

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 20, 2009**  
**Indiana Memorial Union – Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Randy Arnold, Robert Arnove, Bruce Burgun, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Angela Courtney, Jon Dilts, Erika Dowell, Lessie Jo Frazier, Thomas Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Mary Gray, Robert Hatten, Patricia Henderson, Brian Horne, Robert F. Jacobs, Paul Losensky, Jack McCarthy, Patrice Madura, Michael Morrone, Robert Noel, Elizabeth Raff, John Raglin, Michael Rushton, Ranu Samantrai, Peter SerVaas, Deborah Shaw, Richard Shockley, Herbert Terry, Vasti Torres, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Sue Whiston, James Wimbush, David Wise

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Rob Aspy (Martin Hadley), Sarita Soni (Geoffrey Conrad)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Eric Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Purnima Bose, Arthur Bradley, Gregory Demas, Carrie Donovan, Lucas Fields, Julia Fox, Valerie Grim, Karen Hanson, Patrick Harbison, Claudia Johnson, Michael Jolly, Padraic Kenney, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Valerie Markley, Jennifer Miller, Jenna Morrison, Diane Reilly, Eric Sandweiss, Sonya Stephens, Richard Stryker, Alex Tanford, Neil Theobald

**GUESTS:** Amanda Ciccarelli, Galen Claviok, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Ann Elsner, Pete Goldsmith (Dean of Students), Robert Goodman (HPER Dean), Tracy James, Elizabeth Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Dae Hee Kwak, Choong Hoon Lim, Bryan McCormick, Debbie O’Leary, Jonathan Plucker, Erin Rykken (Faculty Council Office), Sue Talbot (Trustee)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

September 15, 2009: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/09-10/09.15.09.pdf>

2. Resolution Honoring Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B8-2010.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

Circular B4-2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B4-2010.pdf>

Circular B5-2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B5-2010.pdf>

Circular B6-2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B6-2010.pdf>

Circular B7-2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B7-2010.pdf>

4. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(President Dowell)

5. Update on the Core School Deans Review Task Force. (20 minutes)  
(Professor Jonathan Plucker, Chair of the Core School Deans Review Task Force)  
[DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/auxiliary/deandraft.pdf>

6. Discussion of the Formation of the School of Public Health on the Bloomington Campus.

(30 minutes)

(Bob Goodman, Dean of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation)

[DISCUSSION]

<http://www.hper.indiana.edu/initiative/index.html>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/auxiliary/HPERdoc.pdf>

7. Introduction of the new Dean of Students (20 minutes)

(Pete Goldsmith, Dean of Students and Vice Provost for Student Affairs) [DISCUSSION]

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or President Dowell should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)

## Minutes

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**DOWELL:** Alright, we'll get started. Thank you all for being here today. Can you hear me alright? Yeah? Okay. Good.

Well, welcome. Provost Hanson can't be here today. She's at a hospital board meeting in West Virginia. Hopefully we'll have her presence at the rest of our meetings for this academic year but she's had a number of scheduling problems this first part.

First item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the September 15, 2009 meeting. Do we have any corrections? Yes?

**WISE:** On page 3 near the bottom, there's in my quote there's an ellipsis. It should be "the Committee on Program Merger/Reorganization/Elimination."

**DOWELL:** Alright, Craig do you have that? Anything else? Do I have a motion to approve?

**GIERYN:** Is Sonya Stephens' name corrected throughout? "ph?"

**DOWELL:** Anything else? I'll wait longer this time. Okay, do I have a motion to approve? Second? Yes. Thank you. All in favor? [Aye] Abstentions? Nays? Very good.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: RESOLUTION HONORING NOBEL LAUREATE ELINOR OSTROM**

**DOWELL:** Alright, Agenda Committee — oh, sorry, next we have a very happy thing to do which is a resolution in honor of Elinor Ostrom. And I will read it now for the record.

