centers. Nursing and dentistry are also advancing well in health-related research funding.

Combined with our recent success in total grants and contracts, endowments from private donors will help us meet the challenge of retaining accomplished scholars and attracting distinguished new faculty. In 1990, the IU Foundation's endowments were approximately \$275 million; today they are approximately \$803 million, with nearly \$1 billion in total managed assets. Successful campaigns on the Bloomington campus and the School of Medicine were major factors in this increase. When the Bloomington campaign began in 1994, IUB had 31 endowed chairs and professorships. Since that time, faculty endowments have increased five-fold to total 165, with 283 such endowments university wide. This remarkably successful campaign has moved IU's faculty endowment level from the bottom quartile of the Big Ten into the top quartile. One reason for the campaign's success is an attractive matching program for the payout of such endowments. Another reason, and an even more important one, is the excellent work of the deans, faculty chairs, and the IU Foundation staff and leadership.

The Bloomington campaign is reaching its final stages, and we will be shifting some of our efforts to the upcoming IUPUI campaign. In addition, campaigns will begin on several regional campuses, including South Bend and New Albany. Given the projected levels of state support and the limitation of other funding, including tuition increases, IU must continue to stress private fund raising if we are to compete well and to achieve our full potential.

Although these successes in generating support for research and faculty endowments are notable, they alone cannot create the funding levels required to meet our challenges. One primary source

for research funding has been, and will continue to be, internal allocations of extant resources. Hard decisions about investments to enhance quality must be made. These academic decisions fall within the purview of the deans, campus chief academic officers, and the chancellors. In some cases, assessment of strengths and strategic plans for investment have already been formulated. I want to compliment especially the Bloomington College of Arts and Sciences for its College Incentive Plan (CIP). In other cases, much remains to be done. I pledge to support these efforts, knowing that, even in the best of circumstances, such efforts can produce anxiety and contentious debate. Where possible, I will also marshal university-wide resources to augment campus investments in research.

Indiana University's future success is intimately linked to the success of its scholarly communities. Our ambitions should always be to enhance the quality of these communities. To meet this challenge, we will need to act wisely and decisively, to be aggressive in seeking avenues for additional resources, and, importantly, to be supportive of each faculty and staff member's scholarly endeavors.

Complementary to our scholarly communities are Indiana University's learning communities. In conducting research and creative activity, faculty members are learning; they are learning about the natural world and about the human spirit. Faculty members caught up in the thrill of intellectual discovery present a special model of active learning to their students. It is artificial—in fact, simply wrong—to separate teaching and research in universities. A humorous analogy likens the relationship of research and teaching to that of sin and confession. Without one, a person has little to say about the other.

Indiana University is proud of its faculty commitment to excellence in teaching. Each campus offers teaching awards for meritorious performance. University-wide, election to FACET acknowledges long-term commitment to teaching excellence. As one of the most successful such organizations in the country, and the only multi-campus teaching academy, FACET proves the old adage: through teamwork, the whole can be more than the sum of its parts. Its success relies on the fact that its members, who represent all campuses and work in many disciplines, have created a field of binding energy focused on teaching.

We have made great strides in recognizing teaching excellence, but we cannot afford to rest on our laurels. I encourage each campus to comprehensively evaluate salary increments, promotion, and tenure decisions to ensure these give proper weight to teaching excellence. I will ask the chancellors to report the results of their review and present their recommendations for improvement early in the spring semester. University-wide, we will review the TERA awards program.

As good as Indiana University's learning communities are, they nonetheless face challenges. Without attempting to be exhaustive, let me highlight several challenges we must address in the near future.

One such challenge lies in enrollment, persistence, and graduation. Students come to IU because they know they will receive a first-rate education. And they have been coming in increasing

numbers. Last fall, enrollment reached one million credit hours for the first time. This year, we have also set records at IUB, at IUPUI and at IU Southeast. I attribute a good part of this success to an improvement in the way we tell the university's story. Our integrated marketing program has done an excellent job of publicizing IU's strengths statewide and throughout the nation.

