

INVESTING IN EXCELLENCE:
THE IMPORTANCE OF STRATEGY AND FLEXIBILITY

The Final Report of the
New Academic Directions Committee
of Indiana University

Contents

- I. Presidential Charge for New Academic Directions
- II. The Context
- III. Committee Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Despite funding reductions, IU must continue to make strategic investments in existing and new programs.

Recommendation 2: Reductions in financial support to academic programs must be applied strategically.

Recommendation 3: IU must reduce barriers and encourage innovative alignments among academic units.

Recommendation 3(a): IU must review academic policies that have the effect of heightening, rather than reducing, barriers between units.

Recommendation 3(b): IU should seize opportunities for strategic structural innovation.

1. International Studies: create a new school and develop a formal graduate program
2. Environmental Sciences: create department or school to more effectively cluster faculty strengths in environmental science
3. Sustainability Studies: develop a new interdisciplinary undergraduate major and a strategic plan for service learning and community outreach in sustainable development
4. Global Health: develop new degree programs in Global Health Studies
5. Media and Communication: develop cross-disciplinary virtual school and research centers
6. Design: develop an intermediate cross-disciplinary structure across existing design programs in Bloomington and Indianapolis

7. Health Sciences: Assess the feasibility of establishing a health sciences campus comprised of medicine, nursing, dentistry and professional health schools
8. Philanthropy: assess the feasibility of transforming the Center on Philanthropy into a school of philanthropy

Recommendation 3(c): IU should facilitate innovation in its undergraduate majors.

Recommendation 4: IU should seize opportunities for enhancing academic administrative efficiency.

(a)

Small Schools: implement administrative consolidation of small academic units

Core Schools: establish a single budget for a core school

Programs: begin formal study of academic programs

University Graduate School: decentralize most graduate studies oversight to each campus

Continuing Studies: integrate continuing studies operations into the academic programs on each campus

(b)

The committee recommends examination of the structure of the IUB College of Arts and Sciences:

Option 1: Reorganize the College into Several Independent Schools, Each Operated Under RCM--

Option 2: Retain the College but Move RCM Down to the Divisional, Departmental, or Program Level--

Option 3: Retain the Current Organization of the College and Use it to Create Innovative Centers, Interdisciplinary Programs and Even New Virtual Schools--
Additional Options--

(c)

The committee recommends examination of the structures of the School of Liberal Arts and School of Science at IUPUI

Recommendation 5: IU must reduce administrative barriers to academic excellence and innovation.

Recommendation 6: IU must focus on enhancing revenue strategically and cost-effectively.

IV. Conclusion

I. Presidential Charge for New Academic Directions

New Academic Directions Committee Charge

“The preservation and enhancement of IU’s academic core is the university’s highest priority in a difficult economic climate. This academic core is comprised of the various schools and other academic units throughout the university, and also involves the various administrative units that support them. These units are well-managed, and many are very highly ranked. However, especially on the IU Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, they have mostly remained the same for many years. The School of Informatics, which was established in 2000, was IU’s first new school since SPEA was established in 1971, though it is hoped to establish new schools of public health in the next few years, one of them through the transformation of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

The academic structures we have reflect, at least in part, the accreted wisdom of many generations. As President Wells said, “A university is a durable institution, built on the accumulated experience of the past.” Edmund Burke made the point that human institutions that function well tend to be the result of long and difficult processes of social and political evolution, and one should exercise the greatest of care when considering any change to them. As IU’s recent Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom has remarked, the complexity of the IU academic organization chart is not the same thing as chaos. It is also vital to remember that a liberal education that provides students with an education of breadth and depth, as well as a sound preparation for professional and graduate study, is at the core of an Indiana University education.

New Academic Directions

Nevertheless, an institution like Indiana University, which holds critical inquiry to be a core value and which is the State’s flagship public university, has the duty, from time to time, to ask hard questions about its academic structures. It must periodically review and reassess these structures to ensure they are of the highest quality, that they best serve the broad mission of the University and that they function in the most efficient and effective ways. In spite of Burke’s point, it is also the case that structures that are put together in a relatively piecemeal way over decades can also gradually come to embody inefficiencies that can slowly accumulate in any organization over time, even in an area as dynamic as higher education.

Hence in my State of the University Speech for the 2009/10 academic year (<http://www.indiana.edu/~pres/speeches/022310.shtml>) I announced the formation of the New Academic Directions Committee to be co-chaired by the Provost of the Bloomington campus and the Chancellor of the IUPUI campus to carry out this process of critical scrutiny.

The Committee is asked to respond to the following questions for these two campuses:

1. Is IU offering the kinds of degrees and educational opportunities that one would expect of a university that aspires to be one of the finest universities of the 21st century? If not, what are the impediments to this and how might these be addressed?
2. Do the structure and organization of the academic units at IU allow the productivity of its faculty to be maximized in fulfilling the university's educational, research and clinical mission? If not, how might these be addressed?
3. Are there areas in which our national and international peers have already successfully established new schools or other academic units in which IU should also be considering similar developments? Are there other areas in which IU is uniquely positioned to establish new schools or units?
4. The opposite question is equally important: are there programs that have fallen by the wayside and need to be radically reoriented or even discontinued?
5. Should some of our present schools and other academic units be transformed through mergers or restructuring in ways that allow them to be more efficient and to take full advantage of important national and international educational trends?
6. How can IU support the fullest development of multi-disciplinary activities between academic units?
7. In pursuing its academic mission, is IU responding to and taking full advantage of, the opportunities and challenges posed by the pervasive impact of information technology and globalization?

Some of these questions will only be relevant to one campus or the other and thus may result in recommendations that only involve one campus. But others will involve both campuses, for example, in proposals for a new core school. Where such questions are already being asked on these two campuses in any specific area, these efforts should be incorporated into the deliberations of this committee where appropriate. Moreover, some of the recommendations or ideas that surface in these deliberations may have direct relevance for the academic programs of the regional campuses.

This committee will consult widely and will seek the input of all the deans and schools at IU Bloomington and IUPUI, the regional campuses, administrators, faculty, students, staff,

alumni, supporters and experts in higher education.

This will be one of the most important exercises of this kind ever carried at Indiana University. I am hoping it will attract the best and most creative thinking of the whole university community. The committee is to report by Monday, 31 January, 2011.”

The President solicited nominations for committee members from the Bloomington and Indianapolis faculty councils, the Alliance of Distinguished and Titled Faculty, and other organizations on both campuses, and ultimately appointed 17 senior faculty, deans, and vice presidents, the President of the Indiana University Student Association, and the President of the Medical Student Council to serve on the committee. The President appointed Executive Vice President and Provost of the Bloomington campus Karen Hanson and Executive Vice President and Chancellor of the Indianapolis campus Charles Bantz to co-chair the committee. A complete list of committee members and their affiliations is attached at Appendix A .

To address the President’s questions, the full committee met five times during the fall of 2010 and winter of 2011. Subcommittees were formed to address specific issues, and these met separately and produced reports, which the full committee examined in detail. The committee collected information from within the university, from other universities, and from other external sources. Input was solicited from faculty and staff on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, including surveys of faculty and students.

Given the breadth and importance of the issues and the volume of material to be reviewed, the committee sought and obtained the President’s permission to delay its report until March 21, 2011. This document is that report.

II. The Context

Many of the best academic institutions in the world have been grappling with financial problems in the wake of the worldwide economic downturn— reduced endowments, pressure to hold down tuition costs, and, in the case of public universities in the United States, dwindling state support—and this has led many of these institutions to undertake various forms of restructuring and organizational change. Indiana University has not been immune to the financial hardships that have darkened the last few years, but we understand IU to be undertaking organizational review for reasons that transcend the immediate crises.

As President McRobbie noted in his 2009 State of the University Address, universities are extraordinarily durable institutions, but they do change over time as new fields of inquiry are born, as societal needs and opportunities shift, as cultural expectations evolve. We must be alert to these social and intellectual changes as they bear on our activities and aspirations. As President McRobbie also noted, we hold critical inquiry to be a central institutional value, and it is thus appropriate that we look critically at our own institution from time to time and ask if it can be improved.

Wise decisions about organizational efficacy and appropriate deployment of our resources require a clear sense of core mission and best opportunities. Our mission, articulated in the statement approved by the Board of Trustees in 2005—“Indiana University is a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical and technological education”—is linked with a vision of IU as “one of the great research universities of the 21st century,” “the pre-eminent institution of higher education in Indiana,” a status achieved by 1) provision of excellent education “across a wide range of disciplines” at the baccalaureate, graduate, and professional levels; 2) pursuit of excellent research and creative activity; and 3) engagement in “the economic and social development of Indiana, the nation, and the world” through education and research.

The committee believes that that vision, further detailed in the Principles of Excellence articulated earlier this year, will serve us well as we develop new programs of education and research and as we monitor and modify the structures that support those key activities.

We build on a strong foundation. IU is a successful, highly productive public university that provides outstanding educational opportunities for its students; significant new discoveries, inventions, scholarship, and creative expression; and a wide range of valuable services to citizens of Indiana, as well as more broadly to the nation and the world. Many of the indicators about the university—including the quality of its students, the productivity of its faculty, its success in attracting external financial support, and its economic and cultural impact on the state—are not merely positive, but improving each year.

There is thus much to celebrate and much in which all members of the university community and all Indiana residents can take justifiable pride. There is much we must

preserve and, indeed, much about the structure and operations of the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses that we expect will remain fairly stable in the years ahead. We expect to provide residential education for large numbers of traditional students, young people aged seventeen to twenty-five who attend college full-time; we also expect to serve non-traditional students (part-time, over twenty-five); we expect to conduct research funded by government agencies, foundations, and other partners, as well as research and creative activity that is crucial to the preservation, enrichment, and advancement of culture; we expect to produce the next generation of professionals that will serve Indiana and beyond; and we expect to produce the next generation of researchers and the professoriate, through graduate and post-doctoral education.

We know, however, that the context and opportunities for these core activities have changed markedly in recent years. Information technology has profoundly transformed our (and our students') expectations and capabilities. The increased diversity of students and faculty and the internationalization of higher education create new urgencies. Declines in state support, calls from many quarters for greater accountability, and market competition from for-profit education providers must all be addressed. The committee believes that Indiana University is well-positioned to respond to these changes and demands. Our recommendations build on our institutional strengths, and we propose new routes to enhanced flexibility in our operations. We are doing well, but we collectively aspire to do better, and doing better will require some transformation.

Notwithstanding our optimism about the future of our core missions and the opportunities for academic enhancement we recommend, we are aware of the fact that we face serious economic challenges. It may be useful to sketch some of these constraints. First, significant reductions in the state's appropriation to IU are likely in the years ahead. If the state appropriation to higher education continues to decline, it is unlikely that federal dollars, philanthropy, and tuition revenue can be expanded to make up the entire difference.

Federal stimulus funds for states, which have helped colleges and universities during the last two years, are nearing the end of their temporary authorization and are unlikely to be renewed. Federal research and development budgets are also likely to enter a period of slower growth (or even reduction in absolute dollars), due to the urgent need for deficit reduction in the federal government.

IU is working harder than ever before to secure philanthropic contributions. Nonetheless, the challenge of philanthropy for colleges and universities has become more difficult in recent years, given the sharp decline in the stock market and the diminished pool of funds available to personal and institutional givers. While donations to IU are growing, it is unlikely that accelerated giving can make up for the accelerated loss of state appropriations. And since donors have specific interests, donations for specific purposes can rarely replace general support from the state.

Historically, growth in tuition revenue—derived from larger enrollments and higher rates of tuition for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students (particularly higher non-resident rates)—has been an essential source of revenue for IU. While additional growth in

this source of revenue remains critical to IU's future, political and market forces will constrain tuition increases. Moreover, in the face of smaller high school graduating classes in the years ahead, IU will face intensifying competition for high-quality students. Large investments in financial aid will probably be necessary in order to attract those students.

Large tuition hikes are for many reasons not feasible. Household budgets in Indiana (and around the United States) have been squeezed by persistently high rates of unemployment, declining family incomes, and continued growth in medical expenses for families and their employers. In addition, families across the US are experiencing the effects of historically low savings rates, and are ill-prepared financially as their children reach college age. For the last decade, parents were able to tap higher housing values to replace funds they had not saved for their children's college education, but the decline in the housing market has eliminated this option. For all these reasons, there are now more affordability constraints on the amount of revenue growth that can be garnered by IU from increases in the tuition rate (and related fees).

The recent cuts in state funding have so far been offset primarily by reductions in administrative expenses. This approach was designed to spare core academic functions, although it has resulted in diminished support services for those functions. In any case, this approach will not be sufficient to deal with pending fiscal challenges. The committee believes that future cuts, cuts that will directly hit academic programs, are likely to be unavoidable. At the same time, we believe that IU must retain its commitment to its core academic values and the flexibility to invest in new academic directions and to take advantage of opportunities to advance the quality and impact of IU.

Thus we propose some fundamentally different ways of supporting new and promising teaching and research, as well recommending some particular academic initiatives. We suggest some routes to a more nimble organization, one that can--with improved administrative infrastructure--enhance possibilities for interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary teaching and research and empower faculty and students to pursue their best new ideas.

Finally, as we recognize our fiscal constraints, we want to underscore that what is not scarce in our institution is human talent and creativity. Because the committee believes that some elements of university structure can prevent the best use of that talent and creativity, our recommendations are also designed to remove obstacles to the pursuit of excellence.

The specific recommendations of the committee embody three key strategies:

1. *We must identify ways to distinguish Indiana University that are meaningful to highly talented students and faculty.* We must be able to attract additional high-ability students (and maintain top quality faculty) through truly distinctive schools, programs, and opportunities, with comparatively fewer financial resources devoted to recruitment. Our programs, and the IU "brand," must be exceptionally compelling.

2. *We must create an operating environment that provides incentives for incremental revenue enhancement.* We will not prosper if we compete within the university to divide a fixed pool of resources. We need to expand our revenue base, and the responsibility and rewards for that expansion must be more thoroughly diffused.
3. *We must improve operating efficiency.* In addition to identifying new sources of revenue, we must continue to find ways to improve operating efficiency, without compromising the academic mission.

Guided by these strategies, and mindful always of the vision captured by the Principles of Excellence, the committee offers six general recommendations.

III. Committee Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Despite funding reductions, IU must continue to make strategic investments in existing and new programs.

Despite the fiscal constraints that the university faces, we must continue to make strategic investments in existing and new programs that promise to advance the university and the value it provides to the state and the nation. While we must be realistic about the inevitability of financial cuts, particularly in the near future, we must be equally realistic about the imperative to pursue excellence. If we fail to continue to invest, we run the risk of compromising IU's long-term future and of diminishing the extent to which we offer relevant, important degrees, majors, research, creative expression, and service.

We must have specific criteria for new investments. We recommend that future new or increased funding decisions take into account five factors. These are the extent to which a program:

1. Is essential to the university's core academic mission as "a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical and technological education";
2. Demonstrates meaningful potential to achieve academic excellence as demonstrated by national program rankings, the ability to compete for funding, the ability to attract top students to the university, faculty productivity and citations, and other "objective" indicators;
3. Prepares students, produces scholarly or creative works, and provides service in areas of current or anticipated national (or international) importance that are not served as well or better by other existing units of the institution;
4. Can generate revenue or is otherwise self-supporting, whether through extramural funding, external partnerships (commercial, community, or academic), appeal to philanthropic donors, etc.; and
5. Leverages existing IU resources.

The committee has considered a number of specific areas for new or enhanced investment. In Recommendation 3 (b), below, we offer specific details about programs that satisfy the criteria delineated here, and we provide information on additional options, many suggested by our faculty, in Appendix B, below.

Recommendation 2: Reductions in financial support to academic programs must be applied strategically.

The criteria for reduced financial support are exactly the same as those identified above for enhanced funding. This is a unified strategy for principled investment and reallocation in times of constrained resources; consistency is required.

Specifically, we recommend that future funding reductions take into account five factors. These are the extent to which a program:

1. Is essential to the university's core academic mission as "a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical and technological education";
2. Demonstrates meaningful potential to achieve academic excellence as demonstrated by national program rankings, the ability to compete for funding, the ability to attract top students to the university, faculty productivity and citations, and other "objective" indicators;
3. Prepares students, produces scholarly or creative works, and provides service in areas of current or anticipated national (or international) importance that are not served as well or better by other existing units of the institution;
4. Can generate revenue or is otherwise self-supporting, whether through extramural funding, external partnerships (commercial, community, or academic), appeal to philanthropic donors, etc.; and
5. Leverages existing IU resources.

IU has long been noteworthy for the breadth of its academic programs and majors. This breadth is important and should be protected. But in the face of serious financial constraints, the committee recommends that reductions in scarce funds should not be applied evenly, across-the-board, but rather in a way that protects the university's core academic programs, advances excellence, and continues to support academic innovation.

To the extent possible, we believe such determinations should be made within Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) units. However, we recognize that there will be a need for the campus or the university to make similar determinations among RCM units, especially in the case of smaller schools, which have less flexibility for significant reallocations.

We do not for a moment anticipate that these decisions will be easy to make, but we think the outcome of these decisions will both better serve the university and be more broadly accepted to the extent that the criteria are agreed on in advance, and to the extent that the decision-making process is grounded on firm empirical data and is as fair, objective, and transparent as possible.

This is why we have not attempted to make these decisions on our own, in the context of this report. In the case of departments within larger RCM units or schools that operate on only one campus, we believe that a university-wide committee is definitely not the right place to make such decisions. And in the absence of already identified decision-making criteria and the time and resources to allow larger units to marshal the factual indicators applicable to their units, we do not believe that any specific budgetary recommendations would be appropriate or acceptable. We believe that we have, however, identified the

appropriate decision-making criteria and that the process of bringing those criteria to bear on the facts, and then on budgetary decisions, should begin.

While the process of drawing distinctions between units can be speculative, frustrating, and distasteful to faculty, staff, and administrators, these distinctions must be drawn, and an explicit and transparent process will be more intelligent, more effective, and more trustworthy.

Recommendation 3: IU must reduce barriers and encourage innovative alignments among academic units.

Despite sustained efforts at reducing barriers between academic units, substantial impediments remain to academic cooperation and innovative realignments of academic resources. In a very real sense, the significant innovation already present on and between both campuses is testament to the perseverance and good will of the people involved, but more must be done to reduce and remove institutional barriers to joint degrees, joint faculty appointments, the creation of centers and institutes, and other vehicles that spark and sustain collaboration and innovation.

Anecdotal evidence sometimes suggests that RCM, whether in principle or as administered, may contribute to some of these barriers; but there is equal testimony, especially from academic deans, that RCM facilitates innovation and effective collaboration. Another committee is reviewing RCM so we have not pursued this issue in detail. We have instead focused on the need to overcome problematic barriers, a need that will only grow more intense as the financial challenges ahead generate increased pressure on scarce resources, and we have identified some structural options that could provide relief.

One expression of those barriers (and one that is hard to attribute to RCM) is the extent to which individual faculty identify with a department or school, more than the university. As long as loyalty is focused primarily on individual units, it is easy to see why there might be resistance to moving between units or reconfiguring units or creating real or virtual academic structures that bridge units.

To address these issues, the committee offers these specific recommendations:

Recommendation 3 (a): IU must review and reform academic policies that have the effect of heightening, rather than reducing, barriers between units.

Examples of these policies include:

- Tenure and Promotion Policies—Does the role of individual departments or schools need, in some cases, to be reduced or modified, and the role of the campus or university increased, so that faculty members can better pursue genuinely multi-disciplinary careers? Could we thus also facilitate greater faculty identification with the institution as a whole and better manage joint appointments and other collaborative approaches to hiring? In order to effect changes in this area, the

institution must be receptive to-- indeed, should develop templates for -- appropriate hiring agreements, including options for split and merged efforts, and with assessment criteria clearly stipulated. The institution must then honor those stipulations in official reviews, including reviews for tenure and promotion.

- Credit Transfer Policies—What more can we do to facilitate the easy transfer of credits among schools and programs? The new general education program on the Bloomington campus is an important step in this direction. Clearer specifications of learning outcomes for courses and programs, a process already underway for broader purposes of assessment at both Bloomington and IUPUI, can provide the foundation for rational transfer policies at both the school and the campus level.
- Centers and Institutes Policies—The university currently has no policy for creating or reviewing university-level centers, though one is currently being formulated. At the campus and school levels, however, there are policies, and these tend to impose restrictions on centers offering courses or degrees or deriving revenue from tuition. As the importance of centers and institutes and other academic programs that cross traditional department and school boundaries increases, what can we do to increase the flexibility with which we approach these units and the accountability we expect from them? The development and propagation of new models for the operations of centers—in particular, models that allow for increased sources of revenue and models that enable student enrollments and degree participation--would allow the institution to respond more quickly and more cost-effectively to new opportunities for cross-school collaborations and to new areas of inquiry and instruction.
- Cross-Teaching and Teaching Buy-Out Policies—Different units currently employ widely varying approaches to the terms under which faculty from one unit may teach in another, how the tuition from such courses is allocated, and how teaching time is “valued” for purposes of buying it out with grants or administrative supplements. What can we do to encourage a more consistent approach, one that encourages flexibility among teaching assignments and configurations, and one that does not need to be re-invented for each new collaboration? Although there can be good reasons for differences in practice in these matters, we should encourage affirmative steps to recognize contributions that go beyond the level of the lowest single unit.
- Course and Degree Remonstrance Policies—There is a growing tension between the concern that units are being stymied in offering new courses and degrees because of objections from other units and the concern that we are offering duplicative courses and degrees throughout the university. IU must review its remonstrance policies and practices to ensure that we are facilitating innovation while avoiding inefficient duplication. CARMIN (the electronic course approval and remonstrance function) has improved remarkably the campus and university notifications processes—at least with respect to courses; a similar system must be developed for new degree programs--but the disputes that arise from those notifications are still often difficult to resolve. Some of the fault lines of unresolved complaints are likely indicators of the need for mission clarity.

These policies originate from a variety of sources and are often subject to well-established policies and procedures governing their alteration. This committee recommends that the units with responsibility for these policies undertake an expeditious review of these matters—viz., faculty governance bodies for the tenure and promotion policies (with the assistance of the administrators for academic affairs); faculty governance bodies for credit transfer policies (with the assistance of the administrators for undergraduate and graduate education); school deans and department chairs for the policies on cross-unit teaching and center and institute operations; campus administrators on course and degree remonstrance processes; faculty curriculum committees and academic administrators on duplicative and overlapping offerings.

Recommendation 3 (b): IU should seize opportunities for strategic structural innovation.

The current organization of IU's academic resources does not always work to create intellectual synergism, relevance to key societal concerns, or international visibility. Much of the current organization is built around traditional academic disciplines (e.g., history, mathematics and sociology) or recognized professions (e.g., business, law, and education) that are replicated at most major colleges and universities. It is also crucial, however, to look beyond standard disciplinary and professional perspectives at cross-cutting concerns or themes that are critical to the future of the state, the nation, and the world. In doing this, we should also be mindful of IU's distinctive strengths and look for opportunities to deploy these strengths to their best advantage.