WHEREAS, Elinor (Lin) Ostrom, Arthur F. Bentley Professor of Political Science and Professor, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, and Senior Research Director, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, began her academic career as a Visiting Assistant Professor at Indiana University in 1965,

WHEREAS, Lin Ostrom co-founded (with her spouse and long-time collaborator Vincent Ostrom) the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis in 1973 and served as one of its co-directors until July 2009,

WHEREAS, Lin co-founded (with Emilio Moran, Rudy Professor of Anthropology) CIPEC, the Center for the Study of Institutions, Population and Environmental Change in 1996 and served as one of its co-directors until 2006,

WHEREAS, Lin co-founded (with colleagues in Economics, Geography, Political Science, and Psychology) the Inter-Disciplinary Experimental Laboratory in Woodburn Hall in 2004,

WHEREAS, Lin helped lead the Workshop and CIPEC to become globally recognized leaders in interdisciplinary research, with multi-faceted research programs that have identified the many ways in which local communities throughout the world have crafted creative ways to successfully manage resources critical to their own survival, while also identifying the severe challenges such communities can face in the context of increasing globalization,

WHEREAS, Lin has served as mentor to numerous Indiana University students, as well as many postdoctoral and visiting scholars, and has actively involved them as full participants in interdisciplinary research teams,

WHEREAS, Lin's research has integrated multiple methods of research and has been disseminated in hundreds of scientific papers and such widely influential books as *Governing the Commons* and *Understanding Institutional Diversity*,

WHEREAS, Lin's research accomplishments have been recognized by her election to the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences,

WHEREAS, Lin has served in many leadership positions in department, university, and professional service, including as chair of Political Science, President of the American Political Science Association and President of the Public Choice Society,

WHEREAS, Lin serves as an inspiration to her many colleagues at Indiana University and at institutions around the world,

WHEREAS, the truly extraordinary nature of Elinor Ostrom's contributions has been recognized by her selection by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences as a co-recipient of the 2009 Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel, "for her analysis of economic governance, especially the commons,"

BE IT RESOLVED that the Bloomington Faculty Council congratulates and honors Elinor Ostrom for her many accomplishments during her 45 years of dedicated service to the Faculty of Indiana University, Bloomington. [Applause]

**DOWELL:** Alright. Moving along, let's see. Agenda Committee business. You have a number of circulars before you, these are circulars that relate to the nominations for the election of next year's Council. Yes?

**WHEELER:** Do we need to vote on the resolution?

**DOWELL:** I suppose we should, actually. I'm sorry. I skipped that. Shall we vote in favor of the approval of this resolution in honor of Lin Ostrom? Yes? All in favor? [Aye] Okay. Thank you, Bill. Sorry about that.

Okay, back to the circulars. These are lists of people who are eligible to nominate people to serve on the Faculty Council or for election to serve on the Council. It also includes a list of those ineligible for reelection either because they have recently served on the Council for two consecutive terms or because they are currently serving on the Council and have another year left to serve. You should have received one of these lists as part of a packet of materials seeking nominations for the next round of elections to the Faculty Council. And they are due back on November 6<sup>th</sup> or before. Any questions on our exciting circulars for today? Okay, thank you.

Also on Agenda Committee business, I am happy to report that we did find a volunteer to serve as election supervisor for the coming year. I imposed on another librarian, Virginia Sojdehei in the Information Commons Undergraduate Services has agreed to serve for the coming year and this year we should also put together the procedure to elect or select, whatever successors to her since I don't think we can expect anyone to serve for thirty plus years as our previous supervisor did.

I also have, as part of the business, a response to an earlier issue, or an earlier request that was made, perhaps you remember, in our first Council meeting. We had a request from BFC member David Wise to ask – he was asking at that time for a new mandatory procedure to be put in place to inform newly elected members of the Council of the polling results of his or her election. That matter has been referred to committee and is still in committee as far as some kind of particular procedure or policy but in the interim, Professor Wise is concerned about the timeliness of such information and he's actually offered to send out this information himself, but I suggest as an alternative that the BFC office will send out this information. So if you are a newly elected Council member, expect to receive an email, should be tomorrow, listing the polling results for your particular seat. And you can let me know how you feel about that and if you have any particular opinions on the formation or not of some kind of policy related to the dissemination of this information. And I should note that the full results of the election are available to anyone upon request if you're interested.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

That's all I have for the Agenda Committee business. Karen isn't here, but if there are any questions that we have from the floor? That I can't answer or that we can refer to Karen, okay? I think that part of the business is going to go fast today.