Enrollment increases are not uniformly distributed, however. The Kokomo campus faces a challenge because local employment needs tend to push students to the workplace. Likewise, the Gary campus faces increased local competition. Although the Bloomington enrollment picture has improved considerably in the past few years, there is some uneven distribution among the schools. Each of these problem areas will be addressed this year.

While we attend to these issues, we must also continue our focus on persistence and graduation rates university wide. Graduation rates among the campuses vary, of course, and must be understood in the context of student goals, admissions criteria, and institutional missions. Bloomington is a residential campus with selective admission standards. These factors combined with efforts by the faculty, a stimulating campus intellectual environment, and excellent support services have enabled IUB to exceed its predicted graduation rate of 55% with an actual rate of 66%. However, no other IU campus meets its nationally predicted norm. While it is true that nontraditional students tend not to complete college at the same rate as traditional residential students, there is room for considerable improvement.

A major initiative has been undertaken on this front. The Lilly Endowment has provided a significant grant over five years, and a campus-based, university-wide effort is underway to increase student persistence to the sophomore year. As national longitudinal studies have shown, students tend to drop out if they do not feel connected to the campus in their initial year. Nonresidential campuses face particular challenges in providing conditions for this connectivity. IUPUI, for instance, recently initiated the University College, which maintains a supportive environment for incoming students.

The challenge is to increase persistence and graduation rates on the regional campuses and IUPUI. That will not be easy, I understand. There is no magic formula. Rather, dedicated teachers and administrators must be willing to employ innovative strategies. It is hard work, and success comes one student at a time. Even though the Bloomington campus has had notable success in graduation, it can do better. Of course, for all campuses, increases in graduation rates must occur without diminishing the rigor of the course work or curriculum. Actually, I do not view the possibility of diminished rigor as a serious problem, since I am confident of the high standards and professionalism of Indiana University faculty.

I take great pride in our faculty, and that brings me to the second challenge facing our learning communities. Our non-tenure-track faculty and graduate students also deserve considerable praise for their work in the classroom. They are dedicated and knowledgeable. Nevertheless, IU students are advantaged by learning with regular faculty. And thus, we should take steps to increase the proportion of instruction by regular faculty as much as possible.

Given predicted levels of state support, IU will always employ non-tenure-track faculty. We need to be certain that these persons receive fair compensation, that they have professional development and career advancement opportunities, and that their academic freedom is protected. Fortunately, the University Faculty Council has been addressing these issues. Good progress has been made, and I urge my colleagues on the Council to continue their efforts. I will also work with campus administrative leadership and the IU Trustees, who have shown interest in these issues, to develop and implement promising new approaches.

Non-tenure-track faculty play less of a role in instruction on the Bloomington campus because Bloomington has a large array of graduate programs that provide graduate student instructors. Part of the mission of a research campus is to prepare the next generation of scholars and teachers, and the graduate programs at Bloomington this very well. But we must assure ourselves that these aspiring faculty members and researchers are fairly and equitably compensated and that their working conditions are conducive to peak performance. Positive measures are underway by the campus and by RUGS. I will ask for a review of the current state of affairs concerning instruction by graduate students, together with recommendations and a timetable for implementation for any improvements necessary.

The third challenge facing our communities of learning lies in review of our general education curriculum. General education is the underlying intellectual foundation on which an undergraduate education is built; it provides the basic literacies and knowledge needed to specialize in a major. During the first half of this century, general education at most universities consisted of a set of core courses. But with the liberalization of the curriculum in the 1970's, most universities—including IU's campuses—changed to a broader distribution model for general education. While this approach provides students with a greater array of choices and more control over their education, it can lead to lack of proper sequencing and the avoidance of some critical areas of study. The distribution model still dominates general education curricula, though most universities have placed sufficient constraints on the distribution of courses to solve these problems.