To address these current interests or concerns we need not always think in terms of the creation of a new department or school. One of the lessons of our review of barriers to innovative academic alignments is that we would do well to encourage "intermediate" structures at a variety of levels—e.g., centers and institutes that can play some of the roles played by departments and schools—and "virtual schools" that can exist alongside or within our current academic structure. Addressing the academic and administrative impediments we identify above, in 3 (a), and below, in 4, will be necessary in order to effect these possibilities, but we are convinced that enablement of these intermediate structures will allow us to respond more quickly and more efficiently to new opportunities for research and education. This approach will also allow Indiana University to be appropriately experimental in its support for new initiatives. Intermediate structures that prove their value by facilitating enhanced research and teaching can grow and can perhaps be transformed into permanent departments or schools. On the other hand, if the landscape of academic interests and needs changes, we can more easily shift resources to address higher priorities.

That understanding of structural innovation should frame the specific recommendations that follow. These recommendations have emerged from our solicitation on both campuses of faculty suggestions and from our own extended discussions about strategic and multidisciplinary opportunities for which Indiana University is well positioned. We believe that the following areas have great potential, in terms of all five criteria identified above, and we recommend these areas for strategic enhancement:

1. International Studies

The internationalization of many areas of research and professional development has created new challenges and opportunities. Despite its wealth of intellectual resources in the area, IU is not considered a global leader in international relations, international affairs, foreign policy and development. Yet because of the resources it does have, IU is well equipped to respond to the changes in the world around us and provide a world-class program in international studies. We are also well-positioned to expand and coordinate our investments in emerging countries and regions of the world of long-term strategic significance: China, India, Russia, Brazil, the Islamic world, and the Spanish-speaking world.

The development of a formal graduate program in international studies and enhancement of the current undergraduate program will benefit students who are trying to become better citizens of the world, equipped to meet the professional and intellectual challenges of the twenty-first century. An undergraduate-graduate international studies program with options for specialization ranging from translation to international trade and global health would combine our extraordinary strengths in foreign languages, the humanities, social sciences, and some professional programs, as well as add new dimensions to better link these strengths and provide incentives to faculty and students to participate in them.

These resources should be better coordinated and enhanced through the creation of a school for international studies. (The international building still in planning on the Bloomington campus would offer a great opportunity for bringing together in one location many of the relevant units.) The school could either stand alone, perhaps initially as a “virtual school,” or it could be located within the College, where many of the existing resources (e.g., faculty, course offerings, area studies centers) are located. A number of faculty (existing and likely new) would have to be recruited for the first five-to-seven years of operation of this unit to enable it to develop its own “culture,” set of connected programs, course offerings, etc. Partnerships that could be enhanced/developed have been identified in the Kelley School of Business, SPEA, Maurer School of Law, HPER (Public Health), and the School of Education. The new school would also act to enhance similar collaborations between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, using the Global Health Initiative as a starting point.

2. Environmental Sciences

More creative clustering of faculty strengths could enhance the Bloomington campus’s productivity and visibility in the environmental sciences. Currently, Bloomington has substantial strengths in the environmental sciences, but they are scattered across several departments of the College (e.g., geography, geology, biology and chemistry) and at least two professional schools (SPEA and HPER).

On the educational front, the undergraduate major in environmental science (BSES), a College-SPEA collaboration, is so tiny that it is not a significant presence on the Bloomington campus. SPEA has a substantial Master's Degree Program in Environmental Science (MSES) that is often taken jointly by students enrolled in the much larger Masters of Public Affairs (MPA) program. A joint JD/MSES degree has existed for many years between SPEA and the Maurer School of Law. A creative proposal for a joint MSES/MBA was recently developed but has not yet attracted sufficient support in the Kelley School of Business to move forward. There are several doctoral programs around the campus that train environmental scientists. They vary considerably in national ranking, size, and selectivity.

On the research front, the Bloomington campus is arguably more innovative. The Center for Research in Environmental Science (CRES) was established several years ago as a vehicle to foster multidisciplinary collaboration and extramural grant activity. The new MSB II, opened in 2009, provides excellent space and facilities for some of the scientists who are active in CRES. In order to build on the start CRES has made, several near-term options are worth considering. CRES's role could be expanded, in line with our general recommendation to expand the scope and effectiveness of multidisciplinary centers, so that it would coordinate new faculty hires in the environmental sciences, taking responsibility for wise deployment of the resources of multiple units. CRES could also become the primary home for doctoral and/or post-doctoral training in the environmental sciences on the Bloomington campus, with financing from existing academic units and from extramural sources. CRES should also retain its primary role, viz., research stimulation.

If research and education thrive within these intermediate structures, then the university should move to create a separate department or school to supply education, research, and service in the environmental sciences, possibly in conjunction with Bloomington's efforts to expand education and research about the production and consumption of energy. This is and will continue to be an area of inquiry that is of great national and international importance, and Indiana University is poised to make greater contributions in a variety of ways.

A school focused on environmental sciences could be an independent entity, or it could be a department (or virtual school) located within the College or as an expansion of SPEA. While some faculty on the Bloomington campus may prefer a focus on the physical and life sciences (including engineering) as they relate to the environment, it is likely that other faculty and most donors, students, and policy makers will see value in an entity that strives to integrate progress in environmental science with progress in environmental economics, ethics, policy, and law.

Bloomington should remain flexible about the organizational options, because philanthropists who are interested in the environment may wish to participate in the organizational discussions. The Nicholas School at Duke University and the Bren School at the University of California at Santa Barbara present interesting models.

Until a transformational gift is acquired, it may make the most sense to build incrementally on CRES rather than create a new organizational structure.

3. Sustainability Studies

Another promising cluster of faculty (and student) activity on the Bloomington campus is the emerging field of sustainability, or what is called “sustainable development” in much of Europe. This field is considerably broader than the field of environmental science and hence we have presented our recommendations in this area separately. The concept of sustainability means “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” Serious study of sustainability is interdisciplinary in nature and draws on a remarkable variety of fields: the physical and life sciences, engineering, architecture, the social sciences, humanities, public affairs, public health, business, ethics and law.

IU’s Office of Sustainability on the Bloomington campus has already been created to promote sustainability in the daily operations of IU and to enhance opportunities for student learning experiences in this area. Several units in Bloomington have also joined together to finance seed grants aimed at stimulating extramural research funding on sustainability questions. It is too early to assess how effective the sustainability seed grants have been.

Seed grants have also been available in Bloomington for course and program development in this area. A recent review of existing academic programs in Bloomington identified some 29 undergraduate and 34 graduate programs, and over 20 research centers that address some aspect of sustainability, including participation by 85 faculty members in 296 courses.

One can argue that the infusion of sustainability thinking into more Bloomington programs is exactly what is needed, rather than creation of a superstructure that would house all sustainability studies, and, in fact, we do not recommend the creation of a school or department. We recommend instead (1) development of a two-track (one based in the social sciences and one humanities-based) interdisciplinary undergraduate major in sustainability studies that is led by the College but draws on resources from SPEA and other units on campus, and (2) an agenda for enhanced development of service learning and community outreach opportunities, including internships, in the field of sustainable development.

Bloomington students interested in a sustainability degree or major grounded more specifically in the natural sciences will soon have three viable options in closely related areas: a revitalized BSES (the College and SPEA), a BSPA in environmental management (SPEA), and a new BSPH in environmental health (HPER). In keeping with our concern about program duplication and overlap, enrollments in these three programs should be monitored closely over time to ensure that all three are necessary.

At IUPUI, sustainability and the environment are the focus of the following research centers: 1) the Lugar Center for Renewable Energy, housed in the School of Engineering and Technology, 2) the Center for Earth and Environmental Science (CEES), a multi-disciplinary center with participating faculty from the schools of Science, Liberal Arts, and Public and Environmental Affairs, and 3) a new Center for Global Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development that has been created within the School of Liberal Arts. In terms of academic programs, SPEA-Indianapolis has developed a proposed Bachelor of Science in Sustainability Policy, and Liberal Arts will develop a complementary Bachelor of Arts in Sustainability Studies. Both are interdisciplinary majors. Courses on sustainable development, environmental health, environmental science, environmental problems, environmental engineering, environmental economics, environmental ethics, and environmental policy and politics are currently offered by the Schools of Engineering and Technology, Liberal Arts, Medicine (Public Health), Public and Environmental Affairs, and Science.

Thus, as at IUB, there are multiple faculty members with interests and expertise in sustainability and the environment and multiple academic offerings across several schools. A new school does not seem warranted, but the educational offerings that are in development should be appropriately aligned with the existing research centers, and the Indianapolis campus should take steps to publicize the alignment and allow students full access to the course and faculty resources that are located in different units.

4. Global Health

IU has a substantial number of existing yet disparate programs in global health. We recommend leveraging our strengths in this area for greater educational impact.

At present we have graduate programs in our professional schools in Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, and in HPER which have a wide range of programs in developed and developing countries. Several Area Studies Programs (Russian and East European, Caribbean and Latin American, and African Studies) have recently begun developing dual degrees with the MPH.

Undergraduate programs in global health exist in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Schools of Liberal Arts, Informatics, Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, and Public and Environmental Affairs, and are being developed for the nascent Schools of Public Health. President McRobbie has also recently created the IU Center for Global Health, whose goal is to enhance IU student and faculty engagement in global health education, research, and service.

To leverage these existing global health programs, we propose that IU develop a crosscutting major in Global Health Studies through which a student at any level can design an individual course of study that would include a substantial component of individual research and/or service, as well as possibility for immersion in the

language and culture of the area of focus. Each of the above schools on both campuses would identify an administrative home for Global Health Studies in order to facilitate the designing of students' Global Health Studies majors.

Representatives of all participating schools would comprise a Global Health Council to facilitate coordination of multiple schools and perhaps groups of students in courses of study. These partnerships could be developed in concert with the new school for international studies, which the committee proposes for IUB. Given our strength in both global health service and research, and our strengths in foreign languages, this could be a signature degree program for IU, one that draws on resources in both Indianapolis and Bloomington.

5. Media and Communication

IU should explore options for new structures that bring together complementary and partly overlapping assets in fields related to communication and media in the School of Journalism and in the College of Arts and Sciences at IUB. Within the College, these assets are found in several units. Communication and Culture (CMCL) and Telecommunications (TELC) are two relevant departments, the first (CMCL) specializing in humanistic inquiry into cultural dimensions and implications of communicative practices, the second in social scientific, professional, and technical aspects of media production and reception, e.g., marketing and management, multimedia design, RTV production, and media effects (TELC). CMCL also offers a program in film studies. In addition, faculty members from several units (African American and African Diaspora Studies, Comparative Literature, Folklore and Ethnomusicology, French & Italian, Gender Studies, German, History, Slavic Languages & Literatures, and Spanish & Portuguese) include specialists who study and teach about cinematic traditions across the globe.

Supporting these faculty assets are a broad and deep array of archival resources, including a vast repertoire of films housed in the Black Film Center and Archive, the Kinsey Institute, the Lilly Library, and the historical IU Athletic Film College. In addition, IUB is the home of Archives of African-American Music and Culture (AAAMC), a repository of materials covering a range of African-American musical idioms and cultural expressions from the post-World War II era, as well as the Archives of Traditional Music. (These two units are affiliated with ethnomusicologists in the Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology.) Moreover, IUB has extensive production capacities, most notably the world-class public broadcasting operation of WTIU/WFIU and the advanced, professional facilities for production of digital video in TELC. CMCL also has some resources for filmmaking as part of its undergraduate program. The campus is now home to a state-of-the-art exhibition venue for cinema, the new IU Cinema.

Clustering ongoing activities across these areas presents potentially enormous new opportunities--new degree opportunities for students, a higher national profile in this area, and more potential for extramural and philanthropic funding. Exploration

of potential alignments has begun, but there has been faculty resistance to the prospect of a new stand-alone school. Other options—in particular, some of the intermediate structures defined in this document—have not been considered by the affected faculty, but some among this group have made proposals that are consonant with the model of structural evolution that this committee endorses, so this is a promising avenue for new alignments. More powerful centers—permitted to teach as well as to do research and service—may be appropriate for some sub-units in this area (e.g., film studies), but a more comprehensive virtual school—either within the College or as a unit that would serve as a bridge across Journalism and the College—would be most likely to develop the potential the committee recognizes in this area. (See Appendix C for reports on prior discussions of these specific issues.)

6. Design

Design is an element of many programs at IUB in a wide range of departments and schools, including the Departments of Apparel Merchandising and Design (interior design, fashion design), Geological Sciences, Sociology, and Theatre & Drama; the Hope School of Fine Arts (graphic design); the School of Education (instructional systems design); the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (Indiana Ergonomics Laboratory); and the School of Informatics and Computing (human computer interaction design).

A consortium of faculty with interests in design from these and other programs formed the *IUB Design Thinking Forum* to cultivate multidisciplinary design education and research opportunities on the IUB campus and encourage greater interaction and collaboration throughout the university's design community. The Forum developed the following goals for the initiative: a) establish and build a framework for greater interaction among IUB's various design resources; b) support more effective and consistent university-wide collaboration among design faculty and researchers through various projects and academic programs; c) develop and promote multidisciplinary/multi-departmental design initiatives at IUB; d) provide students with educational programming that expands their design thinking capacities in a universal manner and builds their skills and training for functional application in their chosen fields; e) raise the profile of design on the IUB campus by cultivating educational programs and research projects that address relevant design issues, and use these initiatives to capitalize on design method commonalities and showcase divergent approaches to design challenges; f) expand IU's multidisciplinary design profile beyond the Bloomington campus to national and international audiences.

At Indianapolis, the Herron School of Art and Design offers programs in furniture design and in visual communication, as well as a full range of programs in studio arts. There are also resources in Informatics and in Engineering at IUPUI that bear on design. In addition, a partnership has recently been formed between Indiana

University and the Education Coalition of Columbus (IN) to establish a center in Columbus, a city which is an important locus of significant architecture, to teach art and design.

Thus the university has, at both of its core campuses, and now elsewhere in the state as well, a wealth of interest and expertise in the general area of design. The committee recommends that the university build on these strengths. The IUB consortium, augmented by participation from interested units at IUPUI, would provide an appropriate basis for further planning in this area; and the recommendations this committee has made for new options for centers and virtual schools should provide appropriate initial leverage to enhance teaching and research opportunities in this area. Again, if the immediate structures that emerge are sufficiently robust, a school of design would be the next step.

7. Health Sciences

In Indianapolis, the large, nationally-ranked medical school is complemented by highly ranked schools of nursing and dentistry, and professional strengths in rehabilitation sciences and public health. Newer programs in health economics, biostatistics, and health ethics/law have also enriched IUPUI's footprint in health fields.

In the rapidly growing and rapidly changing health sector, the graduates of any one of IUPUI's health programs are most likely to work closely together with graduates from the other sorts of programs, so it is important to align their training and look for more opportunities for educational and research collaboration. One framework for alignment that should be considered is combining most or all of the health sciences into a coherent health campus based primarily in Indianapolis. Some universities—such as UCSF, U Texas-SW, U Texas-Houston, U Texas-Galveston, Oregon Health & Science University—have single function campuses—centered entirely around medicine and related sciences. Other universities—Florida, Wake Forest, Duke, Washington, UCLA, Michigan--have integrated health and academic campuses with a Senior Health Executive (often the dean of medicine also serving as Vice Chancellor or Vice President of Health Affairs). Additional comparative information can be found in Appendix D.

How a merged health campus would be organized, financed, and led should be discussed by a committee of faculty and community leaders committed to the health sciences. The ramifications for the rest of the IUPUI campus, and for the rest of the university, including the School of Optometry, which is located in Bloomington, and the planned Schools of Public Health in Bloomington and Indianapolis, would need to be carefully considered.

8. School of Philanthropy

Another unique feature of IUPUI is the Center on Philanthropy. As the Center recovers from a recent recession-induced loss of endowment income and programming revenue, serious consideration is being given to a transition from Center status to a new School of Philanthropy. The ramifications for IUPUI's School of Liberal Arts and for SPEA (in both Bloomington and at IUPUI) would need to be considered with care. In particular, there are some configurations of a new school that could weaken the liberal arts foundation of philanthropic studies or could harm the highly ranked SPEA programs in non-profit management.

The details of this possibility would need to be worked out in consultation especially with those two schools, but if there is adequate funding, and robust student and faculty interest, this could be a prominent addition to IUPUI and IU as a whole.

Members of the IU community have presented the committee with many other suggestions for new programs and schools, and we are grateful for each of these ideas. They are described in greater detail in Appendix B. By omitting further discussion of them here we do not mean to suggest that the committee has reached a conclusion that they should not be pursued. In some cases, we lacked adequate or ready access to information needed to evaluate a proposal. In others, while we found the proposals creative and intriguing, we were inclined to think they were not as high on the priority list for the whole university, or they did not require as much structural attention as the suggestions identified above.

Recommendation 3 (c): IU should facilitate innovation in its undergraduate majors.

Undergraduate education will continue to be of central importance to Indiana University, and we expect innovation in program offerings and in modes of instruction (with increases in hybrid models that combine face-to-face teaching and mentoring and the best tools of e-learning). Another committee is examining new directions in teaching and learning, so we have concentrated here on programmatic concerns.

In addition to the development of new areas of concentration we detail above, many of which are relevant to undergraduate opportunities, we also recommend that IU develop a new signature approach to undergraduate education. We have pondered the tension between the "vocational" expectations for higher education that have become common in our society and the ideals of liberal education that we continue to cherish and preserve. We know it is not unreasonable for our students and the larger society to expect that higher education will prepare those who graduate for better jobs and more successful careers, and it does that. But we also know that higher education does that in part by developing skills and capacities that can only be gained by liberal learning. Moreover, we are confident that the value of education is not measured by its contribution to career success alone but also by its contribution to a meaningful life.

For many of our students, a resolution of the felt tension between liberal and career-oriented education could be found in the opportunity to take “combined” majors of one of the three types described below.

1. A major that combines a career-oriented (vocational) interest with a personal development (avocational) interest. The career-oriented interest could be in any of the professional schools or in almost any area of arts and sciences in which the student hopes to build a career. Similarly, the personal enrichment interest could be in any area of the arts and sciences or in any of the professional schools, and would underscore the fact that a university education helps provide the foundation for an educated life, as well as a career. As an example, a student intent on a career in business who also has a deep personal interest in literature could have a combined major those two areas. (The highly successful LAMP and IMP programs are useful points of reference for the value of this approach.)
2. A major that combines an academic area with a skill-based application of that area. Informatics majors already are configured in this way—to combine computing with an application area of the student’s choice that can range from business to science to the arts (and more). One can imagine a similar approach with many other academic majors with applied skill-based components in communication, writing, analytics, performance, or business, just to cite a few examples.

We emphasize that these are meant to be combinations that fit within the normal four-year, 120- credit plan towards graduation, not conventional double majors or additional certificate programs. While the combined majors would be designed to allow individual choice, it is likely that IU would want to create plans for popular combinations, and templates that groups of combinations fit into. This administrative assistance would also help establish the “signature” status of this opportunity at IU. A starting point for this sort of planning should be gathering data about common major/minor and double major pairings by current and recent students, and the committee has initiated this task.

3. One particular proposal for a combined major is of special note—a combined major for teacher education:

We need to develop new models for cooperation and integration of effort between the disciplines and the School of Education in order to provide more flexibility in access to teaching as a career. Though collaborative majors now exist in Music Education, Health Education, Physical Education, Journalism Education and various areas within the College of Arts and Sciences, such as Math and World Languages Education, barriers to full-transcript dual majors exists. The barriers come from both sides of the school divisions. College major programs, for example, do not have the flexibility to allow students to change to a teaching career once they have embarked on a major course of study, and education students do not have flexibility in their programs to acquire more training in their subject fields of interest. These barriers seem to be artifacts of the history of the majors and teacher licensure requirements and degree designs, rather than

insuperable obstacles from either side. Dual majors of the sort we propose would be particularly well suited for students interested in careers in secondary education.

In addition, we recommend that IU undergraduates should have the opportunity to engage in a significant undergraduate research and/or creative work experience. The possibility of such experiences is one of the distinguishing features that marks the special value of a major research university to undergraduate students. Experiencing the open-ended, creative nature of research and other creative work is a valuable opportunity that IU can provide its undergraduates. While there are obvious capacity questions associated with this recommendation, an approach where graduate students provide the first level of mentoring to undergraduates might help us scale up in this area.

Recommendation 4: IU should seize opportunities for enhancing academic administrative efficiency.

(a)

Small Schools

The committee was struck by the extent to which the Indianapolis campus comprises a remarkably large number of small academic units. Some are components of core schools (flagged below with asterisks), of course, and one (Social Work) is a system school, but it is still noteworthy that there are nine academic units at IUPUI with an annual general fund budget (FY 2010-11) of less than \$10 million:

<u>School</u>	<u>Annual Budget (\$)</u>
Journalism*	1,075,308
SLIS*	2,160,007
Health & Rehabilitation Sciences	4,337,344
Physical Education and Tourism	5,528,996
SPEA*	5,891,869
Informatics*	6,848,565
Herron	6,977,770
Social Work (a system school)	7,316,404
Education*	7,993,357

The Bloomington campus has three academic units with general fund budgets less than \$10 million:

<u>School</u>	<u>Annual Budget (\$)</u>
SLIS*	5,074,506
Journalism*	6,713,224
Optometry	8,168,805

To place these numbers in the context of our entire academic enterprise in Bloomington and Indianapolis, here are the general fund budgets for all academic units on each campus (FY 10-11):

Indiana University			
General Fund Budget FY 2010-11			
Bloomington & IUPUI			
Bloomington Campus Responsibility Center	General Fund July 1 Budget	Indianapolis Campus Responsibility Center	General Fund July 1 Budget
ARTS & SCIENCES	208,009,868	HEALTH & REHABILITATION SCIENCES	4,337,344
MEDICINE & HEALTH SCIENCES	2,189,291	<i>MEDICINE & HEALTH SCIENCES</i>	<i>273,119,344</i>
BUSINESS	92,048,234	NURSING	14,769,886
EDUCATION	28,093,938	DENTISTRY	36,089,155
HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION	23,741,497	LIBERAL ARTS	29,801,294
LAW	24,847,878	SCIENCE	34,757,009
PUBLIC & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	22,252,890	BUSINESS	15,311,823
LIBRARY & INFORMATION SCIENCE	5,074,506	EDUCATION	7,993,357
MUSIC	40,074,575	HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION	5,528,996
OPTOMETRY	8,168,805	HERRON SCHOOL OF ART AND DESIGN	6,977,770
INFORMATICS	17,651,955	LAW	22,646,539
JOURNALISM	6,713,224	ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY	18,065,239
OTHER ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	6,513,986	PUBLIC & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	5,891,869
ACADEMIC SUBTOTAL	485,380,647	SOCIAL WORK	7,316,404
SUPPORT CENTER SUBTOTAL	360,735,742	INFORMATICS	6,848,565
FACILITIES DEBT SERVICE	44,949,500	IUPUI COLUMBUS	11,400,914
Bloomington General Fund Total	891,065,889	JOURNALISM	1,075,308
		OTHER ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	2,160,007
		ACADEMIC SUBTOTAL	504,090,823
		SUPPORT CENTER SUBTOTAL	174,712,931
		FACILITIES DEBT SERVICE	16,917,063
		IUPUI General Fund Total	695,720,817

The committee believes that there are some forms of administrative consolidation on the Indianapolis campus, and perhaps at Bloomington as well, that could, without harming the academic programs, reduce significantly the cost of administering the current programs. Each of the schools now has its own administrative staff functions: human resources, finance/budgeting, communications, and IT support. If several schools were to share the same administrative staff, in functions for which this sort of non-specialized sharing is possible, the overall cost of delivering educational programs might be reduced. Since there is good reason to believe that there are economies of scale in administrative functions, we believe both campuses should consider reorganization options.

