

A REVIEW OF IU'S CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL  
OPERATIONS

A Report Commissioned by President Adam Herbert

*file*  
*"CORE CAMPUS"*

Advisory Team Members:

Charles F. Bonser, Chairman  
Alfred C. Aman Jr.  
Gerald L. Bepko  
Angela B. McBride  
F.C. Richardson  
Maynard Thompson  
Jack R. Wentworth

September, 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary and Recommended Actions	Pg. 2
Introduction	Pg. 8
Findings – System and Core Campus School Operations	Pg. 12
Issues in the Multi-Campus Relationships	Pg. 21
Other Issues Raised in the A Team Interviews	Pg. 24
System Schools and the Regional Campuses	Pg. 27
Conclusions	Pg. 30
Appendix I – Questionnaire Used with Schools	Pg. 33
Appendix II – School of Education Long-Range Planning Report	Pg. 35

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June, 2006, President Adam W. Herbert, appointed a committee of former IU senior administrators (referred to as the “A Team”) to conduct a review of the structure and operations of the University’s “system schools” – those that conduct programs on campuses throughout the IU system - and the “core campus” schools that operate only on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The A Team administered a detailed questionnaire to the deans of the affected schools. We also conducted extensive interviews with the deans and their associate deans, and with faculty representatives of several of the programs.

Most of the Bloomington and Indianapolis core campus and system schools (Business, Education, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing, Social Work, and SPEA) have similarities in their operations on those two campuses. They basically function as “one school, two campuses”, albeit often with different student populations and complimentary programs. (Music and Journalism have special issues we discuss in the report.) The system schools on the regional campuses (SPEA, Nursing, Social Work, and Continuing Studies) vary both in their programs and among the campuses in their operations. It is obvious there is no one template that fits all IU system and core campus schools. Nor do we recommend one. Each of the schools has its own culture and method of operation. In some cases these differences are driven by the type of profession the schools serve. In other cases the history and the national prominence of the schools drive the nature of the relationship.

The body of this report discusses how each of the system or core campus schools conducts their intercampus relationships. It also discusses advantages and disadvantages of the multi-campus academic programs. We suggest a number of changes that could be made to facilitate the functioning of these programs, and summarize them here as “Recommended Actions”.

On balance, we believe the IUB / IUPUI relationship, while not without costs, yields significant benefits to both campuses, to our University, and to our constituents. The integration achieved by the core campus professional schools aid both campuses, and the added strengths from the sister campus of a school certainly strengthens its case for a high national ranking. We think there is an opportunity for enhancing Indiana University’s mission accomplishment if the professional schools using this model in Bloomington and in Indianapolis explore ways in which they can become better integrated. However, we also understand that if the relevant parties do not favor integration, we should not force “marriages with a shotgun”

The IU system schools examined in our project that operate on the regional campuses appear to be heading toward more of a federation than a system. Reorganizations are being considered on some of the campuses that could result in a withdrawal of the system schools from the regional campus. If that should occur, school federation councils are a possible alternative for program coordination.

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

### *For The Trustees and the Central Administration*

- Reaffirm Board support for the concept of “Core Campus Schools”. Make it clear core and system school IUPUI / Bloomington campus collaborations are highly valued and publicly acknowledged; work with the deans and the campus leadership to identify and eliminate barriers to program integration; and provide incentives for core campus activities.
- Increase investment in two way communications technology that can strengthen and facilitate interactions among all of the core campus programs.
- Examine the possibility of another experiment with an inter-core campus bus transportation system.
- Revisit the possibility of coordinating campus calendars and schedules.
- Direct the System Schools that now function on the regional campuses to work with each of the regional campus chancellors to determine a mutually agreeable course of action, and the nature of any future relationship agreed upon, for the system school programs in each location. We believe the Board should avoid any particular template for these relationships and allow each program to develop – or not - based on its nature, history, and needs of the campus as well as the School and the local constituencies.
- Develop an increased focus on telling the story of the multi-campus professional schools of Indiana University, and their benefits to our constituencies. Provide internal forums, through such programs as the President’s Leadership Development Program (IU Lead) for new administrators, and for current and prospective IU leaders, where the techniques, benefits, and cultures of our multi campus matrix organizations can be explored, analyzed, and debated.