Last year I requested that the chancellors lead a review of the general education curriculum on their respective campuses. The curriculum belongs to the faculty, and so faculty committees undertook these reviews. In some cases, the campuses completed their tasks. On others, the reviews remain underway. I ask that those chancellors who have not completed the review of their general education curriculum continue and complete the process.

Our learning communities also face challenges in relationship to K-12. Indiana University educates approximately 40% of the state's school teachers. Additionally, the large majority of our students are graduates of Indiana schools. It behooves us, then, to focus on teacher education and school improvement. On all our campuses, our education programs are exceptionally strong. IU has pioneered the use of distributed education techniques in the schools. Our faculty are engaged in policy issues, practicum, as well as classroom instruction for future teachers. Our efforts are extensive and sound. The challenge is to determine how, within Indiana, IU can assist in improving the quality of K-12 education. Are there additional avenues for IU to improve undergraduate teacher education that would benefit both our students and the schools? Can more

extensive professional development for working K-12 teachers improve matters? If so, what role should IU play in its design and implementation?

These are difficult questions, and they require detailed consideration to obtain sound answers. I ask the School of Education, working with other academic units, such as Arts and Sciences, to continue to address these issues.

The final challenge I will mention has the potential to affect IU deeply and for the long term. In this past legislative session, under the guidance of the Commission for Higher Education, a community college system was initiated that will combine Ivy Tech State College and Vincennes University. If it develops in the right way, this community college system will benefit the state, and it will nicely complement IU's programs. If it does not develop in the right way, it will duplicate, needlessly, programs offered by IU, and it will fail to meet the state's needs.

A sound community college system will provide job-related training. The emphasis should not be on degree programs, but rather on meeting the needs of workers and employers. The most successful community colleges follow this path. But another approach is favored by some who think of a community college as a junior college that focuses on the first two years of a four-year degree. This approach was popular in the 1970's but has mostly fallen out of favor, and for good reason. It threatens to divert resources from other state universities without addressing the state's need for work force training.

What can we do? During this start-up period for the community college system, we must refine our campus missions to complement the emerging system. We must articulate well with the community college campuses, thereby giving those students who want a four-year degree the opportunity to receive one. And we must be diligent in our efforts to convince state leaders that the strength and resources of IU should not be sacrificed to the emergent community college system. In fact, I have already asked each chancellor to make recommendations about the best strategies for achieving these goals. I compliment, in particular, the good work of the IUPUI campus in thinking through these issues.

IU's scholarly and learning communities are embedded in a community of citizens who must uphold the highest standards of civility. The commitment of a civil community encompasses the entire university, in our scholarly interactions, in our classrooms and informal learning settings, and in all our social interactions. It pertains to everyone, all the time. It tolerates no exceptions. It acts in unison to change unwelcome behaviors and to sanction if necessary. A civil community is a community that practices what it preaches.

Universities, including IU, however, are subject to the intrusions of events out of their control. A most terrible example of this intrusiveness occurred this past summer on the Bloomington campus when a Korean graduate student became the victim of racial hatred. I was proud of the university and Bloomington's reactions in the face of this awful act of violence. The tragedy united us in a sense of heightened commitment and renewed belief in the power of human beings to overcome hatred. It drove home the point that we must be vigilant in promoting the values of diversity that make this a welcoming community for all students, staff, and faculty.

We have taken several steps to communicate our resolve. We have begun to examine our admissions practices to determine if any legal adjustments can be made in our screening of new students. We are enforcing a zero tolerance policy toward hate crimes and related behaviors. That includes establishing a reward leading to the arrest and conviction of perpetrators of hate crimes. And the law school is organizing a teach-in to be held in early October that will help us all learn more about the origins of hate speech and hate crimes and how we can best respond to them as a community and as individuals.

Civility goes beyond reacting to crises or to assisting in resolving the problems faced by some populations of students. Civility must be constantly practiced so that it becomes part of who we are. Universities are places for intellectual exploration, and as such there will be disagreements. Indeed, intellectual disagreement is healthy, since it is from this dialectic that truth often emerges. But disagreement should occur within the context of respect for others. Meanness of spirit has no place in a university community.