The committee is aware that reorganization can create morale problems and, if executed poorly, may not save money. Indeed, it could increase overall costs if hard choices are not made. While there are risks in reorganization, the committee is confident that a spirit of fiscal discipline can reduce administrative costs through reorganization, without damaging academic programs. Indeed, savings in administrative costs may help finance priority academic investments.

On a smaller level, the common provision of administrative support services could reduce costs and increase efficiency in centers and institutes as well. At present, most centers provide for their human resources, finance/budgeting, and IT support needs individually. A common pool of resources, perhaps in connection with a facility that might house smaller

units and provide common conference rooms, copiers, fax machines, and the like, would encourage innovation while decreasing costs and duplication.

Core Campus Schools

For the “core campus” schools, a different approach to efficiency would be to establish a single budget for a core school. The current split-budget arrangement does not encourage the kind of administrative efficiencies or mission differentiation that would be expected of core schools that are cost-effective in their use of resources.

Duplicative Programs

In the course of reviewing the academic programs offered on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, the committee noticed that the same (or a similar) educational degree or program is frequently offered on both campuses. In many cases this apparent duplication is justified. For example, the key liberal arts disciplines need to be strongly represented in Bloomington and Indianapolis since undergraduate students on both campuses need access to such courses and majors.

Similarly, the large IU professional schools operating on both campuses, whether “core-campus” schools (e.g., business) or independent units (e.g., law), seem to have achieved adequate size to create the intellectual synergism that a critical mass of faculty and students provides and to create economies of scale in educational programs and administration.

In some cases, what seems like duplication may actually be complementarity, because the missions (or areas of concentration) of programs on the two campuses are quite different. Both Journalism and SLIS can make this case. In some professional schools, a relatively large Bloomington-based operation may be serving a full-time, residential student market (including a significant share of out-of-state students) while the smaller Indianapolis-based school in the same professional field may be serving a predominantly in-state, working population through part-time, night programs. This is the pattern at SPEA, e.g., where the smaller Indianapolis branch of a “core school” serves working professionals in the state’s capital.

For some relatively new schools that are operating at both locations (e.g., Informatics), more time is necessary to determine whether critical mass is achievable on both campuses. Likewise, if only a particular focus in the smaller location is needed (e.g., Journalism in Indianapolis to connect with a major media and sports market and with the political center of the state, and medicine in Bloomington to provide initial coursework), schools should be expected to limit the presence in the smaller market to the amount that is necessary to achieve specified objectives.

However, the committee is concerned that not all cases of program duplication seem to have a clear rationale. Thus, the committee recommends further inquiry into whether there are inappropriate duplications on the two campuses in any of the professional programs.

In undertaking such a review, IU should consider the alternatives discussed above of consolidation, mission differentiation, and adjustment of organizational size.

One range of programs meriting special attention, on both the Bloomington and the Indianapolis campuses, is the set connected with computing and information science. The organization of the computing-related units at IU is quite complex, and appears to relate more to institutional history and campus politics than to any rational configuration scheme. On the Indianapolis campus there are the Purdue-related units such as Computer and Information Technology, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology, each in the School of Engineering and Technology. The IU side of the Indianapolis campus includes degrees in Informatics and Human-Computer Interaction in the School of Informatics, Computer and Information Science in the School of Science, Computer Information Systems in the Kelley School of Business, and some activity in the School of Library and Information Science.

On the Bloomington campus, the creation of the School of Informatics has brought a measure of coherence and visibility, though the relation between Informatics and the School of Library and Information Science also needs to be examined. The most recent examination of possible organizational synergies between Informatics and SLIS was in 2003. A review of that report would be useful, but both schools have changed substantially since that time, so a discussion that proceeds from a survey of the current operations and aspirations of each unit is also recommended. There are clearly some overlaps between the two schools, but there are also some very separate functions, and there are, as there are with SPEA and Philanthropy, some issues about national visibility and rankings.

In any case, robust and empirically detailed reviews of all these matters are definitely in order, but we must make one cautionary note. While it is tempting for rationalists to seek a maximally logical reorganization, such efforts do not necessarily produce the ends we seek. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign recently undertook a budgetary review of four academic units with 40 or fewer full-time faculty--the College of Media, the School of Labor and Employment, the School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science--and reached the conclusion that no significant savings would be gained by merging the units. In addition, our budgetary concerns must be addressed in ways that do not harm the stature or productivity of well-ranked, successful units.

University Graduate School

The University Graduate School (UGS) has experienced significant change over the past eight years. The primary mission of UGS is to promote excellence in graduate education and to enhance the overall quality of graduate and professional student life. The mission has not changed; what has changed is the way in which UGS executes its mission. Building upon recommendations resulting from a review of UGS that commenced in 2003 and was approved by the UFC, President, and Trustees in 2005, UGS has stabilized and improved operations; it now provides both administrative and academic support and service with greater efficiency and less bureaucracy. It has developed and provided a range of

electronic services for course remonstrance and approval, applications for admission, etc. that have benefited the entire university.

One alternative option that should certainly be considered, however, is a less centralized structure. In Bloomington, this would continue the transformation to a provostial model for the campus, with responsibility for graduate program evaluation and oversight and the various graduate diversity and support initiatives delegated to a vice provost for graduate education; on other campuses these responsibilities would be assumed by academic affairs. Recording functions would be allocated to the schools, as they are now for undergraduate programs. The benefits of a less centralized model would be derived from enhanced integration of graduate operations with the rest of academic affairs and assessment. There are some functions that would still require system-wide oversight, however, mostly connected with gate-keeping to avoid duplicative initiatives and to maintain quality control and mission differentiation.

Continuing Studies

The School of Continuing Studies (SCS) is the primary home for IU's outreach to adult learners who wish to obtain a baccalaureate degree despite the passage of time (often a significant amount of time) since their last educational experience. It serves students who have no college credits and those who have some college credits but not enough to meet relevant requirements.

In order to serve this purpose, SCS over time developed two important additional functions. First, it developed methods of outreach to students who cannot attend classes in person for a variety of reasons, such as physical distance, job or family obligations, incarceration or illness, and those for whom distance education is simply a preference. (The Indiana High School program is a variation on this outreach service, though it is aimed at high school students). These SCS courses have in the past been offered through the mail, though the "correspondence course" mode of distance learning is in transition, soon to be entirely replaced by online provision of services. Second, SCS serves as the home of the General Studies degree--the bachelor's degree in general studies, the BGS; the associate's degree, AAGS, is being phased out--which has some curricular requirements but not the detailed requirements typical of disciplinary majors. The degree is therefore considered appropriate for many adult and returning students, but there is some concern about whether it is the most appropriate choice for the large number of high school graduates at all campuses who pursue it, numbers especially large at IUPUI and the regional campuses.

The SCS and BGS have an ambiguous organizational structure within IU. SCS does not possess its own faculty, and insofar as it offers its own courses, they are not taught by people with full-time faculty appointments. Some programming is centralized, and there is a very small "system" degree (in adult education), but the degrees are issued by campuses. Thus, the BGS represents a combination of SCS and campus-specific requirements. There is both a university-wide staff directly managed by the Dean of SCS, and campus staff who report not directly to the dean, but to each campus. In sum, SCS operates both in parallel to other schools and campuses, with its own administrative and instructional staff, and on top

of them, as the degree-granting school for General Studies degrees, regardless of campus or source of coursework.

The basic purpose of SCS– outreach to adult learners– and its ancillary functions– a non-disciplinary “major” and distance education– remain important to IU, but probably in different ways from those originally intended for the school and in different ways for different campuses. The time has come, therefore, to rethink whether the current SCS structure is the best way to meet those needs.

The most obvious change is the use of on-line education. At the school’s founding, and until quite recently, it was assumed that distance learning was a specialized function requiring specialized skills that would be best concentrated in a single administrative location. A comprehensive on-line strategy is currently in development, but it is already clear that this assumption no longer holds true. On-line education is widely distributed across departments, schools, and campuses, and the further growth of on-line learning will not be served by limiting it to one school and staff. While it has been suggested that SCS should be IU’s repository for on-line expertise, such expertise does not in fact exist in the school, and the major IU providers of on-line education have developed their own expertise. It seems clear that if there is a central role for on-line education, it will be infrastructure and training, not delivery.

Another key change is the evolving role of IU (and especially the core campuses) as Ivy Tech and other entities assume the role of community colleges. The number of students for whom a BGS degree is optimal, or even appropriate, has diminished and is expected to diminish further. Thus, it makes sense to integrate the BGS into the advising and educational structures of each campus to ensure that students are being challenged to take a robust curriculum that will best serve them in their life-long careers.

Both of these changes suggest that a central unit for the provision of the BGS is not the most effective or efficient way to offer on-line education or provide the BGS to appropriate students. Some distance programs may be candidates for discontinuation. The Indiana prisoner education program, for example, has been transferred to Ivy Tech; the Indiana High School program may not be central to the university’s mission or it may be more appropriately housed in the School of Education. On-line infrastructure and instruction should be decoupled. Some infrastructure clearly benefits from continued centralization, but where and how needs to be re-examined in light of expertise that has developed in the academic units, the university libraries, and in UITS. While there may well be areas in which a central approach to on-line instruction is appropriate (e.g., institution-wide arrangements with a community college), they can be managed without a separate school. Advising and support functions must be maintained, but, again, these functions can be incorporated into existing school structures.

The committee therefore recommends that the operations of the School of Continuing Studies be integrated into the academic programs of each campus. (This recommendation necessarily affects the regional campuses as well, since SCS is a system school–though conceivably the regional campuses could choose to continue SCS as an intercampus entity.)

Careful choices need to be made concerning which services benefit from centralization, collaboration, or devolution. BGS and prospective BGS students should be educated and advised through the same organizational structures as disciplinary major students, though we recognize that adult learners and returning students may need special forms of advice and support. There may well be a continuing central or coordinating role for outreach to adult learners, but that too should be primarily a matter for each campus to integrate into its regular academic programs. The long-term future of on-line education is beyond the scope of this report; however, the committee is of the view that it should be integrated into—rather than separated from—the schools with responsibility for traditional in-person instruction. On-line instruction should be located within our general campus academic organizations.

(b)

The committee recommends further examination of the structure of the IUB College of Arts and Sciences

The committee explored a number of alternative structures, and discusses them below, but it is important to note that a new dean will be taking the helm of the College on July 1, 2011, and it is essential that he have the opportunity to assess all available options.

The College of Arts and Sciences is by far the largest unit on the Bloomington campus, and it houses many of the departments and programs that make up IU's academic core. When IU was founded in 1820, it was founded as an arts and sciences organization, and this liberal arts tradition remains today a distinctive feature of the intellectual environment and international reputation of the university and the Bloomington campus.

Today, the College has roughly 70 degree-granting departments and programs. It is home to about 800 of the 1400 tenure-line faculty on the Bloomington campus. The next three largest academic units (the Kelley School of Business, the School of Education, and the Jacobs School of Music) together have 350 tenure-line faculty. Measured by net annual expenditures (i.e., general fund income minus campus assessments), the College is more than twice as large as the second largest unit on the Bloomington campus (the Kelley School of Business).

The College is therefore central to the health of the Bloomington campus. Yet for several decades it has experienced a significant decline in market share of undergraduate credit hours—a trend that continues to the present:

<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Fall Market Share (%)</u>	<u>Spring Market Share (%)</u> ¹
1995	68.387	66.208
1996	66.721	64.927
1997	65.288	63.283
1998	64.411	62.633
1999	63.083	60.887
2000	62.350	59.789
2001	62.295	59.966
2002	60.532	57.998
2003	60.812	58.236
2004	60.662	58.889
2005	60.136	58.365
2006	58.394	56.735
2007	58.527	57.027
2008	58.326	57.060
2009	58.758	57.362
2010	58.331	56.657
2011	57.430	56.384

Under RCM, academic units compete for undergraduate credit hours because a unit's market share of credit hours influences its long-term fiscal well-being. Fortunately, the College does not face a near-term fiscal crisis. In fact, over the last decade the College has eliminated a large accumulated debt and has gradually enlarged its cash reserves, so that it is now in compliance with the minimum cash-reserve guideline set by the IU Trustees. Some of the recent improvement is attributable to a series of campus-wide factors that may not be projected indefinitely: the growth in enrollment on the Bloomington campus, the increase in IU's undergraduate tuition rate, and a low rate of salary increases at IU in recent years. As discussed earlier, these fiscal circumstances are not likely to continue at IU.

The College has not been standing still in the face of its long-term decline in market share. Over the last decade, new departments or programs have been launched in a wide variety of fields, such as applied physics, biochemistry, biotechnology, cognitive science, gender studies, human biology, international studies, medical physics, musical theater, second language studies, and statistics. The Liberal Arts and Management Program (LAMP), a collaboration with the Kelley School of Business, has doubled in size, and the relatively new undergraduate major in international studies is also growing rapidly. The College has been particularly aggressive in building on its strengths (e.g., by expanding the offerings in foreign languages) and launching new interdisciplinary initiatives (e.g., the College Arts and Humanities Institute that provides support to and collaborates with multiple departments) and cross-unit faculty appointments (e.g., new joint faculty searches are underway in collaboration with Informatics, SPEA and HPER).

¹ The market share figure for any year is based on the actual credit-hour information from the previous year. For example, the market share figure for the spring of 2011 is based on credit-hour data from the spring of 2010.

A key question for IU is whether the existing structure of the College is appropriate for the future or whether some form of reorganization should be considered. The committee has considered this question in some detail, and examined several options, but, again, **it is essential that the new dean, coming to IU on July 1, have the opportunity to assess all available options.**

The committee's discussion of the College structure has been informed by a concern about the implications of declining market share, but that is at most an instrumental focus. Our intrinsic interest must always be the continuous improvement of the quality of liberal arts education and research. Still, losses in market share can be tied to diminished opportunities for the College to thrive, so the committee reviewed possibilities for enhancing market share. Each option so far examined by the committee has advantages and disadvantages. We outline some options and our assessment of each below.

Option 1: Reorganize the College into Several Independent Colleges, Each Operated Under RCM

One plausible approach would be to break the College into several colleges (e.g., the physical and life sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts), and operate each college under RCM. The arguments in favor of this approach are that (1) advocacy for a unit is easier when the academic unit is intellectually more coherent, and (2) effective leaders for various functional areas may be easier to recruit when the unit is more homogenous. Perhaps more importantly, this option would bring the incentives for enterprising activity (both on the Bloomington campus and through acquisition of extramural resources) closer to the faculty members who possess the creative ideas and skills that are necessary to maximize market share. As long as RCM is applied only at the top of this large, complex organization, it may be that creative opportunities for expanded market share will be missed.

While this option has been considered at IU over the years, there is concern that this kind of reorganization might weaken the voice of liberal arts education on the Bloomington campus. A counterargument is that it would empower multiple strong voices rather than only one.

Another serious drawback of this approach is that some of Bloomington's most successful educational and research programs fall on the interface of what would on this model become separate units, e.g., between the natural sciences and the social sciences. Collaborative activities between two departments may be more difficult to establish and sustain when the two departments are in different RCM units than when they are housed in the same RCM unit.

A related drawback is that the separate colleges may erect barriers that make it difficult for students to take courses or design majors with courses from more than one (sub)college. But it is dangerous for a unit to become so restrictive that it develops a bad reputation. Students may choose against a unit if their requirements are perceived to be too prescriptive, and thus RCM does not always reward "credit hoarding" by departments. In

order to assess the severity of these drawbacks, it would be useful to consider how RCM is working in other parts of IU and whether modifications to RCM can address some of these concerns without forgoing the enterprising incentives of RCM.

Before moving in this direction, however, IU should also consider very carefully the experience at Ohio State University. After breaking up its liberal arts unit into sub-units in 1968 and acquiring four decades of experience with a structure similar to that described in Option 1, OSU was not satisfied with the results. It has recently moved in precisely the opposite direction, reconsolidating five smaller colleges into a unified College of Arts and Sciences. The goals of the OSU reorganization were to:

- enhance coherence, collaboration, and synergies;
- decrease wasteful College-centric competition and lower College boundaries;
- enhance interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty and students and promote collaborative relationships that strengthen both individual units and the whole;
- provide for an administrative structure that is efficient, effective, and less costly, so that significant resources can be redirected to academic programs.

Fiscal problems in the science college were a significant factor leading to the re-creation of the unified College of Arts and Sciences at OSU, and, absent campus-wide attention to the cost of science, there is reason to believe those problems would be presented at IU, too. Saliently, OSU administrative costs were reduced in the re-consolidation.

Option 2: Retain the College but Move RCM Down to the Divisional, Departmental, or Program Level

An alternative reform would retain the College in its current form and at its current size, but place the enterprising incentives of RCM at a lower level of organizational operation. This reflects the experience of the IU School of Medicine, the only academic unit at IU that is larger than the College. The School of Medicine treats each of its departments as an RCM unit, though with a somewhat different formula than is practiced in Bloomington and with an exception that the one-time costs of new faculty hires tend to be financed centrally. Thus, the School of Medicine experience suggests that it might be possible to retain the College in its current form while making better use of RCM.

Under this option, the Dean of the College would remain the central, powerful proponent of liberal arts education on the Bloomington campus, and the Dean would have the power to tax the College's RCM units to support College-wide activities, including interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary activities that are not funded by partnerships of RCM units.

Presently, most of the College's roughly 70 degree-granting departments and programs have tenure-line faculty members and administrative staff. The question would become how to integrate RCM into their operations.

A modest version of Option 2 might create 10-20 RCM units ("divisions") in the College, each operating with a measure of fiscal independence. Under this model, each of the large

disciplinary departments in the College (e.g., history, English and biology) would operate as an RCM unit while the smaller departments and programs (often interdisciplinary units) would need to be clustered into divisions for budgeting purposes.

A more aggressive reform might place each of the 70 departments and programs under RCM. As noted above, about three quarters of the College's current departments and programs have budgets of less than \$3 million per year. Given the incentives under RCM, some small programs might choose to merge or share leadership and/or administrative costs. (This would parallel the expectation the committee noted about for the operations of small schools.) This could yield significant economies with no damage to the academic enterprise.

An argument in favor of these options is that the incentives for enterprising activity are placed much closer to the individual faculty member in the College than they are today (or than they would be under option 1). Since the boundaries created by RCM units (or any budgetary units) do, though, create rigidities and transaction costs, the optimal number of RCM units in a large organization would have to be considered very carefully. If the College-and the liberal arts and sciences core of IUB-could thrive with a small number of RCM units, then creation of many RCM units would be unwise.

One of the standard objections to any significant reform of the College is that it would weaken the physical and life sciences on the Bloomington campus, since the physical and life sciences are cross-subsidized by other units in the College. This concern is not necessarily an argument against re-structuring of the College. It could instead be an argument for developing a broader instrument of cross-subsidization for the sciences, such as a transparent addition to the university assessment of all Bloomington units in order to support the expensive science departments. Because the natural science departments are crucial to the future of the Bloomington campus, it may be that the university should not rely solely on the humanities and social sciences to carry the burden of cross subsidization. (The humanities, social sciences and arts are also crucial, of course, but they do not have the huge start-up costs of the natural sciences.) The issue of adequate funding for science is important, but there are a variety of ways in which the issue can be addressed.

The disadvantages to this option (as well as option 1) relate precisely to ills of creating numerous budgetary units when a fluid intellectual environment is desired. If we are concerned with reducing silos, why build more of them? Why use RCM to erect new barriers to the relatively free movement of students and faculty across boundaries that are now internal to the College? There might also be increased administrative costs involved in negotiating these barriers.

At the undergraduate level, RCM units would have perverse incentives to reduce course requirements in other RCM units, a practice that is incompatible with the very idea of a liberal arts education. Units with small general fund budgets-and, again, roughly three quarters of the departments and nearly all programs in the College have budgets in the \$1-3 million range-may have particularly strong incentives to discourage students from taking courses in other units. Bloomington has adopted new campus-wide general education

requirements that ensure some degree of educational breadth, but the general education requirements are only a subset of the more comprehensive educational expectations we have for the breadth of a liberal arts degree.

At the graduate level, students with fee remissions may be harmed under this sort of reorganization, because they may lose free access to valuable courses in other RCM units. Some departments might share resources to reduce the substantial cost of graduate education and, even under a more finely grained RCM, a College-wide regulation could be adopted that would ensure any qualified graduate student access to graduate courses in any unit of the College. (Indeed, the concern about graduate student access to courses outside home units is a broader question in need of better resolution, even now.) In any case, however, one might be able to reap some of the advantages of RCM, without the adverse effects, if a more finely-grained RCM is combined with well-designed College-wide (or broader) regulations.

Options 1 and 2 presume that reorganization would increase programmatic innovation, but it must be acknowledged they would also create rigidities and transactions costs. This may call into question whether the benefits of reorganization would justify the costs. Thus there is merit in considering other solutions to the College's market share problem.

Option 3: Retain the Current Organization of the College and Use It to Create Innovative Centers, Interdisciplinary Programs and Even New Virtual Schools

To reverse the slide in the College's market share and attract new revenue sources, another option is the creation of new centers on cross-cutting issues and new interdisciplinary degree options and certificate programs that build on the strengths of the College. As noted above, the College is already moving in this direction, sometimes in creative partnerships with professional schools. There may even be selective cases where it makes sense to create "virtual schools" within the College that significantly enhance the national branding of selected areas of ongoing activity and provide a low-cost organizational framework to facilitate the development of exciting new interdisciplinary degree programs for students.

As noted above, in Recommendation 3, the advantage of centers and interdisciplinary degree programs is that they can be launched relatively quickly and can be terminated more readily than an entire department or school. Once a unit acquires full-time tenure-line faculty, it is not easy to reorganize or eliminate it, even if student interest and research support wane.

Virtual schools are organizations populated, initially, by faculty from existing departments, but the operations and autonomy of the existing departments are, theoretically, the same after creation of a virtual school as before. The school-level organization could be a visible home for new interdisciplinary programs and degrees. In other words, a virtual school could be a location for new full-time faculty or it could be a "location" for part-time commitments from existing faculty members who participate in the school's new programs but also have a faculty appointment elsewhere in the College or university.

This option has budgetary advantages compared to the creation of new departments. Initial budgetary investments will be minimal if faculty members drawn into virtual schools come from the College. The same holds for administrative staffing, which would expand only in tandem with the growth of new interdisciplinary programs. Option 3 might possibly also offer some of the same opportunities for branding and enhanced recruitment as the creation of completely separate schools outside of the College. Lastly, this option is more likely to garner support from the College faculty than the other options, as it seems least disruptive, although some faculty who favor more disciplinary emphasis in the College may be inclined to oppose the creation of virtual schools. Their worry, not unreasonable, would be that faculty efforts dedicated to the virtual schools would be subtracted from the resources available to the existing core departments.