### *For The Core Campus Schools*

- The Deans of the Core Campus schools and their faculties should explore, with the leadership of the two campuses, where impediments to School operations exist, and how further program integration can be facilitated. They should work together to identify and resolve issues such as program direction and the perceived relationship between responsibility and authority.
- The A Team believes the IUPUI / Bloomington operations of Business, Informatics, Library and Information Science, Nursing, Public and Environmental Affairs, and Social Work have proven to be very successful

and have demonstrated sufficient benefits that they should be continued and strengthened wherever possible.

- Education has also been successful on both campuses, but, as described in their long-range planning document (discussed in this report), there continue to be unresolved differences in the integration and direction of the School. We believe the leadership of the School should work with the leadership of the two campuses to remove ambiguities where possible and to clarify expectations, authority, and responsibilities. If the relevant parties conclude the core campus approach for Education should be discontinued, and perhaps replaced with the “federation” model used by the School and the IU regional campus education departments, they should propose their plan for change and its process – including how to deal with programs within the School now closely interrelated on the two campuses - to the President and the Board for their consideration.
- The Jacobs School of Music should discuss the future of the IUPUI music program with the IUPUI Administration. If it is agreed that the relationship with the Jacobs School should be terminated, a mutually agreeable transition to a new departmental format for the IUPUI music programs should be proposed to the President and the Board for their decision.
- The A Team believes that, with new leadership in the School, there are sufficient potential benefits to be had from a core campus IU School of Journalism that it is at least worth another review by the School and the IUPUI / Bloomington Administrations to see if the cooperative core campus program can be continued and strengthened. If the decision is to abandon the core campus school model for Journalism, then a mutually agreeable transition to IUPUI departmental status for Journalism should be proposed to the President and the Board for their decision.
- The Core Campus and System Schools operating in both Bloomington and at IUPUI should work with the Central Administrations to identify and eliminate the practical, everyday barriers (many identified in this report) that stand in the way of cooperation and integration. This will require the deans and their faculties, the academic leadership of the two campuses, and the President to work together to specify the requirements for a successful relationship and to help provide the tools needed.
- Review personnel and teaching policies with a goal of further integration within a core campus school. Strengthen integration, and the School’s research culture, by providing opportunities and incentives for intercampus research collaboration.
- Examine ways in which intercampus course and master calendar scheduling can be improved to provide better options for the students. Work to identify

and eliminate structural barriers for core campus faculty and students. The Deans should consider appointing one of their key staff to be responsible for fostering and implementing core school integration and harmonization.

- Work with the core campus administrations to develop a consistent budgetary policy that encourages budget administration offering enough flexibility so that budgets do not inhibit innovation and program creativity within a core campus school.
- Explore the possibility of such seamless, jointly delivered programs, as distance learning and “blended” academic programs.
- Consider the detailed recommendations listed in the School of Education report in Appendix II of this report. Note particularly the following suggestions from that report:
  - Review the School’s committee structure to assure meaningful participation across the School, and eliminate “token” committee appointments.
  - Develop a core campus faculty recruiting protocol that offers meaningful participation of both campuses.
  - Review all School and IU informational materials to assure explanation of the Core Campus nature of the School, including faculty directories. Make sure cross links of web pages are up to date and functional.

### ***For the Regional Campuses and the System Schools***

- The School of Social Work is the only system school we examined that has broad support in all quarters. The importance of the central school to the accreditation of each campus no doubt plays an important part in this support. We recommend no changes for the School of Social Work
- For SPEA, Nursing, and Informatics, the support varies both on the campuses and in the central administrations of the schools. We think the leadership of each of these schools should, as per the above suggested Board of Trustees directive, work with the faculty and each of the regional campus chancellors to define the nature of their future relationship. This should then be codified in a memorandum of agreement that includes transition steps, if needed, and any changes proposed in the manner in which degrees are awarded and designated on each campus. This should then be presented as a recommendation to the President and the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

- We suggest that, in the cases where the system school structure is recommended for discontinuance, the schools and the campus programs should consider establishing a statewide council of faculty, such as that used by the School of Education, to continue links between the programs and to discuss curricular and other common professional interests. We also believe the School of Education's statewide Council of Deans has been a useful mechanism that could be profitably copied.
- The System School Deans and the campus Chancellors should consider the costs associated with any recommended future relationship between each of the System Schools and the Regional Campuses and arrive at a mutually agreeable cost allocation for each School on each campus.