In recent years, the IU Bloomington campus has made significant strides in matters of equity. Minority student enrollment on the whole is rising, and persistence rates have increased dramatically. Indeed, African American students' persistence to the second year at IUB has exceeded that of the majority population—quite unusual for a major research campus. I attribute our success to the hard work of the students and to the excellent support provided by programs such as MAP, Groups, and FASE. IUB has also made great strides in extending its support structures for minority students. Recently the campus opened the Asian Culture Center. After long years of advocating for replacement of woefully outdated facilities, we received legislative funding the Theatre/Neal-Marshall Education and Cultural Center, which is now under construction.

And the other campuses are also advancing in these areas. For instance, minority enrollment at IUPUI is up 27 percent over the past six years. Persistence rates for African American students at IU South Bend are up 14 percent over 1991 figures. And the diversity of IU Northwest's student population continues to rank first in Indiana and fourth in the Midwest.

Indiana University is a collection of scholarly communities, learning communities, and taken as a whole, it is a civil community. These aspects of IU are not separable; they are features of a single university. However, there are understandable divisions within Indiana University—divisions generated, in part, by the geographic separation of the campuses. Campus loyalty, indeed, is typical among universities. These tendencies can lead faculty and students to identify with their campus and not with IU.

The challenge here is to build loyalty to a campus and to the university in the same way that a good citizen has loyalty both to his local community and to his state or a faculty member has loyalty both to her academic department and to her discipline. But there is a necessary condition of dual or simultaneous loyalty—namely that the two groups are perceived as mutually supportive. Thus, the interests of the campuses must be aligned with the interests of the university if there is to be dual loyalty.

A primary task of university and campus administration is to align these interests. The university must reflect and support the missions and goals of the individual campuses. Administration, and faculty leadership too, I should add, have the obligation to promote the common good for all of IU. Only in that way can Indiana University create the critical mass and marshal the external support needed for it—and thus for the individual campuses—to achieve their full potential.

Competition between campuses is not only counterproductive; it is based on false assumptions. The state of Indiana allocates funding directly to the campuses, not to university administration for redistribution. Percentage base budget increments are the same for all campuses, adjusted by enrollment growth or decline. All tuition and all externally generated funds—grants and contracts, partnerships with the private sector, and donor support—stay with the campus that generates them.

Nonetheless, Indiana University improves its chances for additional state support by acting in a unified manner, thereby taking advantage of its full range of strengths. Over the past several legislative sessions we have pursued this approach, and it has proved successful. The challenge of unity can best be met by teamwork, by administrators, faculty, students, and staff working together for all our campuses. We can do together what we cannot do separately. We certainly should not permit the spatial separation of the campuses to interfere with university wide cooperative and mutually supportive activity.

I suggest several general guidelines for implementing this strategy. With regard to academic matters, individual campus decisions take precedence. With regard to administrative matters, multi-campus decisions take precedence. In both cases, there should be coordination among campuses.

Let me explain. As I mentioned earlier, each campus has been asked to review its general education curriculum. Individual campuses have individual perspectives on the matter of general education. That is not only acceptable; it is entirely correct. The student bodies and academic cultures of each campus are somewhat different, and thus, one curriculum does not fit all. But the above principles also demand that campus academic issues should be resolved in a coordinated manner. In the case of the curriculum, that translates to systematic articulation among our campuses. In recent years, articulation for general education has improved considerably, but some work remains in order to articulate course work in degree programs. I will ask the University Faculty Council to continue its review of course transferability and I will ask the Academic Officers Committee to work with the faculty to develop a resolution to this issue.

Turning to the second guiding principle, a multi-campus perspective entails advantages in a number of administrative areas. It would make little sense to have separate campus offices for legal counsel or architectural design or investment management. Our recent advances in information technology provide an excellent example of the power of combining administrative talents and resources. A number of years ago, each campus developed and operated its own IT

office. The result was a number of uncoordinated, underfunded offices, none of which had the critical mass to be effective in the marketplace or in attracting major grants or contracts.