Alright then I think we want to move on to an update on the Core School Deans Review Task Force from Jonathan Plucker.

### **AGENDA ITEM 4: UPDATE ON THE CORE SCHOOL DEANS REVIEW TASK FORCE**

**PLUCKER:** Thank you. You should have the most recent draft in front of you. It's a white piece of paper among the stack of yellow pieces of paper that you have. I believe it was the provost who asked that we look into this. Is that correct? Is that right? We started May/June-ish of this past year, we worked straight through the summer. Essentially there was no, and actually there is no policy, for how we do administrative review of core school deans. There's an Indianapolis policy for Indianapolis deans, there's a specific Bloomington policy for Bloomington deans, but there wasn't one for core school deans. So what we did with faculty from both campuses is we pretty much took the best pieces of both policies which sounds a lot easier than it is when we really came down to it. And this is a general characterization but I think it's fair. The Indianapolis policy had lots of really good content but was wordy to say the least and a

little bit hard to wade through. The Bloomington policy was much more concise to the point of considerable confusion. And so we really tried to preserve the nice, concise format of the Bloomington policy, but really flesh it out.

Some of the key things that the task force kept coming back to—just clarification—who's on the review committee, who appoints members, who nominates members, what's the procedure once the committee is formed, how do results get summarized, reported back, etc... Transparency, fairness—both to those providing input and those being reviewed—, usefulness, and then certainly inclusiveness—who should actually be involved in providing feedback. Interestingly, the big piece that we've run into lately is trying to figure out under procedures 1 and 2 exactly what the core schools are. But we think we're pretty close to getting that hammered out. Social work actually should not be listed. It's a systems school not a core school and optometry should be listed under Indianapolis. We think those are the two and then SPEA needs to be moved down to Indianapolis. That was as of an hour ago we were still trying to figure that part out. So that actually proved to be one of the harder parts. I'm not going to walk through every single section of this just to spare you that, but I will point out a few changes and then there's one section in particular that we would like your feedback on.

Item 4 on page 2 A through G that bleeds over to the top of page 3 is about how the committee is nominated and appointed. There's a lot of clarification needed there in both campus policies. We believe it's much more straightforward now. Section 5 on page 3 deals with the questions to be asked. The questions that are suggested in both campus policies are very similar. We thought that you know, for example, on number 1 we thought that Indianapolis worded theirs a bit more constructively, et cetera, et cetera... And so we tinkered with those but there's no major changes there. Section 6 is brand new. And the purpose of section 6, how to word this delicately, when we started to talk to people, a lot of people really didn't think that the reviews were all that helpful. They didn't see the results being used very much. They were worried that the results were a little too one-sided sometimes. And when we started to talk about how these reviews actually occur, there seems to be a wide range of practices. One thing that we really wanted to encourage core school dean review committees to do was to avoid solely relying on survey results. We're not saying this has to be a referee journal publishable quality but it should at least pretend to approach that and many of them have not. And so that's why we added section 6.

Section 7 describes the pieces of the report. We actually simplified that a little bit. Section 8 is procedure after the report, the first draft of the report is produced. And here's where we clarified -- 'due process' is not the right word since no one has been accused of anything -- but we did think that it was fair for both the deans and the review committees to have ample opportunity to respond to comments and written responses and so I think we've clarified that fairly well.

9 is what happens with the full final report. Cut back to 10 in a second because it's probably the biggest point of contention right now. And then 11 clarifies when surveys should be conducted outside of the formal review process and then also how those surveys should be conducted. For the most part, we didn't make many substantive changes to how they should be conducted but we did try to clarify when they would be conducted. That's been fairly inconsistent I think on both campuses. So any questions on those sections before I talk about section 10 which is about dissemination? Yes?

**SHAW:** This may just be my ignorance of a novice, but this occurs in section 9 and also it's part of 11c where you refer to the dean's elected policy committee or corresponding governing body. Is the policy committee actually a governing body? I thought the faculty were the governing body.