The costs of virtual schools are not zero. When some of a faculty member's time is shifted from an existing department to a virtual school, the loss of faculty time in the existing department must be addressed (unless faculty members are currently working below full capacity or their work is really already tied to the mission of the new virtual unit). The same issues of effort allocation apply to administrative staff. It is questionable whether a virtual school of significant size can run effectively without any full-time tenure-line faculty or full-time administrative staff. Even if virtual schools are created with entirely borrowed personnel, full-time personnel may be acquired over time. Effective efforts to enhance revenue—through extramural grant and philanthropic funding—may require staff dedicated to the enterprise. The key question with virtual schools—or any new degree programs—is whether they will successfully address student interests and research opportunities (and even donor interests) in a cost-effective manner.

Additional Options:

There may well be alternatives to these three options— different realignments of some of the units of the College, new, but not really RCM approaches to budgeting within the larger whole, etc.— that should be explored. It is also important to remember that some of the factors that contribute to the long-term enrollment trends have little to do with student interest and less to do with inefficiencies. For example, the growth of AP and dual credit courses in high schools has implications for the College that it does not have for the professional schools. Again, it is important to underscore that the central focus in any examination of the structure of the College is not really market share, but how best to maintain and enhance a thriving core of the liberal arts and sciences on the Bloomington campus.

(c) The committee recommends examination of the structures of the School of Liberal Arts and School of Science at IUPUI

A key issue in many of our deliberations about structural matters was whether some units, by being either “too small” or “too large,” might be missing opportunities for cost-efficiency or for research and educational synergies. Prompted by a concern particularly about the latter possibility, the committee recommends attention to the relation between the SLA and the Purdue School of Science. The IUPUI campus has changed substantially in recent

decades, especially in its undergraduate population, which has grown but also shifted toward a majority of full-time, traditional college students, many of whom major in the arts and sciences disciplines as they would at any other college or university. Science majors have doubled and Liberal Arts majors have nearly doubled at IUPUI in the last decade, and the number of students graduating each year from each school has doubled over the same period. As of Fall 2011, the combined number of Liberal Arts and Science majors at IUPUI surpassed the combined number of Medicine, Dentistry, and Nursing students for the first time, and there is little reason to believe that trend will change or reverse.

There are at least two possible foci for an examination of Liberal Arts, Science, and other schools at IUPUI. One such focus is on the central roles of the schools of Liberal Arts and Science in undergraduate education at the Indianapolis campus. This focus requires a study of whether there are gains in effectiveness or administrative efficiency to be captured by some combined structure of Liberal Arts, Science, and other units, such as University College, the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Center for Service and Learning, the Center for Research and Learning, and the Solution Center to provide greater coordination of student academic advising and the integration of co-curricular with curricular aspects of student development throughout the undergraduate experience. While both Liberal Arts and Science are also home to growing and strengthening graduate programs, the focus of this kind of examination would be on whether the large roles of both schools in undergraduate education at IUPUI provide some leverage for coordinating the overall undergraduate experience in new ways that advance student success and the quality of student services and/or reduce administrative inefficiencies.

A second focus for an examination of Liberal Arts, Science, and other schools at IUPUI is on the academic disciplines themselves. One rationale for combined arts-and-sciences units at other colleges and universities is the expectation of intellectual gains through the promotion of interdisciplinary interchange and collaboration. Especially with respect to funded research—and applied or translational research in particular—much attention is now given to the formation of multi-disciplinary teams among investigators in the physical sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and the humanities. It is also possible, though not guaranteed, that a combined unit can make it somewhat simpler for undergraduate and graduate students to navigate the curricular complexities of dual degrees, double majors, and combinations of a major with minors and certificates. An examination of the school structures at IUPUI—not only with respect to Liberal Arts and Science but other schools as well—can determine whether any such advantages are possible through combining faculty and programs from complementary disciplines into a new configuration.

We recommend an examination of Liberal Arts, Science, and other schools at IUPUI with both of these foci. We recognize that the School of Engineering and Technology is at the core of the mission of Purdue University, and thus of the mission differentiation between IU and Purdue, and any organizational changes will need to be undertaken in collaboration with Purdue and will need to respect and support Purdue's mission.

Recommendation 5: IU must reduce administrative barriers to academic excellence and innovation.

One of our sub-committees focused on bureaucratic barriers to academic innovation, and presented a summary of obstacles that are widespread and take many forms, including:

- Slow or nonexistent responses to necessary requests for approvals or processing.
- Being told something cannot be done when in fact it can be done legally and ethically.
- Unnecessary rules or policies, often justified on the basis of “legal obligations.”
- Lack of apparent authority or overlapping or conflicting authority.
- Multiple layers of people doing similar jobs because of the need to navigate unnecessarily complex procedures.
- One-off approaches to frequently recurrent issues, so that we end up with conflicting results.
- Poorly designed tools, automated and otherwise, that introduce inefficiency.
- Units blaming each other for lack of achievement, rather than working together to achieve IU’s mission.
- Lack of central university and central campus resources to act on opportunities.
- Misfocused attention on individual unit financial solvency so we end up treating each other as sources of revenue.

One common aspect of many of these obstacles is the claim that they are “required by law.” Too often this assertion appears to be made without consulting with the General Counsel’s office. In some cases, it appears to reflect an aversion to risk by shifting responsibility for making hard decisions onto the lawyers, when in fact all they usually can do is highlight potential risks. To take just one example that provoked widespread concern and so the committee investigated more fully: Travel Management had imposed a reimbursement policy on the basis that it was “required by law,” when in fact it turned out to be based on an inaccurate, lay interpretation of a state law that did not apply to the university and that had been repealed in any event. More surprising still, the policy continues in effect because we do not have a systematic way to review or remove unnecessary policies.

In many instances, these obstacles either directly block activities that serve the university’s mission or they waste scarce resources by delaying valuable academic activities and wasting administrative resources by escalating comparatively simple issues to higher and higher levels until finally someone says “yes.” We will not meet the challenges or seize the opportunities facing us with timidity or rigidity. We must avoid becoming our own worst enemy by helping to focus all IU personnel on the broad mission of the university, rather than on the rules and requirements of each unit. A rule or policy that does not advance that mission should be abandoned, unless it actually is required by law. And we must reward IU employees who do work energetically to make innovation possible—who look for creative, responsible ways to say “yes,” despite the impediments they face.

The Vice President and Chief Financial Officer and the Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy are already working to improve the service-orientation of IU's administrative units, to remove unnecessary policies, and to streamline procedures. We applaud their efforts and we recommend that the President task them specifically with leading a systematic review of administrative policy and procedure in order to eliminate unnecessary or duplicative ones and to reduce the burdens they impose wherever possible. As part of that review, they should devise a mechanism to allow members of the university community to submit concerns about policies taken to be unnecessary or inefficient. This is not just a question of efficiency or cost-savings or employee morale. In the face of unprecedented pressures on higher education, the ability to innovate boldly and imaginatively is critical to our survival, as well as our success.

Another issue discussed by both faculty members and students as an impediment to collaboration, efficiency, and creativity is the rigidity of academic calendars and the variations within and between the two campuses. It would be useful to have additional mechanisms to schedule special courses, short-courses, and non-traditional educational blocks. The committee believes that campus registrars, working with faculty governance, should develop more flexible means for offering unique and special courses on and between the campuses.

[A very different kind of impediment to collaboration and efficiency–this one physical–is repeatedly raised by individuals who work on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, and that is the lack of transportation between campuses, other than private cars. While many dream of the day when a light rail line might be built between the campuses, an expanded university transportation system with buses or vans could make the commute between the campuses productive time rather than wasted time. This was a recommendation of the Core Schools Operations Committee, as well.]

Recommendation 6: IU must focus on enhancing revenue strategically and cost-effectively.

It would seem to go without saying that in the face of financial exigencies, we should enhance revenue. But efforts to enhance revenue must be guided by our mission and values, so we need to set guidelines for how we pursue this end and how we allocate revenue once generated. It is in this context that we wish to highlight a couple of points.

First, as we have already indicated above by recommending that revenue generation be one of the five criteria for determining how to allocate reductions and make new investments, all academic units should be thinking creatively about ways of increasing revenue from a range of sources. Special alumni/ae programs, executive education courses, online opportunities, shows, targeted grants, tech transfer, new partnerships with businesses, venture funders, and other academic institutions, and other ways of expanding the unit's revenue base should be considered for both feasibility and fit. There are also opportunities to generate revenue through e-texts, IU publishing and archiving, and branding specific "content." These activities have to be consistent with the university's mission and the

principles of excellence that articulate our shared vision for Indiana University. These activities must also of course comply with all relevant university policies. But there are untapped sources of revenue that the successful institutions of the future will have to learn to exploit. Bloomington deans and directors, assisted by a seminar offered by the Kelly School, have already begun to think about identifying hidden assets that can augment their revenue base. Efforts in this direction must be ongoing, and work in these new areas must be tied into the universities merit reward system, including the processes of tenure and promotion

Second, to support the type of flexibility and innovation that the committee believes is essential for IU, it is prudent to begin setting aside some resources—at various levels of the university—so that we will be able to respond strategically to new opportunities. This will be especially difficult in our financially straitened circumstances, but it is crucial if IU is to pursue excellence in education, research, creativity, and service.

IV. Conclusion

The questions posed by President McRobbie to the committee on September 20, 2010, are as difficult as they are important to answer. We have done our best and have enjoyed broad support in our efforts to do so. We know our answers will not please everyone, and we take comfort in the fact that the process of implementing them will provide other opportunities for input, discussion, and improvement.

The key to IU's continued and expanded success is for us all to work together to maintain IU's commitment to its core academic values while enhancing the flexibility and creativity to invest in new academic opportunities to advance the quality and impact of IU. The committee foresees serious financial and other challenges in the immediate future, but we have been repeatedly reminded of the extraordinary record of achievement and excellence that IU offers, its long history of service to the state and the nation, and especially the talented, committed, and creative people that make up the university community. Despite the challenges ahead, with such remarkable resources on which to build, our outlook is optimistic.

Appendix A: committee members

Charles Bantz, Executive Vice President and Chancellor, IUPUI (co-chair)

Karen Hanson, Executive Vice President and Provost, IU Bloomington (co-chair)

John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy

Simon Atkinson, Associate Professor, School of Medicine, IUPUI

William Blomquist, Dean, School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI

Maria Bucur, John W. Hill Chair of European History and Director, Russian and East European Institute, IUB

Craig Brater, Dean, School of Medicine, IUPUI

Fred Cate, Distinguished Professor and C. Ben Dutton Chair of Law, Maurer School of Law, IUB

Daniel Cole, Bruce Townsend Professor of Law, IU School of Law—Indianapolis

Michael Coleman, President, Indiana University Student Association, IUB

John Graham, Dean, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Jorge José, Vice President for Research

Shreyas Joshi, President, Medical Student Council, IUPUI

Bernice Pescosolido, Distinguished Professor, Sociology, IUB

Elizabeth Raff, Professor of Biology, IUB

Robert Schnabel, Dean, School of Informatics

Anantha Shekhar, Raymond E. Houk Professor in Psychiatry, IUPUI

Neil Theobald, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

William Tierney, Chancellor's Professor and Joseph J. Mamlin Professor of Medicine, IUPUI

James Wimbush, Dean, University Graduate School

David Zaret, Interim Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, IUB

Appendix B:

There are a number of other areas of research and teaching that the committee discussed and believed particularly ripe for further development at Indiana University; they are described below, along with other suggestions that have come to the committee from faculty invited to send suggestions.

Network Science. A series of reports (e.g., from the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Science, the National Research Council, the Institute of Medicine) over the last decade have emphasized complexity and transdisciplinarity, and one of the central frameworks that has emerged both within and across disciplines to respond is the idea of networks, or connections, among active agents, rather than a focus on individual elements. The idea is that the network interaction among multi-level elements, whether proteins, people, organizations or nation states, offers a potentially powerful mechanism to understand the workings of complex systems. While the focus on networks is not new in many fields—e.g., sociology, biology, anthropology and statistics—what has changed is the focus on network interactions across the academic landscape.

Perhaps more than any other U.S. university, IU has assembled one of the broadest and deepest cadre of researchers who study networks. To date, 69 individuals from the IU system (63 from IUB; 6 from IUPUI) have presented in the Networks and Complex Systems Lecture Series (initiated in fall 2004). Over the last decade, Indiana University has begun a number of initiatives that have included a focus on networks. A wide variety of centers and institutes have taken a network approach to understanding everything from the brain to international trade. While many of these represent hybrid arrangements between departments or schools, what is lacking is the synergy that could result from a larger coordination of information sharing on research and training to meet the demands of 21st century science.

An overarching structure and set of resources would facilitate the communication of shared interests, assist in the development of transdisciplinary projects, offer resources for project development and grant production, and bring a unified face to the strength in Network Science that exists at IU. Given our strong computing infrastructure, few universities are as well situated as IU to take advantage of theoretical and analytic synergies. Ties among network researchers in the IU system exist, but they are weaker than they could be due primarily to physical, disciplinary, and administrative “silos.” A focused effort would allow the continuation and strengthening of Indiana University’s extraordinary leadership in this research area and serve as a catalyst for future efforts in transdisciplinary research.

Epigenetics. Although the concept underlying epigenetics has been around since the 1940s, it is not until relatively recently that it has become a central area of biological and biomedical research. Significant debate has taken place since the nineteenth century about the dominant importance of nurture vs. nature, e.g. Lamarck vs. Darwin. The term Epigenetics is related to this debate and comes from

the fusion of the words “genetics” and “epigenesis”. The latter term means adult development from the embryo gradually, possibly affected by the environment and inheritance, and not just by the DNA in the preformed zygote. Significant research has been done in this area, for example with identical twins who in principle have the same DNA make up but who can exhibit totally different health behaviors. Epigenetic research is done in conjunction with genome research. A large number of faculty at IU are working both on genomics and epigenetic research, in areas including plant biology, cancer, brain science, translational and clinical trials. It is important to identify and form groups at a university level who are doing complementary work on this important and leading area of biological and biomedical research.

Learning Analytics. Evidence-based teaching and organizational practices facilitate the student learning outcomes and institutional social change that are necessary for the demands of the 21st century global community and workplace. Universities and colleges are coming under increasing pressure to provide evidence of student learning, to be accountable for the “product” they are producing, and to alter their practices and structures to better align with aims. In higher education, issues of teaching and learning have not been ignored; however, sustained research efforts have been focused primarily on substantive problems of the disciplines, and when education is at issue, research has been targeted mostly on K-12. Learning analytics are more broadly applicable.

As a field, learning analytics is the measurement, collection, analysis and reporting of data about learners and their contexts for purposes of understanding and optimizing learning and the environments in which it occurs. It includes issues from software development and use to the architecture of learning environments, from interventions, personalization, and adaptively in the learning process to the social, cultural and cognitive dynamics of learning. It also extends to investigating graduate training and outcomes, providing graduate training that prepares future faculty to understand the complexities of student learning and the critical changes in varied higher education contexts.

Indiana University, with its history of innovation and commitment to teaching (e.g., the 1989 creation of the Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching; the development of discipline-based Preparing Future Faculty Programs and the institution-wide of the Future Faculty Teaching Fellowship), stands in a unique position among the research extensive universities. IU is internationally recognized as one of the premier centers of SOTL, with 6 Carnegie Scholars on the Bloomington campus alone, Hesburgh Awards at both IU and IUPUI, an initial endowment to support SOTL research in the P.A. Mack Center, and the inaugural conference of the International Society for SOTL. In addition, IU has extensive experience in collaborating with other groups to develop and implement large-scale computing resources that can be utilized in the study of learner analytics.

The campuses have established significant capacities for using data derived from operational information systems to address institutional objectives and improve student performance and faculty productivity. Efforts are underway to combine operational information (e.g., on admissions, enrollment, financial aid, human resources, finance, facilities, and research enterprise systems) with data from external sources (e.g., College Board and ACT student information surveys; ETS SAT validity studies; the National Survey of Student Engagement; National Student Clearinghouse; and the National Center for Education Statistics). To date, data from these systems have been instrumental in a range of institutional improvement initiatives, such as “The Gateway to Graduation” program at IUPUI, the University-wide “Degrees of Excellence” initiative, and the “PassPort” program. Indiana University is poised to engage local, national, and international scholars in theory-framed inquiry of teaching and learning in higher education, continuing Indiana University’s leadership promoting excellence in education and transforming higher education.

Other faculty suggestions:

Proposed Academic Initiatives Received by New Academic Directions Committee
(2010-2011)

<u>Proposed Initiative</u>	<u>Key Characteristics</u>
Center for Multicultural Research and Engagement	an academic complement to the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs; would include depts of Asian American Studies, African American and African Diaspora Studies, First Nations and Indigenous Studies, Latino Studies, and others
Merging School of Liberal Arts and School of Science at IUPUI	elevating the stature of these schools to the core of the IUPUI campus
School of Theatre (within College)	Elevate study of theatre to same organizational status as the School of Music and School of Fine Arts
Dance Studies	currently offered in Department of Theatre, HPER, Music, African Diaspora in the African Arts Institute

Oriental Institute of Indiana University	create a research center based on the Sorbonne, Oxford and Chicago models comprised of the best researchers from the departments of East Asian, Near Eastern and India Studies; could grow into a combined department
European Studies Institute of Indiana University	create a research center comprised of European language departments and programs, including Classics
Institute for Cultures of the Southern Hemisphere	create a research center comprised of programs on African, Latin American, Australasian-Oceanian researchers
World Languages Institute	combination of language programs and departments with one goal to produce high quality language-teaching materials
Environmental Science and Geosciences	build on the strengths of the Center for Environmental Science and the BSES to grow degree-granting status for a singular unit combining the strengths of faculty and students, and non-academic units; curriculum areas include atmosphere, oceanography, hydrology and earth science
Applied Theatre/Drama and Theatre Education	develop a curriculum that exposes students to the practical and theoretical applications of interpersonal learning through visual, vocal, physical and written arts based learning
Integration of liberal arts graduate programs between IUB and IUPUI	specific recommendations included: adding a PhD in philosophy at IUPUI, adding doctoral programs at IUPUI in religious studies, American studies and history by combining strengths of liberal arts faculty between two campuses
SLIS	

Computing studies at IUPUI are spread between the following: Computer and Information Technology, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology (all in the School of Engineering and Technology); Informatics and Human-Computer Interaction (in School of Informatics); the School of Library and Information Science; Department of Computer and Information Science (School of Science); Computer Information Systems (Kelley School of Business)

Computing at IUPUI

consideration of the School of Fine Arts in Bloomington, Herron School of Art and Design in Indianapolis; the Department of Apparel Merchandising and Interior Design in the College of Arts and Sciences; perhaps a design program with the potential of an architecture studies program could be created

Design Studies

currently distributed areas could combine for greater effectiveness in research: human intelligence (psychology), multiple intelligences (education), artificial intelligence (computer science), military and governmental intelligence (history, political science, international relations, information science), corporate intelligence (business, information science), propaganda and misinformation/disinformation (history, media, communication studies), collective intelligence (social networking), techno-economic and social intelligence (economics)

Intelligence studies

Combining strengths in digital humanities, digital archiving, and digital librarianship

"Digital"

Joint learning activities can be expanded between the schools of medicine and nursing

Nursing and Medicine

School of Film and Media Studies	building on strength of film holdings in repositories across campus, film studies program in CMCL, film faculty from at least seven other departments on campus, production capabilities from additional units, new IU Cinema, WFIU, leading film publications at the IU Press and from prominent IU researchers
Environmental Sciences and Sustainability	combine strengths from BSES, IRES, faculty from at least ten academic departments into a cohesive unit to leverage resources and strenghts; consider cross-campus academic programs and structures; add new faculty in environmental sciences; models include Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin
Interdisciplinary Sustainability Studies Program	bring together the physical, biological, and social sciences, and humanities to address fundamental issues of coupled natural-human systems; models include Arizona State, U Michigan, Michigan State, Cornell, and Illinois; 29 undergraduate and 34 graduate programs, and over 20 research centers or institutes that address some component of sustainability, involving some 296 courses and 85 faculty members.
Create School of Engineering	modeled after Harvard's recent addition of a College of Engineering; use Purdue School of Engineering and Technology as starting point but needs more emphasis
International Institute	Create and house "Global Studies Program" and combine with international departments and programs
Shared strenghts of the Law Schools	Combine strengths of the law schools to find efficiencies and better academic offerings, faculty specialties, and student publications

School of Philanthropy/Philanthropic Studies	building on strengths in the Center on Philanthropy; authorize degree-granting authority to a new School; consideration would have to be given to the ongoing organization of SPEA if philanthropic studies is removed
---	--

Elevate Groups program to College status	elevate the Groups program and other first- generation programs to the same status as the Hutton Honors College with a senior faculty member leading the organization
---	--

Leadership Studies	model Burns Academy; combine current disparate offerings in leadership studies into a school or as part of an existing school/public administration program
--------------------	--

Cultural Studies Center/School	development of innovative comparative undergraduate and graduate degrees and curricular offerings in cultural/ethnic/nationality studies; a university-wide unit would build on existing strengths; UC Davis model;
--------------------------------	---

Social organization	
---------------------	--

Bionanosystems and technology	
-------------------------------	--

Social Justice	
----------------	--

Appendix C

Final Report of
The Task Force on Communication Studies
Indiana University Bloomington
May 6, 2010

Background

In fall 2009, the Board of Trustees posed a question about the organization of communication studies on the Bloomington campus. That question led to discussions by Bloomington Provost and Executive Vice President Karen Hanson with Brad Hamm, Dean of Journalism; Bennett Bertenthal, then-Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Walt Gantz, Chair of the Department of Telecommunications; and Greg Waller, Chair of the Department of Communication and Culture; and further discussion within Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture about the current organization of their units and their perspectives on the future of communication studies.

On February 2, 2010, following consultation with the Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda Committee, Provost Hanson appointed a Task Force on Communication Studies. The members of the Task Force are:

- Frank Acito, Associate Dean of Information Technology, Max Barney Fellow, and Professor of Marketing, Kelley School of Business
- Mary Ellen Anderson, Director of Admissions, IUB
- Fred H. Cate, Distinguished Professor, C. Ben Dutton Professor of Law, and Director, Center for Applied Cybersecurity Research (Chair)
- Nicholas J. Clark, President, Graduate and Professional Students Organization, and Ph.D. student in Political Science
- Susan Gubar, Distinguished Professor and Ruth N. Halls Professor of English
- Don Hossler, Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, School of Education
- Jane Mallor, Professor of Business Law and Chair, Department of Business Law and Ethics, Kelley School of Business
- Shobha Pai, Vice President, Indiana University Student Association, and Kelley Scholar majoring in Finance and Spanish
- Munirpallam A. Venkataramanan, Associate Dean of Academic Programs and Jack R. Wentworth Professor, Kelley School of Business
- James Walker, Professor of Economics and Co-Director, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis
- Kurt Zorn, Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs and Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Provost Hanson charged the Task Force to

consider whether the current academic organization of these units best serves our students, faculty, and campus. You should consider the teaching missions of each, as well as the research interests and professional alignments of the involved faculty. Is the current organization the most effective use of school and university resources? The internal and external profiles of each unit should also be considered. Does the current

organization help or hinder the activities, the visibility, and the status of the various degree programs, schools and departments?