## INTRODUCTION

In June, 2006, President Adam W. Herbert, appointed a committee of former IU senior administrators to conduct a review of the structure and operations of the University's "system schools" – those that conduct programs on campuses throughout the IU system - and the "core campus" schools that operate only on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The Chairman of the committee was Charles F. Bonser, former Dean of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Other members of the review team included: Gerald L. Bepko, former Vice-President and IUPUI Chancellor (as well as Interim IU President); F.C. Richardson, former Chancellor of IU Southeast; Maynard Thompson, former Vice-Chancellor, IU Bloomington; Alfred C. Aman Jr., former Dean of the IU School of Law (Bloomington); Angela B. McBride, former Dean of Nursing; and Jack R. Wentworth, former Dean of the Kelley School of Business. We will refer to this group in this report as the Advisory Team ("A Team").

The System Schools of particular interest for this project included: the School of Continuing Studies; the School of Dentistry; the School of Informatics; the School of Nursing; the School of Public and Environmental Affairs; and the School of Social Work. The Core Campus Schools included the Kelley School of Business; the School of Education; the School of Journalism; and the School of Library and Information Science. The School of Music, though apparently not formally a core campus school, has also had an oversight responsibility for the music programs at IUPUI. The School of Medicine, without a doubt the most extensive of IU's system schools, was excluded from this review because it operates exclusively at the post-baccalaureate level and separate agreements shape its functioning as *one* medical school with collaborations broader than the IU system. In addition, the School of Optometry, which only operates a clinical program in Indianapolis, in addition to their primary academic program in Bloomington, was excluded. After an initial review, we also dropped the School of Dentistry from the project, as it only has limited intercampus relationships with its dental technician program.

Commenting on his request for this review, President Herbert stated: "After more than three decades since initial implementation, it is important that we examine the continuing effectiveness of the multi-campus school structure - does it continue to offer the most effective approach to deliver high quality academic programs? Does it foster a strong and mission appropriate research culture on each campus? Does it have strong support on each of our campuses? Is there a need for modifications in the manner in which the schools operate and are governed?"

## Related Reports

Indiana University has undergone several reorganization efforts over the past 50 years. The most relevant to our charge was the 1974 reorganization that established the core campus programs.

In 1985, President John W. Ryan appointed a Task Force on University Organization to review these changes as well as the structure and operation of the IU system. The Task Force worked 16 months on this project, and “conducted hearings, interviews, and conversations with individuals, councils, senates, committees, and other groups on all campuses in the Indiana University system, as well as selected individuals outside the University.”

**The findings of this 1985 Task Force concerning IU’s system schools are instructive. They concluded:**<sup>1</sup>

The value of the system approach lies in the capability of Indiana University to deliver professional programs leading to degrees of comparable worth, regardless of program location. The system serves to establish, maintain, and enhance quality in curricular and other academic matters, and the system model enables us to bring the experience, prestige, and certain resources of well-established programs on the core campus to other Indiana University campuses, so that these can deliver professional programs much sooner and at a higher level of quality than the present state of campus development might otherwise permit.

Under the system school concept, the Indiana University Medical Sciences program has become a model for delivery of medical education close to the homes of students and at a level of quality comparable to that of the School of Medicine itself in Indianapolis. Many system schools, such as SPEA, rank among the best in the nation, and their renown is an advantage that accrues to all students and faculty associated with the program and not only to those on the core campus, where the administrative seats of system schools are located.

### **System School Concept Viable**

Among the frequent themes heard by the 1985 Task Force in its discussions were the following:

#### *Schools*

System programs are a burden on the autonomy of the campuses and schools concerned.

They increase the administrative complexities of campus and system administration.

They encourage conflicting loyalties in faculty members toward the campus on which the individual is assigned and the school of which he/she is a part.

They need to be organized uniformly to alleviate campus heads of the

---

<sup>1</sup> “Indiana University on the Threshold of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century”, Report of the Task Force on University Organization, pgs. 23 – 24.

necessity of dealing with a myriad of school organizational models, each with somewhat different policies.