**PLUCKER:** It originally read "policy committee" and we've actually been struggling with how to word the 'or' because not every unit that has a dean has a policy committee. Some have policy councils, some don't even call them that. We actually had to survey all of the units to see what they actually call them. It was very inconsistent. I don't think anyone really has the same title as anyone else. One or two schools could be loosely interpreted as not really having an elected faculty governing body, which is probably an issue for people to consider but was not my job. It's...

**SHAW:** My question's just about governing...

**DETHLOFF:** Yeah, that's sort of the compromise language that we came up with. The alternate language was "corresponding faculty governance body." But that language was lost in the process.

**PLUCKER:** It's also arguable whether at least one school has a faculty governance body. It could be debated a little bit. So that one also you could argue isn't elected either. So we don't know what to do there. We're open to suggestions. Bob?

**ARNOVE:** It was another question, but... number 5E: how's the unit perceived by the faculty and staff? Do you have a notion perceived in relationship to what, are there certain criteria that are considered important in gathering these perceptions?

**PLUCKER:** Not especially. We actually started to get into much more detail in all of these questions. The list was a lot longer when we first combined the two. We wanted to capture the spirit of what both policies currently suggest in terms of appropriate questions but we also didn't want to get into too much detail because we wanted the review committees to have as much leeway as possible to interpret things as they see fit. So that's why some of these border on vague and that's certainly one of them.

**ARNOVE:** And just moving back to the focus groups. Do you have any ideas exactly about how they'll be conducted and what people will be looking at in these focus groups?

**PLUCKER:** No. And I would lean toward that we don't want to get any more specific than that. Although I say that very hypocritically because when I first drafted that particular item it was much more detailed and everyone told me that was crazy. And I have seen their wisdom. So it's, you know, again, the spirit of section 6 really is, or item 6, is that it shouldn't just be surveys. Interviews, you know, conducting interviews with alumni, students can be difficult, but focus groups properly conducted could be a viable way of doing it. Document analysis, etc... Herb?

**TERRY:** One suggestion, one question. The suggestion is that it might be useful in this document to define what year is. You, I think assume, that it always means the start of an academic year or something like that. Dean Bertenthal came in in January and I think there's always been a little bit of confusion as to when his third year is and this sort of thing...

**PLUCKER:** That's a great point.

**TERRY:** it would be useful to say "calendar year" or "full year" or something to figure out what works. The other question is probably much more controversial. Has any thought been given to what notice on the Bloomington campus the president should receive of these reviews? In a sense, the core schools work not just for the campuses but they work for the system and while the Chancellor at IUPUI is the Chief Executive Officer of the Indianapolis campus, the president of Bloomington is the Chief Executive Officer of this campus although the provost is the appointing officer. And I'm just wondering if any of this information should come to the attention of the president either because these are units not simply responsible to their campuses but to the system, and then also because of the president's role on this campus.

**PLUCKER:** I'll be honest. Certainly the last part is food for thought given the president's role on this campus. We only discussed this very briefly. And when we did, the thought was that, I mean, the core school deans report to a specific provost or chancellor and if there is discussion to occur after their results are resulted, for lack of a better term, after their summarized, it's going to be interaction with that provost or chancellor where we would hope that action happens. Now, but that's not exactly what you're asking either, I realize that. You know, in terms of dissemination, what should go to the president. That's a good question. We really didn't touch on that aspect of it.

**TERRY:** Think about it.

**PLUCKER:** I am. Other questions before I jump into number 10? Tom?

**GIERYN:** I'm looking at the old policy which you described as confusing and so a couple of questions. One is, in an effort to make a policy that is less confusing for core school deans have you introduced any potential inconsistencies with the existing policy which is the generic Bloomington review of administrative policies and second, would you propose that we need to revise the policy on the Bloomington campus to take advantage of the work you've done to make them more consistent and possibly less confusing? Would you be prepared to take that on as part of this...