Provost Hanson noted that “[i]f you recommend any substantial changes, those recommendations will be brought to the affected units and to the appropriate faculty governance bodies.” She asked the Task Force to report by early April.

The Task Force met for the first time on February 19 and, informed by consultations that had already taken place between the Task Force chair and the four unit heads, decided to meet:

1. Separately with the four unit heads;
2. Separately with the three faculties;
3. With graduate students from the three units; and
4. With undergraduates from the three units.

In addition, the Task Force requested “material on your programs, missions, budgets, enrollments, and outreach and recruiting efforts, as well as the structures of peer institutions” from Dean Hamm and Professors Gantz and Waller.

Two developments affected the Task Force’s work. The first was the announcement by President Michael McRobbie during his State of the University address on February 23, 2010, that he was creating a New Academic Directions Committee, to be chaired by Provost Hanson and Indianapolis Chancellor and Executive Vice President Charles Bantz, to examine the “structure and organization of the academic units” on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, consider “new schools or other units,” and evaluate whether “some of our present schools be transformed in ways that allow them to take better advantage of some of the major mega-trends seen around the world.” President McRobbie provided that “[w]here such questions are already being asked on these two campuses, they should again be incorporated into this effort.” Subsequent discussions with the Provost determined that plans to create the New Academic Directions Committee should not interfere with the Task Force’s work, but that any recommendations the Task Force made would likely be considered by the new committee.

The second development was the request to Provost Hanson in early March by the faculty of Telecommunications, Journalism, and Communication and Culture that they be permitted to conduct their own internal assessment of the organization of communication studies on the Bloomington campus in place of or alongside the work of the Task Force. Provost Hanson agreed and asked the Task Force to defer its work until the internal group reported or April 15, whichever occurred first. The internal faculty working group issued its report on April 9, and the Task Force resumed its work after a five-week hiatus. The Task Force found the internal group’s report, a copy of which is attached, very helpful.

The Task Force held ten information-gathering meetings, in addition to meeting with the Provost and to meetings by the Task Force chair with the unit heads and individual faculty:

- Meeting with Walt Gantz, Chair, Telecommunications, February 23, 2010, 10:00 am
- Meeting with Brad Hamm, Dean, Journalism, February 23, 2010, 11:00 am
- Meeting with Greg Waller, Chair, Communication and Culture, February 23, 2010, 6:00 pm
- Meeting with Bennett Bertenthal, Dean, and Bob Becker, Executive Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences, February 23, 2010, 7:00 pm
- Meeting with Communication and Culture Performance and Ethnography Faculty, February 26, 2010, 2:45 pm

- Meeting with Journalism Faculty, March 5, 2010, 9:30 am
- Meeting with Telecommunications Faculty, March 5, 2010, 2:30 pm
- Meeting with Graduate Students, April 22, 2010, 5:00 pm
- Meeting with Undergraduate Students, April 22, 2010, 6:00 pm
- Meeting with Communication and Culture Rhetoric and Public Culture and Film and Media Studies Faculty, April 23, 2010, 1:00 pm

The Task Force also received a number of email comments from faculty and students, including from David Zaret, who became Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences following the departure of Dean Bertenthal on March 12. We are grateful to all of the people who took time to meet with us, often on short notice, or to provide us with information, especially the unit heads and the members of the internal faculty working group. Their consistent cooperation, despite their reservations about our task, has made our work much easier and is in the finest tradition of academic cooperation.

Current Structure of Communication Studies

Communication-related courses are offered in many schools and departments on the Bloomington campus, three of the most significant of which are those to which the Task Force's attention was directed: the School of Journalism and the Departments of Telecommunications and Communication and Culture. The structure and activities of these three units are well described in the internal faculty working group report, which is attached, and so are only summarized here.

Journalism was originally a department in the College of Arts and Sciences. It became a school within the College in 1974, a system wide school (with a presence on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses) in 1982, and a freestanding school, independent of the College of Arts and Sciences, in 1989. Journalism has 23 tenured or tenure-track faculty on the Bloomington campus, including the dean and two associate deans, and 25 adjunct instructors.

The school offers a range of courses in the areas of journalism, mass communication, and public relations. Faculty reflect a combination of professional and research accomplishments, and the school's course offerings appear to reflect a similar variety of professional preparation and theory courses. Faculty and graduate student research areas include political communication, visual communication, journalism history, media law, critical/cultural studies, health communication, and new media. Journalism has 894 undergraduate majors, 35 master's students, and 31 Ph.D. students in Bloomington. The school is accredited by the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and the Public Relations Society of America. Its endowment is valued at approximately \$11 million.

Telecommunications and Communication and Culture are both departments within the College. Telecommunications focuses on electronic media, including over-the-air broadcasting, cable television, satellite broadcasting, Internet-based media, and online games. The undergraduate curriculum emphasizes three areas: design and production (largely creative), industry and management (which includes media economics), and media and society (largely social-scientific). Telecommunications is the third largest undergraduate major in the College, with 859 majors. The department enrolls approximately 80 students in its M.S., M.A., and Ph.D. programs. The department has 18 tenured or tenure-track faculty, and 6.5 non-tenure-track faculty.

Communication and Culture is the newest of the three units. In the late 1990s, faculty working on film, television, and performance and ethnographic studies who had been affiliated with other units (such as Comparative Literature, Anthropology, and Telecommunications) became part of a reconfigured Speech Communication Department. This department housed the Rhetoric faculty and, in light of the influx of new faculty and new directions, was renamed Communication and Culture.

The department offers a humanities-oriented approach that explores the social and cultural dimensions and implications of communicative practices including live and mediated performance, oral and written text, and photographic images, film, television, and digital media, from their creative generation to their social uptake and application. The department has three sub-divisions: Rhetoric and Public Culture, Film and Media Studies (including studio courses in film production), and Performance and Ethnographic Studies.

Communication and Culture has 526 undergraduate majors and more than 80 graduate students, mostly in the Ph.D. program. The Department has 21 tenured or tenure-track faculty, two full-time lecturers, and one regular adjunct. Four faculty have joint appointments with other units (i.e., Gender Studies, American Studies, and International Studies) in the College.

As noted, communication-related courses are offered in many other units on the Bloomington campus. A survey of 2009-2010 course offerings shows courses with the word “communication” in their title being offered in the Kelley School of Business; School of Education; School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; Maurer School of Law; Jacobs School of Music; and School of Public and Environmental Affairs; as well as the Departments of International Studies, Linguistics, Second Language Studies, Speech and Hearing, and Theater and Drama in the College. In fact, these units offer more “communication” courses than Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture combined.

In addition, given the breadth of subjects addressed within Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, there are substantial interconnections between the courses offered by these units and “non-communication courses” offered by Informatics and Computing, Library and Information Sciences, and many of the departments within the College.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Task Force has been presented at every turn with concerns about barriers between Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, and, even more consistently, perceived barriers between units within the College and those outside of it. Some of these barriers may be related to distinct department cultures. Faculty in Telecommunications and Communication and Culture report that they oppose any move to a school outside of the College in large part because they believe that the close collaboration and joint appointments they have with other College departments might be jeopardized by such a move.

Similarly, Telecommunications and Communication and Culture faculty have stressed to us that the methodological approaches they take to teaching and research fit well within the rubric of arts and sciences and therefore can best be done in a College of Arts and Sciences. The term “professional” has been used frequently by faculty and graduate students outside of Journalism to describe Journalism, and by faculty and graduate students in Communication and Culture to describe production courses in Telecommunications. We are not convinced that this label is always used accurately, and we believe that

this characterization ignores the extent to which humanities and social science subject matter and methodologies are employed in units outside of the College and “professional” courses and teaching occur within the College. But the widely voiced views we have heard certainly appear to be contributing to the perception of an intellectual and administrative barrier between the College and the rest of the university.

Inadequate facilities (or inadequate access to facilities) appear to be posing significant barriers. Despite being a department that addresses film, television, and new media, Communication and Culture has no media-equipped classroom in its current location, and the limited space the department occupies recently has been reduced.¹ Journalism occupies an outdated and inadequate facility. Students and faculty alike have focused considerable attention on the inadequacy of television and other media production facilities within Journalism and Communication and Culture, while Telecommunications enjoys state-of-the-art high-definition production facilities. Everyone has assured us that the Telecommunications leadership is more than generous in its willingness to share, but that because of scheduling and resource allocation barriers between units, it has not been possible to do so effectively. The dean and faculty of Journalism and undergraduate students with whom we met all stressed the barrier that accreditation rules impose on undergraduate Journalism students taking Telecommunications courses. Those rules require journalism majors to take at least 80 credit hours outside of Journalism, but consider telecommunications courses as being offered within the field of Journalism and therefore not eligible for those “outside” hours.

A number of the barriers appear to be financial. For example, the former dean of the College directed our attention to the money the College has invested in Telecommunications’ production facilities and in the building that Communication and Culture now partially occupies, and suggested that these units would either have to vacate these facilities or buy them from the College were they to be part of any other school. Similarly, the acting dean has noted the financial burden to the College if Telecommunications and Communication and Culture were to be part of another school.

The admittedly limited number of Journalism undergraduate and graduate students with whom we met were acutely aware of the barriers they faced to taking courses in other departments. Some reported that they were actually advised by faculty against taking courses in other departments.

The Task Force does not claim to understand these barriers fully. In fact, the professional experience of many of the Task Force members contradicts the claim that it is difficult for units outside the College to collaborate closely with units within the College. Moreover, the information we gathered over the past three months suggests many examples of cross-school cooperation. For example, Journalism undergraduates take a majority of their courses in the College, and Journalism Ph.D. students are

¹ The Task Force recommends that the College consider allocating additional resources to support Communication and Culture’s facilities. In addition to the need for additional and more appropriately equipped space, the department is currently located in the new “Classroom Office Building” on Third Street, but has not been allowed to place its name on the building signage, thus making it difficult for students and faculty to locate. Given the considerable financial subsidy the department generates for the College, it would seem desirable to return some of that so that the department can better serve students.

required to declare two outside areas of concentration, which most commonly include law, sociology, political science, folklore, history, cultural studies and other College departments. Whether those barriers are real, exaggerated, or wholly imaginary, the Task Force believes strongly that they are interfering with the educational opportunities of IU students and the campus' ability to marshal its considerable resources to provide our students with the best education possible, facilitate research, and attract greater visibility and funding.

Our urgent recommendation, therefore, is that the faculty and leadership of Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, together with the campus and university administration, act quickly to eliminate real barriers and demonstrate the fallacy of imagined or exaggerated ones. We see a variety of practical options for accomplishing these goals, each of which may also serve other beneficial purposes as well.

1. Greater Cooperation

As the internal faculty working group report notes, there are many steps the three units could take to facilitate greater student access to education opportunities, such as providing clearer course descriptions, cross-listing appropriate courses, improving sharing of production and other resources, and the like. We believe such an approach could even be helpful in eliminating the accreditation-related barrier to Journalism undergraduates taking Telecommunications courses. If those courses perhaps could be cross-listed as Journalism courses, they could be taken within the required number of Journalism courses.

The Task Force does not see any significant duplication in the courses (or most other substantive activities) of Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture. As the internal faculty working group report demonstrates, the three units see themselves as distinct in their subject matter and methodology, and we generally agree. While some courses have similar names, we are persuaded that they are in most cases quite distinct, often because of significant differences involved in the methodologies brought to the subject. We recommend that the units do more to clarify the distinctive characteristics of their respective missions and course descriptions so that current and prospective students can make more informed choices and confusion can be avoided in the future. We also recommend that the faculty in Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture work together to identify common questions that courses in two or more units may address, and highlight both the potential overlap and the extent to which the courses differ in their methodology or scope. In sum, we endorse the spirit of the recommendations on pages 11 and 20 of the internal faculty working group report. Those recommendations are best developed and implemented by the faculty, students, and leadership of the affected units. We encourage them to continue to pursue those and other ideas. As they do so, we encourage them to consult with their own students to identify additional issues that might be addressed or opportunities that might be seized, as well as effective measures for doing so. And we invite the Provost to provide appropriate support and oversight to facilitate their speedy implementation. In particular, we encourage the Provost to ask the units to report to her annually on the steps they have taken to implement their recommendations and those we have suggested to eliminate real barriers and the perception of imagined or exaggerated ones.

1. Greater Use of Centers and Institutes

Although the three units are distinct in many ways, there are areas of considerable overlap, and not just within Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, but also involving other units.

The Task Force sees interdisciplinary centers and institutes as a flexible, appropriate way to try to capitalize on some of those synergies to the benefit of our students' education and faculty's research. As the internal faculty working group noted in its final report:

Such research centers would have more impact and have a better chance in obtaining large grants with more faculty from around the campus involved. [They] could facilitate larger grant application processes with dedicated grant writing support shared across faculty. For example, new centers in ethnographic film and production; visual communication; children and the media; and digital media are all possibilities of interest to our faculty.

Many research universities are increasing their reliance on such centers and institutes as a way to respond quickly and effectively to new challenges and opportunities without displacing existing academic structures. Indiana University has done so to great advantage in some areas, such as Cognitive Science and the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, but in other areas has been quite restrictive in its approach to such interdisciplinary arrangements, limiting their ability to offer classes, requiring that they be externally funded and then cutting them off from a primary source of funds—i.e., tuition dollars.

We urge a more supportive approach to centers and institutes. To take just one example that we encountered over the past three months, Telecommunications has attracted a small cadre of some of the nation's leading scholars of virtual worlds, a field that is rapidly expanding beyond computer games to include significant research and training applications and important social science research questions. As currently organized, that cadre is unlikely to achieve its full potential due to inadequate staffing and other resources. (In fact, one faculty member resigned this spring to accept an offer from a competing institution.) A center that brought those faculty together with interested colleagues from other departments and schools could create the critical mass necessary to compete successfully for large grants, offer innovative courses, attract leading graduate students, and build an internationally recognized program. The university and the campus should be facilitating this type of collaboration. Rather than requiring that the center fund itself without the ability to offer classes or keep tuition revenue, it would be more far-sighted to create funding mechanisms that encourage such innovation in both research and curriculum and allow multiple funding streams.

1. A New School

The third option, opposed by the vast majority of faculty and graduate students with whom we have met, is to create a new school of communication. The new school likely would include all of the existing School of Journalism and most of the existing Department of Telecommunications, as well as perhaps some individual faculty or small groups from other units. The new school could be freestanding or located within the College, like the Henry Radford Hope School of Fine Arts.

The role of Communication and Culture in such a new school is unclear. On the one hand, the department has a very distinct mission that extends well beyond communications and media. For many of its faculty, being part of a school of communication could well prove an uncomfortable fit. On the

² Pew Research Center Project for Excellence in Journalism, *Press Release: State of the News Media 2010*, available at <http://www.pewinternet.org/Press-Releases/2010/State-of-the-Media-2010.aspx>.

other hand, the department brings an important cultural critique to communication that could be a valuable component of a new school of communication. The existing faculty worry understandably that their humanities approach to communication might well be lost or undervalued within a communication school, especially one in which they were the only humanities scholars working. The existing Communication and Culture Department might well be maintained outside of such a new school or, if elements of it were included, there would need to be strong protections in place to ensure that its distinctive humanities-based approach was not compromised. If the department remained in the College it could provide a home for some humanities-oriented communication scholars from Telecommunications or Journalism.

We are not recommending the creation of a new school at this time. The vast majority of faculty and graduate students with whom we have spoken have made clear their objections to being part of a new school and, while we do not share all of their concerns, we recognize both their significant stake in such a step and the difficulty of building a successful new venture over their opposition. The internal faculty working group does an excellent job of identifying these concerns at pages 14-20 of its report, so we do not address them further here.

However, we do note that the creation of a new school would be one way to help overcome many of the barriers—perceived or real—that have been noted, especially if more moderate approaches do not work. Moreover, the Task Force could envision circumstances in which external developments might make the creation of a new school more attractive to faculty and graduate students. For example, for several years Telecommunications has struggled to change its name to reflect its interest in a broader range of mediated communication. However, proposals to change the department's name to Media Arts and Sciences have met with objections from the School of Informatics and Computing, which sees itself as working in this field. A new school might help resolve the competition over which units may lay claim to this important subject matter.

Similarly, the same convergence of media and information and communication technologies that is at the heart of the dispute between Telecommunications and Informatics and Computing is also creating mounting pressure for Journalism and Telecommunications to further expand their offerings. According to a March 2010 report from the Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism, "[n]ewspapers now spend \$1.6 billion less annually on reporting and editing than they did a decade ago." Newspapers saw ad revenue fall 26% and magazines 17% over the past year. "Network TV is down by hundreds of millions since their peak in the 1980s. Local TV newsrooms are cutting too, down 6% in the last two years, some 1,600 jobs." Local television ad revenue saw a 22% drop in 2009, triple the decline the year before; radio was down 22%; network TV 8%.² Ironically, the readership (or viewership) of many press outlets is up, but access is increasingly through web sites, podcasts, email, social networks, and other new media.

The undergraduates from Journalism with whom we spoke were unanimous in their view that Journalism was too focused on print journalism and offered too few courses in broadcasting, multimedia, nontraditional writing, technical skills, and web coding and design. While universally positive about the quality, accessibility, and commitment of the faculty, the students noted that what they perceived as the narrowness of Journalism's approach failed to prepare students for careers in journalism, where graduates are increasingly expected to have a wide range of skills. A survey of the

school's 2009-2010 course offerings bears out the students' concerns. The Task Force identified very few Journalism courses offered in this academic year that appear to address electronic media.

The tremendous changes occurring in communication technologies offer an exciting opportunity for leading universities to rethink both research and teaching on related subjects, and a serious risk for those that do not. The very nature of communication appears to be changing, with significant impact on virtually every aspect of our lives and society. All three of the units we have considered offer important, yet unique perspectives on communication, but it is not at all clear to the Task Force that in their current structure these separate organizations are positioning IU at the forefront of this new and dynamic communication environment.

A new school that included Journalism, elements of Telecommunications, and relevant faculty from other units may well be essential to respond to those challenges and support both teaching and research for the 21st century. As the dean of Journalism suggested to us, some form of new, more integrated structure may be inevitable in the future given the convergence in media and the rapid expansion and change in communication forms and venues. Even in the absence of structural change, however, we are particularly concerned about the quality and relevance of the education Journalism can provide to its students if it does not respond more aggressively to the extraordinary changes confronting communications generally and journalism in particular.

Growing financial pressures may also heighten some faculty members' and graduate students' interest in different academic structures. At present, Telecommunications and Communication and Culture provide significant subsidies to the College in terms of the tuition of their students. At the same time, Journalism has an approximately \$11 million endowment that funds research and travel for faculty far in excess of what the College provides, in addition to providing student support. If financial pressures force the College to reduce support or make other difficult financial choices, it is conceivable that some combination of the revenue from Telecommunications and/or Communication and Culture and the endowment and revenue of Journalism could provide attractive possibilities for the benefit of undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty alike.

We examined the structure of communication programs in the top 75 universities (as ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*), as well as in other universities suggested to us as peer institutions, however we could discern no definitive trends. Thirty-six percent have a separate school of communication, although that school does not always house all of the major communication studies providers at that institution. Six percent have a school of communication located within an arts and sciences college. Fifty-three percent provide communication studies through one or more departments located within an arts and sciences college. Even these limited data are of questionable value because they are based on the marketing information that institutions place on their web sites, rather than any qualitative investigation; they don't provide information as to trends over time; and IU's Communications and Culture program is very unusual and thus difficult to compare with other institutions. For the future, more in-depth study of peer institutions and interviews with leaders of other leading communication programs might be instructive.

Conclusion

Most of the faculty and graduate students who have communicated with the Task Force see grave obstacles to a new structure for communication studies teaching and research on the Bloomington campus. Many of those obstacles pose barriers to collaboration across school lines that, whether real or exaggerated, we believe must be addressed. Addressing them may remove one of the incentives for a

unified school of communication, but it will also reduce one of the major perceived obstacles to such a structure. As other pressures in favor of such a structure, or some other bolder approach to how the Bloomington campus addresses the rapidly changing world of communications, mount, there may be strong incentives to revisit the issue. We were informed at the beginning of our work that we were not the first task force to examine the structure of communication studies on the Bloomington campus; we suspect we will not be the last.

Attachment

Final Report

Internal Task Force on Communication/Media Studies

Indiana University, Bloomington

April 9, 2010

Executive Summary.

Fifteen faculty members from the School of Journalism and the College of Arts and Sciences Departments of Communication and Culture and Telecommunications considered the question of whether major structural change in communications and media studies at Indiana University – Bloomington would be desirable. Concluding that the current structure – a stand-alone School of Journalism and two communications related departments in the College – is effective and that major restructuring has many disadvantages, the Internal Task Force recommends that the current structure be maintained.

Although some peer institutions have free-standing Schools of Communication that include departments similar to those at IUB, many universities do not. There is no obvious optimal way to organize communications programs at major universities.

The three units, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, fundamentally differ in the approach to the study of media and communications. Communication and Culture offers a humanities-oriented approach within national and transnational cultural contexts. Telecommunications primarily offers a social-sciences oriented approach, although it also offers professionally oriented courses. Journalism combines a liberal arts approach with professional courses designed to prepare students for careers in journalism, advertising or public relations. These differences enhance research and education in communications and media at IUB, offer choices to undergraduate and graduate students, and should be preserved.

The Task Force considered two options to the current structure; a free-standing School of Communication combining Communication and Culture and Telecommunications with the School of Journalism or, alternatively, creation of a School of Communication including the same units but within the College of Arts and Sciences. The Task Force does not support either option. Neither offers clear benefits over the current structure, faculty in Communication and Culture and Telecommunications see clear disadvantages to leaving the College, and faculty in Journalism see no benefit in rejoining it. In addition, creating a School of Communication would require enhanced funding and facilities. Given the fiscal realities of the University and the State, the Task Force doubts those resources would be provided.

Given the success of the three programs, the disadvantages of the two alternate structures considered, and the fact that the majority of the task force members felt that the present configuration was highly beneficial to their own intellectual agendas, to the sound performance of their units, and to their pedagogical missions, we recommend continuing the current academic structure. We make, however, several suggestions for better coordination and cooperation among the programs and clearer explanation of their differences to various constituencies.

I. Introduction.

Following the appointment of the Provost's Task Force to consider the organization of communication and media studies on the Bloomington campus, specifically programs offered by the School of Journalism and the Departments of Telecommunications and Communication and Culture, faculty from the targeted units requested the opportunity to provide their insights regarding a possible reorganization of the units. Provost Karen Hanson agreed to the request and charged the faculty-led Internal Task Force, as it came to be called, to report its findings and recommendations by mid-April.

A subset of the faculty from the three affected units began meeting in early March. The group from Communication and Culture consisted of the elected members of their executive committee, plus their director of graduate studies and two members appointed by the chair, while the faculty from Telecommunications and Journalism were members of those units' elected advisory committees. Faculty participants are listed at the end of this report.