Although we are persuaded that points 1) through 3) have some merit, we are convinced that the substantial benefits accruing to students, the communities served by each campus, the University, and the State outweigh additional burdens associated with system schools. The attendant problems of operating these schools are being solved by deans and campus heads. We have every expectation that their mutual good will can permit continuation of successful system programs on all the campuses until such time that freestanding programs can evolve and be sustained on regional campus at a level of quality comparable to the present norm in system programs. One of the chief problems has been the efficient mediation of differences between campus heads and multi-campus deans over academic issues. The proposed Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will be in an ideal position to structure a negotiating environment for resolution of such issues.

### *Uniform System School Model Desirable but Difficult*

With respect to the fourth point above, it is our sense that the character and mission of system schools are significantly different to discourage recommendation of an arbitrarily uniform model, which would probably result in an organizationally convenient design, but most likely one that would fit none of the schools very well. We do ascribe to the notion, however, that Indiana University should work toward a smaller number of models and more uniform policies in this area, which would tend to maximize standardization of system school administration and minimize subjective factors, which some believe contribute to inconsistencies between schools, is especially important in the administration of budgets, promotion, and tenure.

In the reviews conducted by the “A team” on these issues, we have heard some of the same complaints about the difficulties of managing system schools, and we concur with the conclusions of the 1985 University Reorganization Task Force that “substantial benefits” (discussed below) also have accrued that have outweighed “the burdens associated with system schools”.

On the other hand, over the past 20 years there have obviously been numerous changes in the maturity of the campuses and programs and in the relationships and capacities of the institutions involved. It seems to us a fair question to ask is: have these changes altered the equation to the point where the balance is tipped toward program independence for many of the programs now components of multi campus academic programs?

In 2005 the Mission Differentiation team appointed by President Herbert reported on the system / core campus programs and indicated that the “core campus and system schools concept for terminal degrees should be continued and strengthened.” (pg 16). In reference to the regional campuses, the report stated (pg 11):<sup>2</sup>

One common theme at each campus conversation centered on the challenge of meeting regional needs related to both new undergraduate and advanced degree

---

<sup>2</sup> “Mission Differentiation at Indiana University”, August, 2005

programs. Since many of the chancellors serve on regional economic development councils, additional degree offerings in health care, education and other fields became a hot topic of discussion. The need for master's degrees or applied doctoral degree programs was frequently mentioned. Community leaders in the regional communities consistently viewed the IU regional campuses as trusted sources for providing needed high quality graduate degrees. The responsiveness of other higher education institutions in various regions of the state—including the fast-growing private, for-profit sector—raised serious questions about the willingness of Indiana University to be responsive to regional community needs.

A central question arising from these conversations is the willingness of the Indiana University core and system schools to provide guidance and assistance in meeting the needs of the regional campus communities. There is some desire to consider collaboration with other public institutions to offer degrees in a region if the core (or system) school is not interested in providing a timely response to documented need. This is especially true when other public institutions are in closer proximity to the regional campus than the system or core school. The campus conversations were very clear about a limited, region-specific need for graduate programs, and especially about applied degree offerings.

The history of cooperation and coordination from the system or core schools varied with each regional campus. The regional campuses would like more cooperation and attention to these issues. In some cases, there was a clearly perceived conflict with either Bloomington or Indianapolis over the right to establish and/or grow certain academic initiatives. Simply put, some campuses, especially those geographically furthest from Bloomington and IUPUI, believe their ability to meet community needs is being constrained by the core campuses. At the same time, many spoke of the advantages of core and system schools in the sense that they enable faculty who are not at Bloomington or IUPUI to participate more fully in the life of Indiana University than would otherwise be possible. For example, SPEA faculty at IUN and IUSB value their ability to sit on doctoral dissertation committees of SPEA graduate students at the core campuses. This is viewed as evidence of one university with multiple campuses.

#### Approach Taken by the A Team in the Review

The A Team used a combination of interviews and data gathering to compile background information for this review. A questionnaire was administered to better understand how the schools handle various aspects of their programs on the several campuses of the University. For example, we compiled information on budgeting, faculty appraisals, alumni relations, and inter-campus activities. A copy of the questionnaire used is included as Appendix I to this report. A chart summarizing the results across all of the schools is included here as Attachment A.