Let me be clear about the nature of multi-campus decision making so that there is no misunderstanding. I am not arguing for administrative centralization at the university level. Too much centralization can result in administrative duplication and make it difficult for campuses to respond to local faculty and student needs. Rather, multi-campus decision making involves partnerships between campuses that enable campuses to achieve together what they cannot achieve alone. University administration should facilitate, encourage, and support these joint efforts, not take control of them. We can get the most out of our organizational structure only if we acknowledge that teamwork is the lynchpin to success, only if we recognize the value of unity in diversity.

Although I have been focusing on the campuses, I can easily extend the argument to schools. The School of Music in Bloomington adds luster to all other programs. But the School of Music cannot educate students by itself. It is not a conservatory, but a school within a university. Its students receive an excellent, well-rounded education only in cooperation with other schools, such as the College of Arts and Sciences.

The success of the College, in turn, depends on student access to the School of Music. The School of Music is, after all, one of IU's major drawing cards and principal strengths. But the same point can be made for the School of Business, SPEA, and so on. Whether they are located in Indianapolis, Bloomington, or on the regional campuses, a school reaches a higher level of success when other schools do well.

We are one university whose strength derives from the common good; one university that serves the common good. Without teamwork, without coordination and cooperation, IU cannot capitalize on the advantages embedded in its many and diverse communities. One of my central goals this year is to seek ways to enhance our teamwork. Unless there is genuine understanding and cooperative action among all, IU will fragment its efforts—something that we can ill afford.

For a university to succeed, faculty and administration must communicate openly and, after consultation and debate, decide on courses of action. Academic progress can be fragile. Enlightened, shared governance is elemental to its achievement. Without cooperation and coordination between faculty and administration, internal conflict inhibits progress, much to the detriment of all concerned, especially the students. One of the legendary university presidents of the twentieth century—our own Herman B Wells—has noted that “the most important element in the operation of a university is the spirit present in the academic community. In this peculiar kind of organization,” he said, “spirit . . . becomes the principle motivator to effective action, and therefore, administrators need to pay greater attention to spirit than to statistics.” These are wise words. This year, one of my priorities will be reviewing faculty-administration interaction. I see no need for any formal changes, since, there is already a healthy system of faculty governance. Rather, I want to be certain that all appropriate informal mechanisms are functioning well, that all lines of communication are indeed open, and that there is trust among all concerned.

Unity within diversity, in sum, is the key ingredient to being a successful university. If we are to take full advantage of our diverse strengths, we are going to have to coordinate our talents and put all of our energy in the right direction. As a famous basketball coach well known to all of us points out, a team may have lots of talent, but it isn't a good team unless the players play to one another's strengths, unless they help each other. If we are to prove ourselves equal to our legacy in the coming century, Indiana University's various scholarly, learning, and civil communities must work together to coordinate their efforts for the common good.

Today at the beginning of this new academic year, I have tried to articulate my vision for Indiana University: that IU become one of the best public universities in the world through its commitment to academic excellence founded on its historical and traditional values. The road to realizing this vision will not be easily traveled, especially given the comparative level of state funding. But we have many advantages, the most important of which is an exceptionally talented and dedicated faculty. We will travel this road more rapidly, and with fewer detours, if we focus on enhancing our university's scholarly, learning, and civil communities. We should strive, without hesitation, to excel in forwarding the frontiers of knowledge and art, to excel in providing all students with opportunities to learn and to excel in being a model community in which respect and caring dominate.

Goethe, the great German philosopher and poet, once said that "ambition and love are the wings of great actions." In the past century the ambition of many has been joined with their love of this great university to create the institution where we all now work and learn. I believe we can be equal to the challenges we will face in the coming decades only if we bind together our individual ambitions and love for IU in ways that give wing to great actions. I have every confidence that we will do so.

Thank you.

August 1999