The Task Force subdivided into four working groups: Undergraduate programs, graduate programs, research/creative activities, and financial/administrative structure. Each group considered, within the purview of its particular topic, the desirability of maintaining or changing the structure of the units.

From the start, it should be noted, the Internal Task Force was faced with an obstacle. Because there is no proposal on the table for reorganization, the group could only speculate about possible reorganization possibilities. This task was further complicated by President McRobbie's "State of the University" address, in which he indicated he will create a group to study the academic structure and interrelationships between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses of Indiana University. Many of the Task Force members believe that our communication studies initiative at this time is premature given the fact that a broader organizational study will be conducted.

That said, we first examine the question of whether the current structure of the three units is outside the mainstream of communication education at comparable universities. Next, we offer a description of each unit, followed by more specific descriptions of undergraduate and graduate programs. The report will then discuss research and creative approaches in the three units. The report will close with a discussion of the potential benefits and expressed concerns about a reorganization plus some thoughts on how two or more of the affected units could coordinate our programs without resorting to a full-scale reorganization.

II. Communication and Media Studies at Comparable Universities

Since the Trustees asked about the structure of communication studies at IU, several faculty looked at communications and media programs at comparable institutions. Communication studies is not a freestanding department at the University of Michigan, but an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program focused on "how media interact with and shape society." Interdisciplinary units include Communication Studies, Cultural Studies, History, Political Science, Psychology and Radio/Television/Film. The program is housed in the school of Literature, Science and the Arts. At the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Communication is also located in the College of Letters and Science. Journalism and Mass Communication is housed in a separate school (The School of Journalism and Mass Communication). North Carolina, LSU, Maryland and Oregon are also organized in a manner similar to the one at IUB. The University of California, San Diego's Department of Communication has a structure similar to IUB's Department of Communication and Culture, in that it includes a Communication and Culture area (which in turn includes an anthropology component), and Northwestern includes Performance Studies along with Screen

Studies in its School of Communication, while the Medill School of Journalism focuses on journalism and integrated marketing communication.

Conversely, The University of Texas, Austin has a College of Communications, which includes the Department of Communication Studies, the School of Journalism, and The Department of Radio-TV-Film. Michigan State University has a similar structure. And closer to home, Ball State has a College, which comprises the Departments of Communication Studies, Journalism and Telecommunications, and the Center for Information and Communication Sciences.

This is by no means an exhaustive study, but it does show that there is no consensus regarding organizational models. The current structure of communication studies at Indiana University, with Telecommunications and Communication and Culture housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, and Journalism housed in a separate school, is, in some cases, consistent with the organization of communication studies at comparable universities nationwide, but there is no established standard for organization.

III. Description of Three Units

Communication and Culture

The Department of Communication and Culture (CMCL) offers a humanities-oriented approach that explores the social and cultural dimensions and implications of communicative practices including live and mediated performance, oral and written text, and photographic images, film, television, and digital media, from their creative generation to their social uptake and application.

Administratively, the department has three sub-divisions which, in overlapping ways, intersect with its overall mission to study communication within national and transnational cultural contexts: Rhetoric and Public Culture, Film and Media Studies (including studio courses in film production), and Performance and Ethnographic Studies. The creation of these three areas and the department itself came about as a result of a reorganization of humanities-oriented communication studies at IUB in the late 1990s. Faculty working on film, television, and performance and ethnographic studies who had been affiliated with other units (such as Comparative Literature, Anthropology, and Telecommunications) became part of a reconfigured Speech Communication Department. This department housed the Rhetoric faculty and, in light of the influx of new faculty and new directions, was rechristened with its current name.

The Department has 21 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty; 2 full-time lecturers; and 1 regular adjunct (although other adjuncts teach periodically). Four faculty (1 full professor and 3 untenured professors) have joint/split appointments with other units in COAS. These units are Gender Studies, American Studies, and International Studies. Although the tenure lines of the junior faculty are all in CMCL, teaching and service responsibilities are split between units each semester for these faculty. Almost all faculty in CMCL have adjunct associations with other programs, centers, and departments in COAS, including foreign language and literature departments and centers, American Studies, Gender Studies, Folklore, and English. The faculty draw upon their different academic lineages, so that the Department produces an innovative, interdisciplinary program of research that combines history, ethnography, and theory with critical practice.

The Department of Communication and Culture has 526 undergraduate majors and more than 80 graduate students, mostly in the Ph.D. program. CMCL offers a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D., with students able to either focus on one of the department's three areas or pursue the connections between them in their degree work.

Journalism

The School of Journalism (SOJ) is a freestanding unit (a Responsibility Center (RC) in administrative lingo). It offers a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism degree (a BAJ), a master's degree (MA) in mass communication (professional and academic/thesis tracks), and a Ph.D. in mass communication.

The School has a dean and two associate deans, for graduate study/research and undergraduate study, in Bloomington. An executive associate dean supervises the IUPUI program (see below). Several faculty members have limited administrative duties as well. For example, one tenured faculty member directs the Ernie Pyle Scholars (journalism honors) program, and a lecturer directs the High School Journalism Institute, which runs a series of successful summer workshops for high school journalism students and their teachers. Faculty members also advise student organizations such as the Society of Professional Journalists, Public Relations Student Society of America, and National Association of Black Journalists chapters. The School has the usual assortment of faculty committees found in most IUB campus units.

The SOJ is a core school and therefore also supervises activities at IUPUI. After some confusion over the past few years about the future of the "core school" concept and the School's mission in Indianapolis, the School is now redefining its goals and objectives for IUPUI. The mandate of both Presidents Herbert and McRobbie has been to make IUPUI's mission distinctive from IUB's mission in Journalism. One component of that was the creation of the National Sports Journalism Center, based in Indianapolis. The center has already garnered national attention from both the media and sports institutions. The School also offers a master's of public relations program at IUPUI and a more general undergraduate curriculum in journalism and public relations. The School recently won approval for a master's degree program in sports journalism at IUPUI.

As of Spring 2010, there are 23 tenured or tenure-track faculty in Bloomington, including the dean and associate deans, and 3 in Indianapolis, including the executive associate dean. There are two contract lecturers in Bloomington and four visiting professors, whose salaries are either funded or enhanced through endowed chair funds. There are two lecturers and a visiting professor based at IUPUI. There are 25 adjunct instructors in Bloomington in Spring 2010 and 16 at IUPUI. Because the School of Journalism is both a research unit and professional school, most faculty are involved in teaching both survey/theoretical and skills courses. Generally speaking, faculty members are often hired because of a combination of their professional background and research record/potential.

Partly as an effort to reduce the dependence on adjunct faculty, the Bloomington faculty recently voted to hire four additional lecturers to start in Fall 2010, and a search is under way for tenured and tenure-track faculty in several subject areas to replace two departing tenured faculty members and hire in anticipation of further retirements in the next few years. A School policy limits the number of lecturers in Bloomington to no more than 20 percent of the total number of faculty.

The School has 894 undergraduate majors (up from 623 in 2005), 35 master's students, and 31 Ph.D. students in Bloomington. There are 242 undergraduate majors at IUPUI and 55 master's students.

The SOJ receives a share of IU's state appropriation each year, but the School also pays an assessment, or tax, to the university for general purpose expenses that exceeds the state appropriation by \$600,000 or more. Projections are that this "assessment gap" will rise to \$1 million in the near future. However, increases in class enrollments in recent years have allowed the SOJ to cover the assessment gap without difficulty.

The School has an endowment that, after adjustments for recent losses caused by the worldwide financial crisis, comes to about \$18 million. About 90 percent of the endowment is committed to scholarships and endowed chair positions; the rest is committed to various specific programs or is not tied to a specific purpose.

Despite the deficit created by the assessment versus state appropriation and recent budget cuts, the School is in good financial condition.

The School is accredited by the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC), and its public relations program is accredited by the Public Relations Society of America. (See more on accreditation below.)

Telecommunications

The Department of Telecommunications (TC) primarily offers social-sciences oriented and creative approaches to the study of mediated communication. Its primary focus is on electronic media – ranging from “mainstream” media (historically, over-the-air broadcasting) through “new media” (e.g., cable television and direct broadcast satellite delivery systems) to “new new media” (e.g., Internet-based media, contemporary telephony and online games). The undergraduate curriculum emphasizes three areas: design and production (largely creative), industry and management (which includes media economics), and media and society (largely social-scientific). Some faculty members could be thought of as exclusively devoted to one of these areas, but some faculty also contribute to more than one. The graduate program offers M.A., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees. The Ph.D. is, technically, shared with the School of Journalism – it is a Ph.D. in Mass Communications with an emphasis in telecommunications. Until recently, graduate work fell in one of three areas: technology and policy, processes and effects and media management. In recent years, an increasing emphasis has been on interactive and immersive media. From its beginning, the Department has been a unit of the College of Arts and Sciences. It took its current name in 1973; prior to that it had been the Department of Radio and Television. At the latest count Telecommunications served 859 majors (plus 45 minors and a handful of students working on one of our Certificates), which ranks third in the College behind Biology and Psychological and Brain Sciences. Compared to those units, however, it has relatively few faculty: as of 2009-2010, 13 tenured, 5 tenure-track probationary and 6.5 non-tenure-track. As a result of two resignations, the number of probationary faculty in 2010-2011 is likely to be 4. It is not known, at present, when or if searches will be authorized to replace these faculty members. Depending on enrollments, a few visitors and adjuncts teach several courses each year.

At present, no faculty have appointments split with other academic units (the .5 NTT Faculty member is .5 FTE in IU Radio and Television Services). But faculty have various relationships (e.g., adjunct faculty) in units in the College (Cognitive Science) and outside (the Maurer School of Law). Faculty also affiliate with several other units including the Russian and East European Institute, International Studies, and the Kinsey Institute. The skills courses that are offered in TC are taught by production faculty. The remaining faculty teach survey and theoretical courses in their respective research areas.

The administration of the Department includes a Chair (appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences), and faculty Directors of Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies and Departmental Honors (appointed by the Chair). There is a faculty advisory committee, an undergraduate committee, a graduate committee and a merit review committee. As is true of all College departments, tenure cases proceed from the Department to the College to the Campus to the Provost/President (through executive review), the President and the Trustees.

The Department appears to be a financial asset to the College. While there are high instructional expenses in some production courses, course fees – which flow not to the Department but rather to the College – almost certainly offset these costs. The College transfers some of the fee money back to the Department, but it seems likely that the College retains much for general College purposes. The Interim Dean of the College has acknowledged that loss of the department would inflict financial damage on the College.

The Department does not have significant funds for undergraduate scholarship or support. As is true of most departments in the College, however, a high percentage of graduate students (including nearly all Ph.D. students) are supported through Associate Instructorships. In recent years, some Associate Instructorships have been converted into Research Assistants, although that practice is at risk given the University's current fiscal stress. In any reorganization, it would be very important to the Department to continue to subsidize graduate education at current levels.

IV. Undergraduate Programs

While all three units involved at present in a possible reorganization address various aspects of communication study, each is unique in its approach, direction, concentration, emphasis, and goals. While there may seem to be some overlap with regard to course titles and topics, in truth the courses are complementary, offering different approaches to similar questions. We believe that students benefit greatly from having access to these differing approaches and the different intellectual traditions associated with them. Students who choose to focus either on humanistic, social scientific, or pre-professional approaches can benefit from taking courses that present other perspectives. Students who take related courses in two or more of the three units are introduced to a much broader range of theories and methods than they otherwise would be. The undergraduate programs in these three units are thriving, indicating that students understand and appreciate their complementary nature.

It may be worthwhile to explore ways that the relationships between these units can be both clarified and enhanced for undergraduate students. A common webpage could be produced, for example, to serve as a portal to communication and media studies at IU. In addition, certificate programs that encouraged students to augment their programs of study across units might be considered, together with a more streamlined procedure through which students in the College and in the School of Journalism might add cross-disciplinary minors or double-majors.

The following sections outline in more detail the undergraduate programs in the Department of Communication and Culture, the Department of Telecommunications, and the School of Journalism.

Department of Communication and Culture

The Department of Communication and Culture offers a humanities-oriented approach that explores the social and cultural dimensions and implications of communicative practices including live and mediated performance, oral and written text, and photographic images, film, television, and digital media, from their creative generation to their social uptake and application.

Administratively, the department has three sub-divisions: Rhetoric and Public Culture, Film and Media Studies (including studio courses in film production), and Performance and Ethnographic Studies. The focus is on preparing students to become well-informed, critical, and engaged citizens in a diverse and highly mediated culture.

Courses in Rhetoric and Public Culture continue the long history of rhetorical studies at IU. Drawing on a 2,500-year tradition at the very core of the liberal arts, courses in rhetoric foster a more participatory and responsible citizenry through the analysis and critique of public and political communication in all its forms.

Courses in Film and Media Studies build on IU's distinguished tradition as a leader in the study of cinema, to include the study of television and emerging media. Courses are offered in the history, theory, and criticism of film, television, and new media. Film and video production courses provide hands-on experience.

Courses in Performance and Ethnography encourage students to understand the ways that communicative forms and practices are crafted to achieve social ends. A particular emphasis is placed on ethnographic fieldwork and the opportunities it provides for participant-observation, cross-cultural questioning, and self-reflexivity.

School of Journalism

The mission of the undergraduate program at Indiana University's School of Journalism is to foster critical thinking about news media institutions and global audiences, encourage ethics in an international environment, and develop skills for dynamic journalism and media professions. The mission is both academic and professional: It is about learning, teaching and doing as informed by our core values of excellence, innovation, diversity, integrity and social responsibility.

The School is committed to scholarly research in journalism and public communication, to liberal arts education, and to professional practice in media work involving newspapers and magazines, television and radio news broadcasting, online news, graphic design, photojournalism, and journalism education. Further, the School offers undergraduate students a curriculum that prepares them for careers that are closely affiliated with the news media, such as advertising and public relations. The School is continually evolving to adapt to new approaches to delivering high-quality journalism to audiences that want news and information, even if they do not want it in traditional formats.

At the heart of the School of Journalism's long success story is the range of academic offerings and their relevance to students' desires to craft their own careers in an era of vast technological change. Courses are revised and refined on a regular basis so that they are current with developments in the profession. Regardless of the various forms the news takes in the 21st Century, undergraduates learn journalism basics of reporting and editing for both print and electronic contemporary media. And they take other courses related to journalism's core as well: history, law, ethics, visual communication and research techniques for journalists.

The SOJ maintains a library/reading room with computer workstations and print materials, which is funded entirely from the SOJ's budget. The School also maintains a multimedia lab for student creative work in design, graphics, photography, videography, and other multimedia work.

The School does not require undergraduate students to choose a "track" or concentration, preferring to require a core set of courses for all students and then allowing students to choose electives that best serve their interests and career goals. Unofficially, however, students tend to self-select into two loosely defined tracks, in journalism across platforms (print, broadcasting, and online) or strategic communications (public relations and/or advertising).

Department of Telecommunications

The Department of Telecommunications offers four credentialed undergraduate programs of study: a major in Telecommunications, a minor in Telecommunications, a certificate in New Media and Interactive Storytelling, and a certificate in Game Studies.

Telecommunications majors study a broad range of electronic media. Areas include radio, television, cable, satellite services, telephony, multimedia, and the Internet. Students choose courses from one of three areas of study: Media and Society, Design and Production, and Industry and Management.

Courses in Media and Society emphasize how the electronic media affect people's lives, survey the expectations society has of its electronic media, and assess how the media respond to those social expectations. These issues are considered in both U.S. and global contexts.

The Design and Production course of study focuses on the design and production of audio, video, and multimedia materials. Courses in this sequence provide the concepts, skills, and insights necessary for successful creative work. Facilities include a large television studio, audio studios, video field production gear, analog and digital editing workstations, and multimedia computer workstations.

The Industry and Management course of study focuses on the business, legal, economic, technological, and managerial aspects of telecommunications. A broad range of course offerings provides the opportunity to study the function and operation of the electronic media including radio and television broadcasting, cable, telephone, satellite, and other telecommunications systems. Much attention is given to the changing nature of the media as convergence of technologies leads to the development of new and innovative methods for the delivery of electronic media content.

The Telecommunications faculty is a diverse group approaching the study of electronic and digital media from a broad range of empirical methodologies shared by social science disciplines as well as the humanistic approaches employed by historians, ethicists, and critics.

V. Graduate Programs

All three units have very successful graduate programs both at the Masters and Doctoral level, with impressive success rates in placing their graduates in appropriate academic and professional positions. Technically, Journalism and Telecommunications jointly offer the Ph.D. in Mass Communications, though in reality students in the two units rarely intermix.

Communication and Culture

CMCL currently has more than 80 students, mostly in the Ph.D. program. CMCL's program features three areas or topoi, representing three distinct academic disciplines: rhetoric and public culture, film and media studies, and ethnography and performance (which comes from anthropology). A requirement for students to focus on two of the three topoi is built into the M.A. program, whereas Ph.D. students choose their own path, ranging between disciplinary specialization (which makes them recognizable scholars on the job market) and strikingly interdisciplinary approaches.

At the master's level, the Department requires three semesters of course work, plus a summer directed-reading course designed to help students prepare for the M.A. exam. There is no M.A. thesis in Communication and Culture, where the M.A. degree is seen largely as preparation for further graduate study.

Communication and Culture requires core courses at the M.A. level only. Students entering the Ph.D. program in CMCL are encouraged to take core courses, but the only required course is C545 Introduction to Pedagogy. Following their coursework, Ph.D. students must pass a comprehensive examination with an oral defense before moving on to the dissertation.

CMCL funds all of its graduate students, but recruiting is often hampered because the Department competes with other universities that offer more competitive packages.

The CMCL graduate program maintains extremely strong ties with American Studies, Cultural Studies, Gender Studies, Folklore and Ethnomusicology, Anthropology, and Political Science, as well as with the various national literature programs and the Black Film Archive. CMCL faculty also form a substantial part of the American Studies and Cultural Studies faculties, and some faculty are appointed jointly to Gender Studies and International Studies. Because many of our students apply for film and rhetoric positions within literature, cultural, or American studies programs, or ethnography positions within anthropology or folklore departments, their minors are a key element in their graduate careers.

Journalism

The School of Journalism currently has 66 students taking course work at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels (excluding ABD students). Although the School of Journalism does function as a professional school, in the sense that it provides training for a profession, the curriculum and coursework suggests a much wider range of instruction. The School has roots in both humanities and social science research and is grounded in Mass Communication – with its ties to sociology, history, political science, rhetoric, law and other communication studies -- as an academic discipline.

Journalism offers an M.A. degree in either a professional or research track; both degrees require 30 hours of course work. Students on the research track complete a thesis under faculty guidance. Students on the professional track do not write a thesis. Journalism requires core courses at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels, which includes a pedagogy class.

Ph.D. students must complete a comprehensive examination and an oral defense. A dissertation is required. Journalism does not require a Ph.D. minor, but students are obliged to declare two outside areas of concentration. Among the most common of these are law, sociology, political science, folklore, history, cultural studies and other COAS departments.

Journalism does not fund all admitted graduate students. With very few exceptions, however, all Ph.D. students are funded, and the funding package for doctoral students is one of the most competitive in the country. Ph.D. students are funded through Associate Instructor and Research Assistant appointments for the most part.

Telecommunications

Telecommunications currently enrolls approximately 80 students in the Department's graduate program. The Department of Telecommunications has its roots in production processes as well as in the study of mediated communication at the social and individual levels, relying on social scientific, legal, and economic assessments of media industries and mediated communication.

The Department offers a professionally oriented M.S. degree as well as a research oriented M.A. Both the M.S. and the M.A. require 4 semesters of course work. Telecommunications M.A.

students also write a Thesis to complete their degree requirements. Core courses are required for all of the Department's graduate degrees.

As in the other two units, Ph.D. students must pass a comprehensive exam and an oral defense before beginning their dissertations. Ph.D. students in the Department of Telecommunications often pursue a minor in social science departments such as Psychology, Political Science, Sociology, or Economics. Some of our faculty have joint/dual appointments, adjunct positions, and named research associations with academic units at IU and universities abroad. These include Cognitive Science, The School of Informatics, Political Science, The Maurer School of Law, and The Kinsey Institute.

Telecommunications funds all of its graduate students, and like CMCL, the Department competes for graduate students with other institutions offering more lucrative packages and stipends.

Increasing opportunities for graduate study and plans for future cooperation

In beginning to have a conversation about program similarities and differences, the Internal Task Force has frequently returned to the idea of exploiting synergies between the units. We recognize that it is the very difference between and unique qualities of the programs that currently allow the synergies to work, and would like time to explore the ways in which we might enhance possibilities for graduate level study in communication at IUB.

Currently CMCL has a few Ph.D. students who have declared minors in Telecommunications. (A higher percentage of undergraduate students move easily between Telecommunications and CMCL, taking courses in both departments, than do graduate students). Possibilities for cross and joint-listing courses in CMCL and Telecommunications should be more rigorously pursued. CMCL has no students who have declared Ph.D. minors in Journalism, a fact which may be due to the barriers students face in declaring minors outside the College. Telecommunications and Journalism offer a Ph.D. that is currently shared in name only. Indeed, it appears that this affiliation has become a bureaucratic rather than shared pedagogical one. It might be in the interest of both units to revisit this matter and think about shared core courses, recruitment of students, graduate student training during orientation week, and shared research presentations.

The most promising prospect for closer collaboration and cooperation between the graduate programs of the three units that we can envisage at present would be a set of joint M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, similar to the one that used to operate between Telecommunications and Journalism. The establishment of such programs, which have not yet been discussed within the three units, would of course, be subject to the approval of the faculty in all three units and governing authorities at the University and the state level.

There may well be possibilities for a more formal relationship within the College for Telecommunications and CMCL, and across schools for all three units, but we need to work these out in a deliberate manner that will not adversely affect graduate study at IUB or detract from the three successful graduate programs that currently operate.

VI. Research/Creative Approaches

We can only speculate on how a reorganization might affect our research and creativity. Most faculty seem to envision some type of School of Media/Communication with all three units housed in this new School. To be clear, the task force does not recommend the creation of such a School, either as a freestanding unit or incorporated into the College, but it seems to be a structure that allows us to imagine the shared opportunities and concerns such a reorganization might portend.

Overview of Unit Research/Creative and Methodological Approaches

The Department of Communication and Culture

The Department of Communication and Culture uses a humanities-oriented approach to explore the social and cultural dimensions and implications of communicative practices including live and mediated performance, oral and written text, and photographic images, film, television, and digital media, from their creative generation to their social uptake and application.

The Department has 23 faculty members, including tenured, tenure-track, and senior lecturers. All of our faculty engage in peer-reviewed research.

Methodologies include historical methods, ethnography, performance studies, textual analysis, rhetorical critique, and cultural studies analysis. CMCL faculty use these methodological approaches to critique and interpret the topics listed below. That means faculty do not subscribe to a positivist framework of investigation that assumes knowledge can be qualified or quantified. Rather, CMCL's areas of research and the approaches taken to investigate them hinge on a shared departmental commitment to humanistic interpretation as a means of understanding and transforming the world. Areas of study include histories and political economies of culture/media industries, particularly in the United States; film history, theory, and criticism; ethnographic filmmaking as cultural critique; history of film exhibition; horror and avant-garde theatre and film; digital media; audience and fan studies; gender and GLBTQ issues in media and public discourse; ethnographic methods; global music, theater and poetry; neoliberalism, law, and society; political and visual rhetoric; rhetoric of the environment and sustainability; rhetoric and race; rhetorical critique of democracy, propaganda, and war; and politics in critical political and cultural theory.