We interviewed each of the school deans, and in many cases the associate deans. We also interviewed faculty representatives of most of the programs, and we interviewed all of the regional campus chancellors (with the exception of Kokomo); Charles Bantz, the IUPUI Chancellor and IU Executive Vice President; and Michael McRobbie, the Interim Provost of the Bloomington campus and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## **FINDINGS – SYSTEM AND CORE CAMPUS SCHOOL OPERATIONS**

Any review of the state of multi-campus schools must acknowledge a number of achievements, particularly in the development of education for the professions. The School of Medicine is the most complete and integrated of all multi-campus schools, with Centers for Medical Education in Bloomington, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Indianapolis, Lafayette, Muncie, South Bend, and Terre Haute. The School of Nursing, operating on all IU campuses except for IPFW, served as a vehicle for quickly developing and disseminating undergraduate education around the state; regional campuses that are now separately accredited typically received their first accreditation as outreach from the IUPUI campus.

The School of Social Work operates academic programs on six IU campuses, making possible accredited undergraduate and graduate social work education around the state. Working together, the IUB/ IUPUI Kelley School of Business developed the IUPUI initiated “Kelley Direct Program”, which is the highest-ranked MBA Program that has an online delivery system. There are several instances in which the complementarities of the programs developed on the IUB and IUPUI campuses have strengthened the overall reputation of the school nationally. For example, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, which has more than 23000 alumni in the 34<sup>th</sup> year since it was founded as a system school, has high national rankings for programs unique to the Indianapolis campus as well as for programs unique to Bloomington.

It is also important to state that, as alluded to in the 1985 task force report, it is obvious there is no one template that fits all IU system and core campus schools. Nor do we recommend one. Each of the schools has its own culture and method of operation. In some cases these differences are driven by the nature of the program. For example, professional licensing and program accreditation – or a lack thereof - have a definite effect on how the programs are linked together on the various campuses. In other cases the history and the national prominence of the schools drive the nature of the relationship.

It is fair to say that most of the Bloomington and Indianapolis linkages are more alike between the core campus schools and the system schools than they are for the regional campuses. Business, Education, Informatics, Library and Information Sciences, Nursing, Social Work, and SPEA are all rather similar in how they handle such key management issues on the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses as budgeting, human resource issues (including faculty appraisal and tenure deliberations), alumni relations, and fund development. They all basically operate as “one school, two campuses”. Transferability of courses and credits does not seem to be an issue in any of the core campus or system schools. Although there are some differences from time to time related to leadership

styles and specific functions, they all characterize their Bloomington / IUPUI interactions as “moderate” to “heavy”.

Some of the core campus/ system programs are quite complementary. For example, the Kelley School of Business in Indianapolis has developed joint programs with the Medical School and the School of Engineering that take advantage of the program mix available on that campus. The two campuses also jointly operate the Indiana Business Research Center; the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship; and the Randall L. Tobias Center for Leadership. SPEA in Indianapolis specializes in Criminal Justice, Urban Management and Planning, Not-for-Profit Management, and has developed joint programs and faculty appointments with the Center on Philanthropy and with the Medical School in Health Administration. In Bloomington, SPEA takes advantage of the large science programs on campus in their environmental sciences programs, runs a joint PHD in Public Policy with the large and prominent Political Science Department in Bloomington, and has a very successful joint degree with the Law School. The School of Informatics only offers the M.S. in Health Informatics in Indianapolis. M.S. degrees in Music Informatics and Cybersecurity are being developed in Bloomington and an M.S. degree in Laboratory Informatics is being developed for Indianapolis. These three are currently offered as tracks in existing M.S. Programs (respectively Human Computer Interaction Design for the first two, and Chemical Informatics for the last.)

The School of Education in Indianapolis has strong programs in special education and in leadership and administration, and the faculty members in these areas work quite closely with colleagues on the Bloomington campus. IUPUI’s urban focus also makes it essential that the School of Education at IUPUI focus on urban education – a program that has limited opportunity for the School on the Bloomington campus.