**PLUCKER:** I have already been told that we are going to take that on by the provost. So, sure! There are – I wouldn't actually say there are inconsistencies so much as there are clarifications between the two, which I realize is splitting a fine hair, but... When we sat down with the provost, we went through the procedures step-by-step, compared them to what she's been doing, what she can do, that is very hard to do with the current policy because it is kind of vague. And I think quite frankly, current practice doesn't necessarily match the current policy. I think this is much closer. When we were given our task over the summer, my understanding was that the next step then would be to make sure that they're consistent across both campuses. Obviously, Indianapolis wouldn't be my first concern but it certainly would be Faculty Affairs' concern on this campus. And when we met with Karen at the end of meeting we asked her, 'Now, would you like us, once this is set, to work on the next one?' She seemed pleased, so...think that's fair?

**GIERYN:** I would encourage you to consider taking that step.

**PLUCKER:** We will. We will. Thank you. Herb?

**TERRY:** In light of our continuing problems with keeping policies up to date as names of units and things like that change, I would suggest maybe that you change the procedures section a bit, and explain that these are policies that cover core school units. Explain what a core school dean is or what a core school is and what its grand dean is since they have sub-deans on each campus. And then indicate that at present -- give a date -- these deans exist and report to the Bloomington provost, these others exist and report to the IUPUI chancellor but the policy is intended to cover future core school deans as other schools are created or names change or something like that. See if we can start building into these policies the idea that they aren't as fixed as they sometimes are.

**PLUCKER:** Great. That's good. A great suggestion. Other questions before I tackle 10?

**DOWELL:** You have about 5 minutes left, so I would tackle 10.

**PLUCKER:** 10! This deals with the dissemination of the results. 9 deals with the dissemination of the final report. That was fairly clear cut. It's not much different from how things are currently done. It is different—10 is different and this is where the

provost and the task force are disagreeing a little bit here. The question is what happens after the process is said and done. The final report's been given to all the elected governance bodies, people who need to know what happened know what happened, except that nothing's been communicated back to people who participated in the review: faculty, staff, students whomever. The current Bloomington policy and the current Indianapolis policy both require that a summary be disseminated to all the relevant faculty and staff, I believe. The question has come whether that's really a personnel issue and should that summary be disseminated. And the task force has gone back and forth on this. I think it's fair to say that our current thinking is that some meaningful summary has to be disseminated. Just sending out a note that basically says, you know, 'The process is completed. We're considering the results. Thank you for your input.' Probably does not go far enough for a number of reasons only a few of which I want to touch on. But one, quite frankly, is on the Bloomington campus there is sort of this conventional wisdom, conventional attitude, that we have very powerful deans and that once participation in such a process like this doesn't really mean anything. I think it's important to have at least that summary come back so that people can see that their comments were listened to. Two, it's helpful to see how your feelings about someone match up with other people's. That can be very educational. I know it has been for me in the past. And there are other reasons but just in terms of transparency and communication, we thought that some sort of summary does need to be disseminated. Per Craig's suggestion, we went back to the provost/chancellor review policy and much of what you see in item 10 is taken almost verbatim from that. We just changed the titles a little bit. So currently the provost/chancellor would consult with the UFC Agenda Committee and the review committee chair to determine what should go into that public summary document and we're very clear that direct, verbatim quotes should not be included. And then the summary report be distributed to all faculty/staff in the applicable core school. That's where we are with it right now. Karen has not seen that yet. We were emailing about it today. She's going to consider it and get back to us. But I am interested in others' input on that point. We don't expect the IUPUI chancellor to have a problem with the current language, mostly because this matches their current practice. It has not necessarily matched our practice the last few years on this campus.

**CLARK:** What's the conflict over it? What's the objection?

**PLUCKER:** Whether there should be a summary or not.

**CLARK:** But why? What's the reason for the objection, I mean...

**PLUCKER:** That this type of review is primarily a personnel matter and personnel documents are not normally considered public. I think that's, is that fair? Tom?

**GIERYN:** Point 8 on the existing policy, and since the existing policy covers the reviews of all deans, so what we have now is actually requiring you to do not much more than what you have here in the sense that point 8 reads, "The provost in consultation with

the chair of the administrative review committee, president of the BFC, and if applicable the chair of the administrator's elected policy committee shall prepare a summary of the findings for the review report which shall be made public." So I'm puzzled as to why there would be a difference between what's required of the provost now and what you're requiring in this new policy.