The School of Journalism

The School of Journalism encourages media/communication research from a variety of perspectives using a variety of methodologies.

The School has roughly 33 faculty members, including visitors and lecturers. Roughly 22 of those people engage in peer-reviewed research or creative activity.

Methodologies include experimental design, content analysis, survey research, historical methods, focus groups, legal research, textual analysis, ethnography, as well as other quantitative and qualitative methods. Creative activity among faculty includes, most notably, photojournalism. Research areas include political communication, visual communication, journalism history, media law, critical/cultural studies, health communication, new media-including social media, identity, pedagogy, feminism, and globalization.

The Department of Telecommunications

The Department of Telecommunications focuses on the social, psychological, creative, economic, and regulatory aspects of electronically mediated information as well as the industries and institutions involved in those processes. Our program is rooted in aesthetic, economic, historical, legal, social, and social scientific frames. All students are expected to read widely, think critically, utilize data and write well and, in the case of many, to create mediated content understanding the attributes of each medium, the ways in which they are used and processed, and the consequences of electronic communication.

The Department has 25 faculty members, including lecturers. Roughly 18 of these people engage in peer-reviewed research. Several others engage in various juried and professional creative activities. Methodologies include experimental design, content analysis, survey research, focus groups, legal research, textual analysis, as well as other quantitative and qualitative methods.

Areas of study include law and policy, media economics, media effects, new media, media psychology, and production.

Shared Research Opportunities and Concerns

Potential Opportunities

A reorganization might facilitate closer research collaboration across units. If these Departments were all part of the same school, it would be easier to work with people who have similar research interests currently in other buildings, improving our capacity to coordinate talks, graduate student training, and physical research resources.

A combined school could nurture the growth of new research centers that take advantage of the interdisciplinary intersections of our shared research areas. Such research centers would have more impact and have a better chance in obtaining large grants with more faculty from around the campus involved. It could facilitate larger grant application processes with dedicated grant writing support shared across faculty. For example, new centers in ethnographic film and production; visual communication; children and the media; and digital media are all possibilities of interest to our faculty.

A reorganization might allow access to a larger pool of qualified graduate research assistants for faculty research projects, able to fill out a mixed-methods research agenda so central to Federal grant makers. At the same time, structures could be established for research collaboration without entailing the administrative and financial costs of reorganizing the units.

Definite Concerns

Current tenure-track faculty's understanding of tenure expectations and criteria would be upended as the larger body charged with evaluating tenure and their qualifications to carry out this evaluation would be left uncertain. This could severely disrupt the tenure and promotion process "midstream" damaging the progress toward tenure of recently hired faculty.

All three units have concerns that any change might negatively affect their access to research and travel funding.

Bringing together these three particular units, to the exclusion of researchers working on communication and media topics in units as diverse as history, political science, law, informatics, SLIS, anthropology and folklore to name just a few, would provide little benefit and could weaken existing close ties to our interdisciplinary collaborators across campus.

VII. Views on Reorganization/Financial Implications

Communication and Culture

Certainly, any large-scale reorganization into a School of Communication that exists outside COAS would need to consider the status of all untenured faculty -- particularly those with joint appointments — as a serious matter to adjudicate before the reorganization materialized. No unit should have to suffer a diminution in its FTE nor any junior colleague's trajectory become confused through whatever plans take shape for a different future of communication studies at IUB. In addition, CMCL's full-time lecturers and adjunct instructor (who have had on board for more than a decade) have been instrumental to the delivery of integral parts of the curriculum and would need to be reappointed in a new formation.

Other faculty concerns include the loss of access to CAHI and other COAS sources for research, teaching initiative, travel, and grant monies. Of course, because there are close affiliations between

CMCL and other COAS units, there would need to be discussion of how a School of Communication would affect these intellectual and programmatic alliances.

If the new configuration were to require faculty to primarily identify as media scholars, which would exclude faculty who study communication but not media, some faculty's research programs could be severely hampered.

If the new configuration were to be framed as primarily or predominantly a pre-professional unit, some faculty are concerned that it would constrain their access to colleagues, undergraduates, and graduate students with whom they currently productively engage.

¹ See the ACEJMC website at <http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc> for a complete list and description of the standards.

If the new configuration were to be framed as primarily or predominantly a social-science unit, some faculty research would risk becoming isolated and, perhaps, less well supported within the unit.

A reorganization might lead to less opportunity to hire faculty with specific research agendas that are wrongly perceived as overlapping too much with existing faculty agenda profiles.

A school of communication represents a retro configuration of communication studies.

Combining the units could easily position us for a methods war: quantitative against qualitative against critical interpretive humanities.

Most of the talk of reorganization has to do with some perceived "overlap" among media courses.

But "communication" does not equal "media." Many members of the CMCL faculty, in particular those in Rhetoric and Public Culture and in Performance and Ethnography, are committed to the study of communication but do not study media.

There are serious concerns that performance (as part of the performance and ethnography CMCL topos) would be marginalized within a school of communication and lose current collegial exchange relations with colleagues and students in folklore, anthropology, cultural studies, NELC, India studies, American studies, and international relations

Journalism

Accreditation

The School of Journalism is accredited by the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC). ACEJMC considers each accredited program for reaccreditation every seven years. This involves a review of documents, including a self-study by the unit, and a site visit by a team of educators and professionals appointed by ACEJMC.

The ACEJMC judges each program based on nine broad standards: Mission, Governance and Administration; Curriculum and Instruction; Diversity and Inclusiveness; Full-time and Part-time Faculty; Scholarship (Research, Creative, and Professional Activity); Student Services; Resources, Facilities, and Equipment; Professional and Public Service; and Assessment of Learning Outcomes.

The ACEJMC can recommend several things, including full reaccreditation, reaccreditation with deficiencies in one or more standards, probation, or rejection of accreditation. After the most recent site visit in 2007, the IU School was recommended for full reaccreditation. The full ACEJMC board approved the recommendation.

It is unnecessary to review all of the accreditation standards in detail at this point,¹ but one standard in particular bears discussion in regard to a possible reorganization. Under “Curriculum and Instruction,” the ACEJMC requires that each accredited unit limit the number of credit hours students earn within the unit. Generally, the ACEJMC states that each student must take at least 80 credit hours outside of the accredited unit, and at least 65 of those credits should be in the liberal arts and sciences. Generally, the ACEJMC states that each student must take at least 80 credit hours outside of the accredited unit, and at least 65 of those credits should be in the liberal arts and sciences. Because many Telecommunications classes and some Communication and Culture classes have Mass Communication aspects, the ACEJMC would likely consider them to be courses that should count toward the major in Journalism and not the liberal arts credits. However, because they are not offered in the School of Journalism, these courses are not technically “Journalism” courses either. This has the practical effect of limiting the number of courses Journalism students can take in Telecommunication and, to a lesser extent, Communication and Culture. Journalism students may pursue a second major, minor, or second concentration in Communication and Culture as long as they avoid certain courses that ACEJMC is likely to classify as Mass Communication. Journalism students generally are barred from counting Telecommunications courses as liberal arts courses or toward courses toward the major. Students may, of course, take as many courses as they want as long as they attain the university minimum for graduation, but for financial and time reasons, many students try to finish with the fewest “extra” credit hours possible. They tend to avoid courses that do not allow them to check off a graduation requirement.

If a reorganization included bringing Telecommunications and/or Communication and Culture into a unit with Journalism, this problem could largely be solved because Telecommunications and Communication and Culture courses could then also be considered “unit” courses and could count toward the major. Currently, the School requires students to earn 39 credits in Journalism to qualify for a bachelor of arts in journalism degree.

The ACEJMC generally accredits a unit as a whole, although it can accredit specific programs in a unit. A professor in the School of Journalism who has examined the Telecommunications curriculum believes it would easily be accredited with a few minor changes, either alone or as part of a new unit with Journalism. ACEJMC also, however, does not accredit certain communication-related programs, such as (for the purposes of this report) film studies and rhetoric.

An informal poll of Journalism faculty raised several other issues, mostly in regard to the idea of the School rejoining the College. These included:

Tenure/promotion

At present, Journalism reviews candidates for promotion and tenure through the Personnel Committee, which is made up of all tenured faculty. Decisions on promotion to full professor are considered by a subgroup made up of only full professors. Once the Personnel Committee decides whether to recommend promotion and/or tenure and the Dean makes his recommendation, the decision is then forwarded to university-wide promotion and tenure committees, the Provost, President, and Trustees.

Several faculty have expressed concern that a new unit made up of some combination of Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communication and Culture, and/or possibly others would necessitate the creation of departments, which would add another layer to promotion and tenure considerations. However, they also believe that the problems would be minimal in a School of Communication, in which the professors would speak more or less the same language in regard to teaching and research

areas, as compared to the College, where their work would be judged by chemists, biologists, and mathematicians, among others.

Visibility/Fund-Raising

At a time when public universities rely more than ever on private money to survive, several Journalism faculty believe that a School of Journalism or School of Communication is much easier to “brand” and is more visible than a department within the College, or the College itself. This would have an effect on fund-raising and also alumni relations. It is easier for alumni and donors to identify with a smaller, well-defined entity than to a larger, less clearly defined entity.

Faculty Collaboration in Teaching and Research

Several Journalism faculty believe that a reorganization involving some joining together of Journalism, Telecommunications, and/or CMCL would be beneficial in encouraging teaching and research collaborations among the faculty. While that might also be true if the School became part of the College, the faculty believe that the road to collaboration is smoother in a smaller unit devoted to one broad academic category, such as communication/media, than many categories.

Autonomy/Authority

One concern among several Journalism faculty is that any reorganization could damage the autonomy the School enjoys as an RC and its direct line of communication with the Provost and other university officers. Reorganizing into a larger School of Communication would probably mean forming departments, possibly putting an extra layer of administration between Journalism and high-level university officials. However, these same faculty believe that such an inconvenience would be minor compared with having the College absorb the School, creating several layers of separation between Journalism’s concerns and those who might be able to address them.

Along these same lines, several faculty members were strongly committed to preserving the School’s autonomy to make decisions about its future. The faculty see this autonomy as one of the greatest strengths of being an RC. Although there are university-imposed constraints, the School is largely free to chart its own course and use its own budget as it sees fit under the current system.

Similarly, some faculty expressed concern that a larger unit would be less “nimble” in reacting to the rapid changes taking place in the communication industries. Again, the concern here was much more pronounced in regard to rejoining the College than in regard to a new School of Communication. One faculty member called the College a “large, slow-moving organization” and wondered if a unit within the College would be able to make needed curricular changes within a reasonable time.

Travel

Although this concern was not widespread, it should be noted that, until recent university-wide limits were placed on travel, the School’s faculty have enjoyed a generous travel policy that is aided by a streamlined approval system. A faculty member fills out a short form and submits it to a staff member, who then gets the dean’s approval. If the dean approves, which is the norm, the staff member and the faculty member work out the details. There is no numerical limit on faculty funding, and trips generally are approved unless they are of dubious benefit to the School’s teaching, research/creative activity, or service missions. In addition, graduate students have up to \$1,500 per year each for research-related travel. Some faculty members worry that any sort of reorganization into a larger unit will complicate and/or limit travel funding.

Conclusion

The consensus among Journalism faculty, based on an admittedly unscientific poll, is that they would prefer to either have the School remain as it is or combine with Telecom, CMCL, or other units that share similar interests in teaching, research/creative activity, and service into a School of Communication or something similar. No support for rejoining the College emerged, although several faculty said they would keep an open mind if clear advantages could be demonstrated. On the flip side, several were adamant that the School remain separate from the College at all costs.

Telecommunications

The Department has had several meetings to discuss possible reorganization. The overwhelming majority of faculty believe that they, and the Department, should remain in the College of Arts and Sciences. Most believe that this requires no further discussion. A few are less firmly convinced that the College is our only academic home and believe it is valuable to consider alternatives. It appears that a majority of the faculty, should a decision be reached to reorganize the study of communications at IUB, could support some type of School of Communications in the College (incorporating Journalism and Communications and Culture and perhaps other units) modeled, to some extent, on the structure of the Hope School of Fine Arts.

The Telecommunications faculty offer the following arguments for maintaining the current organization of communication and media studies on the Bloomington campus.

The three communication units at IUB do not share similar foci and therefore do not have similar approaches, methods or understandings of the study of communication. These differences across programs drove them apart. A school of communication will not serve to integrate them.

While the three units under review focus exclusively on communication and media, mediated communication is studied across departments and schools at IU, including Political Science, History, Sociology, Psychology, and the Schools of Business, Education, Informatics, Law, and Music. Creating a separate school suggests a rigid boundary that does not exist.

Faculty noted the value of being in the College, including the College's responsiveness to our financial needs (e.g. new production facilities). The College also provides funds for the Institute for Communication Research (ICR) lab, which is operated by the department. The ICR lab is central to the research of many faculty members and graduate students. The College paid for renovation of the space to make it suitable as a psychophysiology lab, and it also pays the rent for the space. The support for the ICR comes from the College or from grants. It does not come out of the Department's budget. On the other hand, some Telecommunications faculty, cognizant of the fact that Telecommunications provides a positive net economic benefit to the College, acknowledge that resources might improve under some restructuring. But those faculty are concerned about the adverse economic impact of withdrawal from the College upon it.

Some faculty also expressed concern about moving into a professional school where credentialing and accreditation may drive many decisions – or with being in a professional school where the future of the profession (journalism) is uncertain.

Nearly all of TC's graduate students are funded through the College. Faculty wonder whether the Department could continue to support them if it left the College.

Faculty members are concerned about the money for start-up support for new faculty. This is obviously a much bigger problem in the sciences, but it is basically a problem with every new hire. However any new communications unit was set up, it would need -- from the beginning -- the money for start-up support for new faculty.

Comments on Responsibility Centers

Under IU's system of responsibility centered management, stand-alone schools (not embedded schools such as the Hope School of Fine Arts) must be financially self-sustaining. They receive a share of the annual appropriation from the General Assembly, their "market share" of undergraduate tuition income, retain most of indirect cost recovery from research, can hold on to income from intellectual property (although earnings are shared with involved faculty), and maintain accounts in the Indiana University Foundation. Schools are "taxed" by the campus to pay for non-academic campus responsibility centers (e.g., the Library, Registrar, etc.) and also to help pay the tax that the campus pays to University Administration.

If, hypothetically, a new School of Communication was created that incorporated one (or more) current IUB schools (e.g., Journalism, Informatics and Computing, SLIS), those units would presumably simply take with them into the new unit their current share of the IU General Fund (the appropriation from the legislature).

If any new school also incorporated departments from another school (e.g., the Departments of Telecommunications and/or Communications and Culture), negotiations would have to be mediated by the Campus which would ultimately settle how much of the general appropriation of the school from which they came would be transferred to the new school. The most recent example of this (and the only one since IU adopted Responsibility Centered Management) occurred a few years ago when the Department of Computer Science moved from the College of Arts and Sciences to the (then) School of Informatics (now School of Informatics and Computing).

The School of Journalism, although small, is a stable and successful Responsibility Center. Depending on the outcome of negotiations with the College and the campus, it seems likely that a School of Communications, including Journalism, Communications and Culture and Telecommunications, could also be self-sustaining. Creation of such a school, however, would likely have adverse financial consequences upon the College of Arts and Sciences because it appears that tuition revenue from those two programs (combining direct tuition income from their classes with tuition gained from the general number of majors they bring the College) exceeds College support for the units.

Alternatives to a Reorganization

Toward the end of delivering the most effective education in communication and media possible, and given the points of mutual interest and potential collaboration highlighted throughout this report, we suggest the following possible pursuits that might bring our units closer together intellectually and programmatically. These suggestions are in addition to those listed elsewhere in this report.

1. Identify undergraduate (and even graduate) programs that cut across departmental and school lines that would easily allow students to take courses from all three units without special permission. Examples of such programs might include political communication, health and science communication, creative media industries, documentary and film production, media and society, communication law and policy, and media economics;

2. Build a Communication/Media@IU identity, possibly involving the development of a shared website, to recruit applicants nationally and internationally and to present a more unified image to outside publics;
3. Host a communication and media reception during the academic year, whether at the graduate or undergraduate level, or both, similar to how the College hosts a fall reception for new faculty;
4. Co-sponsor a communication and media reception (and perhaps coordinating graduate student recruitment efforts) at the National Communication Association (NCA), International Communication Association (ICA), and Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) conferences;
5. Consider jointly sponsoring a graduate student recruitment booth at NCA, ICA, and AEJMC;
6. Explore the possibility of collaborating at the undergraduate program level by meeting with our respective academic advisors to determine where student interests are, then devising programs that are in some way collaborative;
7. Develop a formal mechanism for transferring graduate applicant files when warranted (i.e., when a student's file is much better suited for a different program, a practice most graduate directors follow informally now);
8. Enhance intellectual exchanges between units by reserving a few spots each semester for research talks from faculty of other units;
9. Expand the Individualized Major Program to develop and design minors, certificate programs, and majors that cut across unit boundaries. If IMP is independent of existing campus units, it could more efficiently design such programs, including some related to communication/media, without some of the turf jealousy that might ensure if the programs attempted to do such work themselves.

VIII. Conclusion

The College Departments of Communication and Culture and Telecommunications and the School of Journalism offer instruction in communication and media, but do so with very different approaches, perspectives, and purposes. All are successful and well regarded units, and the faculty of each believe that their unique missions are best served by remaining in the current administrative structure.

While all participants agreed to keep open minds on the subject of reorganization, Telecommunications and Communication and Culture were clear in asserting that they believed that their missions were better served in the College of Arts and Sciences because of its liberal arts tradition. The School of Journalism was likewise clear in asserting that it believed its purposes were best served in a freestanding unit that could chart its own path more freely than would be possible as part of a larger structure such as the College. Informal polls of the faculty found no major support within Telecommunications and Communication and Culture for leaving the College, and Journalism faculty expressed no support for rejoining the College.

Seeing no reason to fix something that does not appear to be in the least bit broken, discerning no financial benefits to a reorganization, and recognizing the clear desire of all three affected faculties to maintain the current structure of their programs, the Task Force concludes that there is no reason to consider further a reorganization of communication/media studies on the Bloomington campus.

However, should the broader study proposed by President McRobbie affect communication and media studies on the Bloomington campus, we fully expect this Task Force or some analogous body to have a significant role to play in that process.

Respectfully submitted by the members of the Internal Task Force,

Mike Conway, Journalism

Jack Dvorak, Journalism

Anthony Fargo, Journalism

Betsi Grabe, Telecommunications

Mary Gray, Communication and Culture

Joan Hawkins, Communication and Culture

Susan Kelly, Telecommunications

Barbara Klinger, Communication and Culture

Nicole Martins, Telecommunications

Michael McGregor, Telecommunications

Emily Metzgar, Journalism

Susan Seizer, Communication and Culture

Jon Simons, Communication and Culture

Robert Terrill, Communication and Culture

Herbert Terry, Telecommunications

Appendix D

Organizational Characteristics

<u>School</u>	<u>COD Representative</u>	<u>COD Representative Title</u>	<u>Deans' Responsibilities Other than the Medical School</u>	<u>AAHC Representative</u>	<u>AAHC Representative Title</u>	Other Health Schools
Creighton University School of Medicine	Rowen K. Zetterman M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine Associate Dean, GME	Faculty Practice Plan	Robert Heaney, MD, FACP, FACN	Interim Vice President for Health Sciences	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
Drexel University College of Medicine	Richard V. Homan M.D.	Dean Senior Vice President Health Services Senior Vice President Health Services	Faculty Practice Plan	Richard Homan, MD	Dean, College of Medicine and Senior Vice President, Health Affairs	Allied Health Nursing Public Health
East Tennessee State University James H. Quillen College of Medicine	Philip C. Bagnell M.D.	Dean of Medicine Vice President for Health Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Wilsie Bishop, DPA, BSN, MPA, MEd, MSN	Vice President for Health Affairs and University Chief Operating Officer	Allied Health Nursing Public Health
Howard University College of Medicine	Robert E. Taylor M.D., Ph.D., M.S.	Dean Professor and Chairman Department of Pharmacology	Faculty Practice Plan	Donald Wilson, MD, MACP	Senior Vice President for Health Sciences	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
Indiana University School of Medicine	Donald C. Brater M.D.	Dean and Walter J. Daly Professor Dean and Walther J. Daly Professor	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Health Administration Nursing Public Health
Jefferson Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University	Mark L. Tykocinski M.D.	Anthony F. & Gertrude M. DePalma Dean Sr Vice President, Thomas Jefferson Univ.	Faculty Practice Plan	Robert Barchi, MD, PhD	President	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing
Keck School of Medicine	Carmen A. Puliafito M.D., M.B.A.	Mary S. and John Hooval, Dean's Chair in Medicine, Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Carmen Puliafito, MD, MBA	Dean, Keck School of Medicine	Allied Health Dentistry

of the University of Southern California		SOM				Nursing Pharmacy
Loma Linda University School of Medicine	Henry R. Hadley M. D.	Exec. Vice President for Medical Affairs LLUAHSC and Dean, School of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan	Richard Hart, MD, DPH	President, Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center and President, Loma Linda University and Loma Linda University Medical Center	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Public Health
Louisiana State University School of Medicine in New Orleans	Steve H. Nelson M. D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Larry Hollier, MD	Chancellor and Dean, School of Medicine	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Veterinary
Medical College of Wisconsin	Joseph E. Kerschner M.D.	CEO, Children's Specialty Group Senior Associate Dean for Research	Faculty Practice Plan	T. Michael Bolger, JD	President and Chief Executive Officer	Grad Studies
Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine	Etta D. Pisano M.D.	Vice President for Medical Affairs Dean, College of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan	Raymond Greenberg, MD, PhD	President	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
Meharry Medical College	Charles Mouton M. D., M.S.	Dean and Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Interim Dean, SOM	Faculty Practice Plan	Wayne Riley, MD, MPH, MBA, FACP	President and Chief Financial Officer	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies
Mercer University School of Medicine	William F. Bina M.D., M.P.H.	Dean Interim Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Pharmacy
Michigan State University College of Human Medicine	Marsha D. Rappley M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Nursing Veterinary
Morehouse School of Medicine	Sandra A. Harris-Hooker Ph.D., M.S.	Vice President and Senior Associate Dean Sponsored Research Administration	Faculty Practice Plan	John Maupin, DDS	President	Grad Studies Public Health
Oregon Health & Science	Mark A. Richardson JR M.D., M.B.A.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Joseph Robertson, MD, MBA	President	Dentistry Nursing