The three smaller programs on the Indianapolis campus – Continuing Studies, Music and Journalism – are less tightly interrelated. Continuing Studies operates on a very decentralized model. **The School of Continuing Studies** only has a state-wide faculty of five, four of whom are in Bloomington, and one in Indianapolis. It is not a true “school”, as in the sense of other system schools. All of its courses are taught in other departments or schools. While its degrees in General Studies are offered on all IU campuses, there is no common organizational structure among the campuses. The SCS also is responsible for Independent Study courses at IU, the IU High School Diploma Program, and the Masters Degree in Adult Education. Although the School controls the General Studies curriculum, the management, budgeting, and human resource control on the campuses are essentially delegated to the local campus administrations. Some believe there is no need to have a coordinating school for non-credit education, which is largely campus based. Non credit education requires enormous commitment to market responsiveness, which argues for bringing authority closer to the market.

The SCS is a unique and specialized program that needs to be dealt with separately from the traditional system wide professional schools. IU recently completed a study of the organization of the SCS which was endorsed by the University Faculty Council. We presume this report will now be implemented in the months ahead.

**The Music program at IUPUI** was established as a small program in the 1980's to offer non major music education. It grew to include master's degree programs in Music Technology and Music Therapy, neither of which was offered in Bloomington. The Music School does not consider itself either a system or a core campus school. They have what they regard as little effective management authority over the IUPUI program, and very little interaction. **The School of Journalism** likewise has little interaction between the two campuses. A proposal is currently under discussion on the IUPUI campus to relocate both the Music program and the Journalism program to the IUPUI School of Liberal Arts. This would probably eliminate any programmatic links between the Bloomington and the Indianapolis campuses in Music and Journalism.

It should be noted that the recently appointed Dean of the School of Journalism has expressed a willingness to develop a plan for building relationships and interactions with both the Indianapolis campus and the regional campuses, if the IU Administration is interested in moving in this direction. The news media industry is presently undergoing significant changes, as it is impacted by changing newspaper circulation and consolidations, new TV and radio broadcast technologies, and the expanding use of the internet as a means of getting news online. (e.g., Britons aged 15 – 24 say they spend almost 30% less time reading national newspapers once they start using the web.) Given the importance of this industry to our society, it seems to us that before the Bloomington / IUPUI relationship is dissolved, it would be worth another examination of the possibility of strengthening the relationship in Journalism between the two campuses, and possibly even exploring how they might benefit by working more closely with the regional campuses. However, given the accreditation requirements of these programs, as well as needed technological investments and other expenses to be a "player", it is not an uncomplicated matter. Any examination of this possibility could benefit from including industry representation in the deliberations.

For the system schools also operating on the regional campuses, there is a great deal of variety in the level of overall school involvement on the campuses. With the exception of Social Work (see below detail), none of the programs have budgetary responsibility for any of the school's regional campus programs. Neither are they typically involved in fund development on the regional campuses. The system schools usually have an associate dean who spends 15 – 30 % of his or her time on system issues such as academic program changes and personnel evaluation. The School Deans, or their Associate Deans, normally attend such ceremonial functions as commencement exercises or annual alumni functions. Of course it is IU policy that any IU degree from either a system or core campus school states the degree name (for example, a Masters in Public Affairs, from the School of Public and Environmental Affairs) "Awarded at XYZ Campus."

Since its formation in 1972, the **School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA)** has operated as a "system school" on five campuses—Bloomington, Indianapolis, South Bend, Fort Wayne and Northwest. Each of the five historic campuses supports both the undergraduate degree in public affairs (BSPA) and the graduate professional degree, the Master of Public Affairs (MPA). In the early 1980's, other campuses of Indiana

University entered the SPEA system. Kokomo has now emerged as a SPEA Division, and offers the BSPA. It is seeking approval for the Masters in Public Management (a mid-career degree recently initiated at IPFW). Campuses at IU East and IU Southeast have mounted baccalaureate programs in criminal justice; however, there is no distinct SPEA unit on those campuses.

SPEA, the first “system school” in IU, still is actively involved in academic program oversight – academic program changes on all campuses must go through SPEA central review processes. Promotion and tenure decisions in the SPEA programs on the regional campuses pass through SPEA’s central Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as the local campus committees. For the past several years, each SPEA campus MPA (Masters in Public Affairs) program has been accredited separately by the national accrediting authority, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).