**PLUCKER:** What's being required now does not necessarily match current practice. And, frankly, the provost is concerned that these are primarily personnel matters.

**GIERYN:** The provost is not conforming to number 8 is what you're suggesting as a matter of current administrative practice?

**PLUCKER:** I'm not going to say that on the record, but maybe-ish. [laughter] I think there's confusion about what should be done with the results now. So I know that there's at least one that the provost mentioned that she has that she does not know what to do with the summary. So she's kind of waiting for this. How's that? That's a more nuanced answer. I think it should be shared, personally. Bob?

**ARNOVE:** I think the feedback to the faculty and staff of the academic units are important and particularly I'm concerned that the summary report would be so bland that certain policies, practices, behaviors are not corrected because they (inaudible) own academic unit that the feedback had a big impact on the deans in terms of correcting certain behaviors that were not acceptable to the faculty and staff.

**PLUCKER:** I think that's a very, very, very important point. I think the downside, a big downside for the provost or the chancellor is that if you don't put that summary out there people will spread rumors about what was actually in the document and I think we see that all the time; specifically when it's a survey not part of a comprehensive review. Those things really haven't been disseminated all that well at least on this campus and yet everyone purports to know what was in it and yet no one has actually seen it [laughter]. It concerns me that you kind of let the conversation get away from you if you don't put something out there publicly saying, 'Here's the summary. Here's what was found. We're working on it.' It just seems, in terms of transparency in faculty governance, it just strikes me as a very appropriate idea. Herb?

**TERRY:** I agree with the idea that these should be public. And I can remember times on this campus when they were. It was generally useful and as Bob said, it tended to put some pressure on the deans to pay attention to the results. I have one suggestion for the final sentence in light of environmental concerns or something. It might be a good idea I would say since it says at the beginning of that paragraph "a public summary document," I would suggest that we notify all faculty and staff at the applicable core school of the availability of the summary rather than distribute it to them. That implies we might send printed versions or who knows what. We're probably going to put it on a

website or something, but we make sure that every faculty and staff member gets an email saying it's available and where and how.

**DOWELL:** Well I think distribution is vague enough at this point. You know we may all want it texted to ourselves in the future.

**PLUCKER:** I would like it twittered.

**DOWELL:** You would like it twittered? [laughter]

**PLUCKER:** We actually did discuss this. Availability versus dissemination. We thought that dissemination was stronger language and we thought that the PDF could be emailed to everyone, but that probably was a better way to do it. But again, that's probably almost a semantic point. Just about out of time.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**PLUCKER:** Any other questions or comments?

**HORNE:** Actually if I may, just for clarification. You know you're talking about this report, you're talking about the entire report. Not just some summary of it.

**PLUCKER:** Section 10 is just the summary. Only the specific groups mentioned in item 9 will see the final full report along with the dean's written response if he or she chooses to provide one.

**MORRONE:** When you look at the summary and the "shall determine what elements of the final report will be in the summary," it looks like some of the questions obviously should be summarized for everybody but then some of them do look like personnel questions. You know, "What are the dean's strengths and weaknesses?" I mean, that could very well be a personnel type question.

**PLUCKER:** Could be.

**MORRONE:** But "how has the dean managed resources?" That seems like something the public ought to know.

**PLUCKER:** Right. The task force, I think it's fair to say, think that the way it's set up, there's several groups that will have to agree on what goes into that. Several groups are going to be able to provide input on what actually goes into that summary document. You know, I've seen one or two from five or six years ago. Thought they were a little bit bland, a paragraph or two. It doesn't really strike me as a summary. That's more like an abstract of a summary. It didn't really tell me all that much. Given the way that this is currently set up, I would expect that we're not going to run into that problem.