University School of Medicine						
Stanford University School of Medicine	Philip A. Pizzo M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine, Professor of Pediatrics & Microbiology/Immunology	Faculty Practice Plan	Philip Pizzo, MD	Dean, School of Medicine	
Temple University School of Medicine	John M. Daly M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Pharmacy
Texas A&M Health Science Center College of Medicine	Thomas S. Shomaker J.D., M.D.	Jean and Thomas McMullin Dean of Medicine Vice President for Clinical Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Nancy Dickey, MD	President, Texas A&M Health Science Center and Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, Texas A&M System	Grad Studies Public Health
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center Paul L. Foster School of Medicine	Jose de la Rosa M.D.	Regional and Founding Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
The Brody School of Medicine at East Carolina University	Paul R. Cunningham M.D., M.B.B.S.	Dean, The Brody School of Medicine & Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Phyllis Horns, RN, DSN, MPH, FAAN	Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences	Allied Health Nursing
The Commonwealth Medical College	Robert M. D'Alessandro M.D.	President and Founding Dean, (MEDC)	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
The School of Medicine at Stony Brook University Medical Center	Kenneth N. Kaushansky M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine Senior Vice President of Health Sciences	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Dentistry Nursing
The University of Texas School of Medicine at San Antonio	Francisco A. Gonzalez-Scarano Ph.D., M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine Vice President for Medical Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	William Henrich, MD	President	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing

Tulane University School of Medicine	Benjamin P. Sachs M.B.Ch.B., D.P.H., M.B.B.S.	Sr Vice President, Dean of the School of Medicine, Tulane University Gynecology & Reproductive Biology	Faculty Practice Plan	Benjamin Sachs, DPH, BS, MB, SACOG	Senior Vice President of Tulane University and Dean, School of Medicine	Public Health
Universidad Central del Caribe School of Medicine	Jose G. Rodriguez M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
University at Buffalo State University of New York School of Medicine & Biomedical Sciences	Michael E. Cain III M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine al Sciences	Faculty Practice Plan	David Dunn, MD, PhD	Vice President for Health Sciences	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences College of Medicine	Debra H. Fiser M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	I. Dodd Wilson, MD	Chancellor	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of California , San Francisco, School of Medicine	Samuel A. Hawgood M.B.B.S.	Dean and Vice Dean for Academic Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	A. Eugene Washington , MD	Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor	Dentistry Grad Studies Health Administ ration Nursing Public Health
University of Central Florida College of Medicine	Deborah German M .D.	Dean, College of Medicine Vice President for Medical Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine	Andrew T. Filak M. D.	Interim Dean Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	David Stern, MD	Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean, College of Medicine	Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Florida College of Medicine	Michael Good M.D.	Dean, College of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan	David Guzick, MD, PhD	Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and President of University of Florida & Shands Health	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Veterinary

					System	
University of Illinois College of Medicine	Joseph A. Flaherty M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	William Chamberlin, MD	Chief Medical Officer and Chief Compliance Officer	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy Public Health Veterinary
University of Iowa Roy J. and Lucille A. Carver College of Medicine	Paul B. Rothman M.D.	Dean in Internal Medicine and Professor of Microbiology	Faculty Practice Plan	Jean Robillard, MD	Vice President for Medical Affairs	Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of Kentucky College of Medicine	Emery A. Wilson M.D.	Director Office of Health, Research and Development	Faculty Practice Plan	Michael Karpf, MD	Executive Vice President for Health Affairs	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
University of Louisville School of Medicine	Edward C. Halperin M.D., M.A.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Larry Cook, MD	Executive Vice President for Health Affairs	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Public Health
University of Maryland School of Medicine	E. Albert A. Reece M.D., M.B.A., Ph.D.	Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of UMD John Z. & Akiko K. Bowers Distinguished Professor	Faculty Practice Plan	David Ramsay, DM, DPhil	President	Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey-Robert Wood Johnson Medical School	Peter S. Amenta Ph.D., M.D.	Dean Professor, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine Professor, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
University of Michigan Medical School	James O. Woolliscroft M.D.	Dean & Lyle C. Roll Professor of Medicine Lyle C. Roll Professor of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan	Ora Hirsch Pescovitz, MD	Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs and Chief Executive Officer, University of Michigan Health	Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Public Health

					System	
University of Missouri-Columbia School of Medicine	Robert J. Churchill M.D.	Hugh E. and Sarah D. Stephenson Dean Antonia Lodwick Distinguished Prof. of Radiology	Faculty Practice Plan	Harold Williamson, MD, MSPH	Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences	Allied Health Nursing Veterinary
University of Nevada School of Medicine	Cheryl J. Hug-English M.D., M.P.H.	Interim Dean and Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Maurizio Trevisan, MD	Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer	Allied Health Nursing
University of Oklahoma College of Medicine	M. Dewayne Andrews M.D.	Vice President for Health Affairs, Executive Dean and Lawrence N. Upjohn Chair in Med	Faculty Practice Plan	Joseph Ferretti, PhD	Senior Vice President and Provost	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of Puerto Rico School of Medicine	Walter J. Frontera Ph.D., M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Jose Carlo, MD, FAAN	Chancellor	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of South Carolina School of Medicine	Richard A. Hoppman M.D.	Dean Assoc Dean, Med Ed & Aca Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Harris Pastides, PhD, MPH	President	Health Administration Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of Tennessee Health Science Center College of Medicine	Steven J. Schwab II M.D.	Chancellor U of Tenn. HSC; Exec Dean, COM, Medicine Campuses: Memphis/Knoxville/C Chattanooga	Faculty Practice Plan	Hershel Wall, MD	Chancellor	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy Veterinary
University of Texas Medical School at Houston	Giuseppe N. Colasurdo M.D.	Dean, H. Wayne Hightower Distinguished Prof in the Med. Sciences, Prof & Chairman, Dept of Pediatric	Faculty Practice Plan	Larry Kaiser, MD, FACS	President	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Vermont College of Medicine	Frederick C. Morin M.D.	Dean Associate Dean for Primary Care	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Nursing
University	Robert N. Golden M	Dean, School of	Faculty	Robert	Dean,	Health

of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health	.D.	Medicine and Public Health Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs	Practice Plan	Golden, MD	University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, and Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs	Administration Nursing Pharmacy Veterinary
Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine	Jerome F. Strauss II I M.D., Ph.D.	Dean Executive Vice President for Med. Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan	Sheldon Retchin, MD, MSPH	Vice President for Health Sciences and Chief Executive Officer, Virginia Commonwealth University Health System	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
Wayne State University School of Medicine	Valerie M. Parisi M.D., M.P.H., M.B.A.	Dean, School of Medicine Office of the Dean Office of the Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
Wright State University Boonshoft School of Medicine	Howard M. Part M.D.	Dean	Faculty Practice Plan	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Nursing
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine	Edward D. Miller JR M.D.	Dean of the Medical Faculty CEO, Johns Hopkins Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Hospital or Health System	Edward Miller, MD	Dean of the Medical Faculty, School of Medicine and Chief Executive Officer, Johns Hopkins Medicine	Nursing Public Health
Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine	Harold Paz M.D.	CEO Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, S VP for Hlth Affrs, Dean COM, Penn State Univ.	Faculty Practice Plan; Hospital or Health System	Harold Paz, MD	Senior Vice President for Health Affairs, Dean of the College of Medicine and Chief Executive Officer, The Milton S. Hershey Medical Center	Allied Health Grad Studies Health Administration Nursing
Texas Tech University	Steven L. Berk M.D.	Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean, School of	Faculty Practice Plan;	John Baldwin, MD	President	Allied Health Nursing

Health Sciences Center School of Medicine		Medicine	Hospital or Health System			Pharmacy
University of Miami Leonard M. Miller School of Medicine	Pascal J. Goldschmidt M.D.	Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean Chief Executive Officer, U. of Miami Health System	Faculty Practice Plan; Hospital or Health System	Pascal Goldschmidt, MD	Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean, Leonard M. Miller School of Medicine	Grad Studies Nursing
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine	William L. Roper M.D., M.P.H.	Dean, School of Medicine, VC for Medical Affairs & CEO, UNC Hlth Care System	Faculty Practice Plan; Hospital or Health System	William Roper, MD, MPH	Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs, Chief Executive Officer, University of North Carolina Health Care System, and Dean, School of Medicine	Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of Washington School of Medicine	Paul G. Ramsey M.D.	CEO, UW Medicine; Exec VP for Medical Affairs; Dean of the SOM, Univ of Washington	Faculty Practice Plan; Hospital or Health System	Paul Ramsey, MD	Chief Executive Officer, University of Washington Medicine, Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs, and Dean of the School of Medicine	Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
Albany Medical College	Vincent P. Verdile M.S., M.D.	Dean and Executive Vice President for Health Affairs, Albany Med College	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing
Boston University School of Medicine	Karen H. Antman M.D.	Provost of the Medical Campus and Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Health Administration Public Health
Eastern Virginia Medical School	Gerald J. Pepe Ph.D.	Dean and Provost	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	C. Donald Combs, PhD	Vice Provost for Planning and Health Professions	Grad Studies

Marshall University Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine	Charles H. McKown JR M.D.	VP, Health Sciences & Dean, SOM	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Nursing
Mount Sinai School of Medicine	Dennis S. Charney M.D.	Dean Exec VP, Acad Affrs, Mount Sinai Medical Center	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Grad Studies Health Administration
Rush Medical College of Rush University Medical Center	Thomas A. Deutsch M.D.	The Henry P. Russe, M.D. Dean, Rush Med College Provost, Rush University & Sr VP, Medical Affairs	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Larry Goodman, MD	President and Chief Executive Officer	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing
Saint Louis University School of Medicine	Philip O. Alderson M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine and Vice President for Health Sciences	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Public Health
University of Colorado School of Medicine	Richard D. Krugman M.D.	Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs Dean, School of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Richard Krugman, MD	Vice Chancellor, Health Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine	Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Public Health
University of Hawaii, John A. Burns School of Medicine	Jerris R. Hedges M. D., M.S., Master Unk	Dean Interim Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Public Health
University of Nebraska College of Medicine	Rodney S. Markin Ph.D., M.D.	Interim Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Harold Maurer, MD	Chancellor	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences	Joshua D. Wynne M.D., M.B.A., M.P.H.	Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean School of Medicine and Health Sciences	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Nursing
University of South Florida College of Medicine	Stephen Klasko M. B.A., M.D.	CEO, USF Health Dean, College of Medicine Dean, College of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Stephen Klasko, MD, MBA	Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean, College of Medicine	Nursing Public Health
University of Texas	Garland D. Anderson M.D.	Executive Vice President & Provost,	Faculty Practice	David Callender,	President	Allied Health

Medical Branch School of Medicine		and Dean, SOM Thomas N. & Gleaves T. James Distinguished Chair	Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	MD, MBA, FACS		Grad Studies Nursing
West Virginia University School of Medicine	Arthur J. Ross M.D., M.B.A.	Dean, School of Medicine Interim Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Fred Butcher, PhD	Interim Vice President for Health Sciences	Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy
Yale University School of Medicine	Robert J. Alpern M.D.	Dean Ensign Professor of Medicine Ensign Professor of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s)	Robert Alpern, MD	Dean, School of Medicine	Grad Studies Nursing Public Health
The University of Toledo College of Medicine	Jeffrey P. Gold M.D.	Provost and Exec Vice President of Health Affairs Dean of the College of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Jeffrey Gold, MD	Provost, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs, and Dean of the College of Medicine	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing
University of California, Davis, School of Medicine	Claire Pomeroy M.B.A., M.D.	Vice Chancellor for Human Health Sciences and Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Claire Pomeroy, MD, MBA	Vice Chancellor for Human Health Sciences and Dean, School of Medicine	Veterinary
University of California, Los Angeles David Geffen School of Medicine	Eugene A. Washington M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine Vice Chancellor, Health Sciences	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Dentistry Grad Studies Health Administration Nursing Public Health
University of California, San Diego School of Medicine	David A. Brenner M.D.	Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and Dean Interim Dean, School of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	David Brenner, MD	Dean, School of Medicine and Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences	Grad Studies
University of Connecticut School of Medicine	Cato T. Laurencin Ph.D., M.D.	Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean SOM Van Dusen Distinguished Endowed Chair & Professor	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Veterinary
University of	Aaron L. Friedman M.D.	Vice President for Health Sciences and	Faculty Practice	Frank Cerra, MD	Senior Vice President	Dentistry Nursing

Minnesota Medical School		Dean McKnight Presidential Leadership Chair	Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System		for Health Sciences	Pharmacy Public Health Veterinary
University of New Mexico School of Medicine	Paul B. Roth M.D.	Executive Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Paul Roth, MD	Executive Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean, School of Medicine	Nursing Pharmacy
University of Utah School of Medicine	A. Betz M.D., Ph.D.	Sr VP for Health Sciences, Executive Dean SOM, CEO, University of Utah Health Care	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	A. Lorris Betz, MD, PhD	Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Executive Dean, School of Medicine	Allied Health Nursing Pharmacy
Vanderbilt University School of Medicine	Jeffrey R. Balsler Ph.D., M.D.	Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs Dean, School of Medicine	Faculty Practice Plan; Other Health Professions School(s); Hospital or Health System	Jeffrey Balsler, MD, PhD	Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine	Nursing
Loyola University Chicago Stritch School of Medicine	Richard L. Gamelli M.D.	Dean, Stritch SOM, Robert J. Freeark Prof Surgery Director, Burn & Shock Trauma Ins, Chief Burn Ctr	Hospital or Health System	Paul Whelton, MBBCh, MD, MSc	President and Chief Executive Officer, Loyola University Health System	Grad Studies Nursing
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey-New Jersey Medical School	Robert Johnson M.D.	Professor Interim Dean Interim Dean	Hospital or Health System	William Owen, MD	Chancellor	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing
Baylor College of Medicine	Paul Klotman M.D.	President, CEO, and Executive Dean and Chancellor Emeritus	No Other Responsibilities	William Butler, MD	Interim President and Executive Dean	Allied Health Grad Studies
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine	Pamela B. Davis M.D., Ph.D.	Dean and VP for Medical Affairs Arline H. and Curtis F. Garvin Research Professor	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Dentistry Nursing
Chicago Medical	Russell G. Robertson III M.D.	Vice President for Medical Affairs Dean,	No Other Responsibilities	K. Michael Welch, MB,	President and Chief	Allied Health

School at Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine & Science		Chicago Medical School	ties	ChB, FRCP	Executive Officer	Grad Studies
Dartmouth Medical School	Wiley W. Souba M.D., D.Sc., M.B.A.	Vice President of Health Affairs and Dean Microbiology and Immunology	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Grad Studies
Duke University School of Medicine	Nancy Andrews Ph.D., M.S., M.D.	Dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs	No Other Responsibilities	Victor Dzau, MD	Chancellor for Health Affairs, President and Chief Executive Officer, Duke University Health System	Nursing
Florida State University College of Medicine	John P. Fogarty M.D.	Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Georgetown University School of Medicine	Stephen R. Mitchell M.D.	Dean for Medical Education	No Other Responsibilities	Howard Federoff, MD, PhD	Executive Vice President for Health Sciences and Executive Dean of the School of Medicine	Grad Studies Nursing
Mayo Medical School	Keith D. Lindor M.D.	Dean Mayo Clinic College of Medicine Mayo Clinic College of Medicine	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Grad Studies
Medical College of Georgia at Georgia Health Sciences University	Peter D. Buckley M.B.Ch., M.B.B.S., M.D., M.B.B.Ch.B	Chairman Department of Psychiatry & Health Behavior	No Other Responsibilities	Daniel Rahn, MD	Senior Vice Chancellor of Health and Medical Programs for the University System of Georgia	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing
San Juan Bautista School of Medicine	Yocasta Brugal Mena M.D.	President and Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Southern Illinois University School of Medicine	J Dorsey Ph.D., M.D.	Dean And Provost	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Dentistry Nursing
The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown	Edward J. Wing M.D.	Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	

University						
Tufts University School of Medicine	Harris Berman M.D.	Interim Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Dentistry Grad Studies Veterinary
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences F. Edward Hebert School of Medicine	Larry W. Laughlin Ph.D., M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine	No Other Responsibilities	Charles Rice, MD	President	Grad Studies Nursing
University of Alabama School of Medicine	Raymond Watts	Senior Vice President for Medicine Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Robert Rich, MD	Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Optometry Public Health
University of Arizona College of Medicine	Steve A. Goldschmid M.D.	Dean Professor of Medicine Professor of Medicine	No Other Responsibilities	William Crist, MD	Vice President for Health Affairs	Allied Health Nursing Pharmacy
University of California, Irvine, School of Medicine	Ralph Clayman M.D.	Dean, School of Medicine; Professor, Department of Urology	No Other Responsibilities	Michael Drake, MD	Chancellor	
University of Mississippi School of Medicine	James E. Keeton M.D.	Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs Dean, School of Medicine	No Other Responsibilities	Daniel Jones, MD	Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Medicine	Betty M. Drees M.D.	Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Betty Drees, MD, FACP	Dean, School of Medicine	Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry	Mark B. Taubman M.D.	Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Bradford Berk, MD, PhD	Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Chief Executive Officer, Medical Center and Strong	Nursing

					Health System	
University of South Alabama College of Medicine	Samuel J. Strada Ph.D.	Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Ronald Franks, MD	Vice President for Health Sciences	Allied Health Nursing
University of Virginia School of Medicine	Steven T. Dekosky Jr M.D.	Vice President and Dean Interim Dean, SOM	No Other Responsibilities	Steven DeKosky, MD	Vice President and Dean, University of Virginia School of Medicine	Nursing
Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine	Cynda Johnson M.D., M.B.A.	President and Founding Dean	No Other Responsibilities	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University	Allen M. Spiegel M.D.	Dean	Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	Lee Goldman M.D., M.P.H.	Exec Vice Pres for Health and Biomedical Sciences Dean, Faculties of Health Sciences and Medicine	Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Allied Health Dentistry Grad Studies Nursing Public Health
Emory University School of Medicine	Thomas J. Lawley M.D.	Dean and William P. Timmie Professor of Dermatology	Not Indicated	Fred Sanfilippo, MD, PhD	Chief Executive Officer, The Robert W. Woodruff Health Sciences Center, Chairman, Emory Healthcare Inc., and Executive Vice President for Health Affairs	Allied Health Nursing Public Health
FIU Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine	John Rock M.D.	Founding Dean	Not Indicated	John Rock, MD	Senior Vice President Medical Affairs and Dean, College of Medicine	
Harvard Medical School	Jeffrey S. Flier M.D.	Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Caroline Shields	Not Indicated	Jeffrey Flier, MD	Dean of the Faculty of Medicine	Dentistry Public Health

		Walker Professor of Medicine				
Hofstra University School of Medicine			Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Louisiana State University School of Medicine in Shreveport	Andrew L. Chesson M.D.	Dean And Dean	Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Grad Studies
New York University School of Medicine	Robert I. Grossman M.D.	The Saul J. Farber Dean, Chief Executive Officer, NYU Langone Medical Center	Not Indicated	Robert Grossman, MD	Dean and Chief Executive Officer, School of Medicine	Dentistry Nursing
Northeastern Ohio Universities Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy	Jeffrey L. Susman M.D.	Dean, College of Medicine Director of Clinical Sciences	Not Indicated	Lois Margaret Nora, MD, JD	President and Dean, School of Medicine	Grad Studies
Northwestern University The Feinberg School of Medicine	Jeffrey Glassroth M.D.	Interim Dean and Dean	Not Indicated	J. Larry Jameson, MD, PhD	Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine	Dentistry Health Administration
Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine			Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
Ponce School of Medicine and Health Sciences	Joxel A. Garcia Garcia M.D.	President and Dean, School of Medicine	Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
University of Chicago Division of the Biological Sciences The Pritzker School of Medicine	Kenneth S. Polonsky M.B.B.Ch.	Dean Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs Medicine	Not Indicated	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	Health Administration Pharmacy
University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine	Arthur H. Rubenstein M.D., M.B.B.Ch.	Executive Vice President, Univ Penn Health System and Dean, School of Medicine	Not Indicated	Arthur Rubenstein, MBBCh	Executive Vice President for the Health System and	Dentistry Nursing Veterinary

					Dean, School of Medicine	
Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine	Larry J. Shapiro M.D.	Executive Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs Dean	Not Indicated	Larry Shapiro, MD	President, Washington University Medical Center and Executive Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs	Allied Health Grad Studies
Weill Cornell Medical College	Antonio M. Gotto JR M.D., D.Phil.	Provost for Medical Affairs and Dean	Not Indicated	Antonio Gotto, MD	Stephen and Suzanne Weiss Dean and Provost, Medical Affairs	Grad Studies Health Administration Veterinary
George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences	Jeffrey S. Akman M.D.	Interim Dean	Other Health Professions School(s)	John Williams, MD, EdD, MPH	Provost and Vice President for Health Affairs	Allied Health Public Health
New York Medical College	Ralph A. O'Connell M.D.	Provost and Dean, School of Medicine	Other Health Professions School(s)	Karl Adler, MD	President and Chief Executive Officer	Allied Health Grad Studies
Ohio State University College of Medicine	Catherine R. Lucey M.D.	Interim Dean Vice President & Executive Dean of Health Sciences	Other Health Professions School(s)	Steven Gabbe, MD	Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Chief Executive Officer, Ohio State University Medical Center	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Optometry Pharmacy Public Health Veterinary
Sanford School of Medicine The University of South Dakota	Rodney R. Parry M.D.	Dean and Vice President of Health Affairs	Other Health Professions School(s)	Not AAHC Member	Not AAHC Member	
State University of New York Downstate Medical Center College of Medicine	Ian L. Taylor Ph.D., M.D., M.B.Ch.B.	Sr. VP for Biomedical Education & Research, Dean of the College of Medicine	Other Health Professions School(s)	John LaRosa, MD, FACP	President	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing
State University of New	Steven J. Scheinman M.D.	Dean Dean, College of Medicine	Other Health Professions	David Smith, MD	President	Allied Health Grad

York Upstate Medical University			School(s)			Studies Nursing
University of Kansas School of Medicine	Barbara F. Atkinson M.D.	Executive Vice Chancellor UK Med.Cntr. and Executive Dean	Other Health Professions School(s)	Barbara Atkinson, MD	Executive Vice Chancellor and Executive Dean, School of Medicine	Allied Health Grad Studies Nursing Pharmacy
University of Massachu setts Medical School	Terence Flotte M.D.	Dean, Provost, and Executive Deputy Chancellor Dean, Provost, and Executive Deputy Chancellor	Other Health Professions School(s)	Terence Flotte, MD	Executive Deputy Chancellor and Dean, School of Medicine	Grad Studies Nursing
University of Pittsburg h School of Medicine	Arthur S. Levine M. D.	Senior Vice Chancellor for the Health Sciences Dea n, School of Medicine	Other Health Professions School(s)	Arthur Levine, MD	Senior Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and Dean, School of Medicine	Allied Health Dentistry Nursing Pharmacy Public Health
University of Texas Southwes tern Medical Center at Dallas Southwes tern Medical School	J. Gregory G. Fitz M.D .	Exec. VP Academic Affairs & Provost Dean, UT Southwestern Med School UT Southwestern Med Centre	Other Health Professions School(s)	Daniel Podolsky, MD	President	Allied Health Grad Studies
Wake Forest University School of Medicine	William B. Applegat e M.D., M.P.H.	President, Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Dean, Wake Forest University School of Medicine	Other Health Professions School(s)	William Applegate, MD	President and Dean, School of Medicine	Allied Health Dentistry Public Health