With the exception of Regional Campus budgets (the Dean sets the budgets for Bloomington and Indianapolis) and shared hiring decisions, the Dean has substantial responsibility on all other matters of governance, as shaped by the policies and decisions promulgated by three School-wide entities:

- 1) The SPEA Policy Committee—with elected faculty representatives on a proportional basis from across the campuses and with the Dean presiding--deliberates and acts on questions of a major University-wide policy nature;
- 2) The Council of Administrators-- with membership designated by formal position across the campuses and with either the Dean or a designated campus director presiding-- addresses the School’s administrative issues, especially on curricula and other matters delegated by the Policy Committee;
- (3) The Academic Council--with membership of all the faculty across the campuses and with the Dean convening-- legislates on matters submitted by the Policy Committee and the Council of Administrators via an electronic docket (with extraordinary matters not resolvable by that docket to appear at its Annual Conference or a special meeting) and convenes in person annually on either major matters of policy or innovative ideas and strategies. The use of this “docket” technology has eased the intercampus (and even within campuses) meeting requirements of the School. At the same time, we heard some comments from the regional campuses that there are now fewer opportunities to get acquainted with faculty colleagues on other campuses.

In addition, SPEA has a Board of Visitors whose purview is the entire School across all campuses. There is an effort to appoint members of the Board to reflect the diversity of campus constituencies whether in a geographic sense or from a professional and academic perspective. The Board is advisory to the Dean especially on matters of: outreach to all SPEA constituencies including prospective donors; competitiveness in the



marketplace; contemporary trends in the professional fields germane to academic expertise; and emerging developments in public and environmental affairs.

**The University's School of Nursing** state wide involvement has evolved over time. Dean Emily Holmquist worked to turn the offerings at IUB and IUPUI into one degree in the 1960's. Development on the regional campuses began in the 1970's. The School is now more like a federation than it is a system. There is one governance structure for the University School, which was reorganized and streamlined last year. This structure is called the University Nursing Faculty (UNF). There are now three committees (executive, curriculum and student affairs) with one representative from each campus. The university faculty as a whole meets once a year during the Culbertson Symposium – a day long faculty development opportunity. The deans and directors of the 8 programs meet in person 3 times a year. The University Dean attends all graduations and visits each campus one additional time each year at the invitation of the dean at that program.

In comparison to the nursing programs on the five regional campuses (IUE, IUK, IUN, IUSB, IUS), each of which is separately accredited, undergraduate education at IUPUC and IUB is closely associated with IUPUI because they are accredited as one unit. The IUPUC faculty report to the chancellor of the Columbus campus and those at IUB report to an assistant dean at IUB. However, the faculty in the BSN program at IUPUC and IUB are assigned to departments at IUPUI (unlike all other campuses). This structure is called “the corridor” (IUPUI, Columbus and Bloomington). Faculty at all three campuses then serve on “corridor committees” for curricula, faculty affairs, etc.

Nursing no longer has centralized tenure consideration of regional campus faculty but tenure-track positions on the regional campuses need the University Dean's opinion for a promotion and/or tenure decision (the Dean is part of the formal process). There is a document that is used by all campuses that describes exemplars of behavior at each professorial level for tenure-track and clinical-track faculty appointments; however the portfolios are not assessed by a central IUSON committee. The University Dean is asked to write a formal letter of recommendation for any tenure track decision/promotion. The University Nursing Faculty's Curriculum Committee and Student Affairs Committee, ensure consistency in undergraduate offerings across campuses so transfer is not a problem, but only “substantive” changes are considered, meaning that each campus has the right to use different books and meet goals in different ways. Individual faculty from each campus who qualify are members of the IUPUI based Graduate Curriculum Committee. Some faculty members from the regional campuses have taught graduate courses offered both on-line and in regular classroom settings. All federally funded researchers in the School of Nursing reside on the IUPUI campus.

**The School of Education**, under IU's classification, is a Core Campus, not a system school, but it does have relationships on the regional campuses that are codified in a “Constitution for the Governance of Professional Education Programs in Indiana University”, and are helpful to the academic programs and the profession they serve. The School has a legislative body known as the “Education Council”, which is chaired by the University Dean. This academic governance organization is elected state wide and