**DOWELL:** Alright, thanks Jonathan. Alright then Dean Goodman, would you like to step forward? We're at item 6, discussion of the formation of a school of public health on the Bloomington campus.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: DISCUSSION OF THE FORMATION OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH ON THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS.**

**GOODMAN:** Thank you.

**DOWELL:** Thank you for being here.

**GOODMAN:** I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Council. I asked to be on the agenda today because as you no doubt know that the IU system is developing two schools of public health. One at IUPUI and the other that will transform out of the school of HPER. It's, I think, important all the way around that how we do this becomes a known quantity and I felt it was important and spoke to Erika about an opportunity to speak to you as early as we can about the processes that we're going through to build the school and engage in the dialogue around it. The three areas that I'd like to talk about, and they're informed by the handout that you should have are the compelling case of the background as to why a school of public health is important, the accreditation criteria for a school of public health and the processes by which we're transforming HPER into a school of public health.

Many of you are aware that in May, President McRobbie announced the formation of these two schools. There wasn't much, obviously, that we could do over the summer. There's not many faculty around then so we really kicked this into gear with a faculty staff retreat of 300 people at Bradford Woods on August 22<sup>nd</sup>. Let me start with a little bit of background information.

It's important to understand, oh and by the way, I want to recognize my associate dean for global and community health who's here today, someone who's not a stranger to this Council, Dr. Lloyd Kolbe. The state of Indiana is one of very few states at this point in the nation that does not have a school of public health. And yet the need for one, particularly at a state institution just seems to me to cry out. Indiana, if you were to look at the latest data provided by various organizations, the first one being the Gallup wellness survey, Indiana in terms of overall health and well being is the sixth worst state in the nation. I can go into all the details as to what those factors are but some of them will come out as I talk. At the same time, in terms of monies that come from the federal government, federal resources from CDC, NIH and other places, Indiana ranks 49<sup>th</sup> in the nation in terms of receiving public health monies for service and research. Some surveys show us at 50<sup>th</sup>. But I don't think we'll quibble between 49<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup>. I think the p-value for that is still, you know, puts us as insignificant. Significantly low. In our state, the average number of public health workers is 46 per 100,000 population where

the national average is 138 and in the Midwest it's 76. So the fact that we have very low levels of dollars coming into the state, low levels of practitioners, somewhat relates to, you know, there is some correlation between our health outcomes. In addition to that, if you were to do an economic analysis as the Milken foundation did, the Milken Institute which is a non-partisan think tank, Indiana over twenty years can with improved public health save as much as \$26.8 billion dollars split out into two things. One is the cost of care or treatment that are preventable, treatments that are preventable, and the associated loss of economic productivity. Sometimes that's in absenteeism, oftentimes a term that's used is presenteeism. Presenteeism is exemplified by not buying the car that was built on Monday, okay? I put a few charts in here to sort of graphically display why schools of public health are necessary. If you look at the first chart, if you look at mortality the numbers put us, rank us from high to low where we exist as a state. So in terms of cardiovascular disease, the rates of cardiovascular disease in this state put us at 37<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states. You know, bottom is lower than the top. In terms of cancer mortalities, we're 40<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states. Infant mortality we rank 37<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states and occupational hazards that cause death we rank at 32, at 32<sup>nd</sup>, okay? These are the factors that physicians tend to see. Physicians tend to see people when they have heart attacks, when they have cancer. They tend to see infants who are in trouble and they tend to see people once they're injured. If you look at the left side of this equation you see the causes of these conditions, often the causes of these conditions. Those other side of the equation addresses public health. These are the preventable conditions. Now, apparently these statistics indicate that we're 45<sup>th</sup> in nation in terms of smoking. Only 5 states smoke more than we do. I just met with Jeff Wigand who you might remember as Russell Crowe in the movie *The Insider*, the guy who was the whistleblower on tobacco. I guess the latest statistics put us at the very bottom. So I met with the state health commissioner, Jeff Wigand, and Tobacco-Free Indiana. I guess now apparently we rank 50<sup>th</sup>. The obesity rates in this state put us 30<sup>th</sup>. High school graduation and high school graduation highly correlates with income and health as you know, we're 36<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states and as far as public health dollars, again we're 50<sup>th</sup> or 49<sup>th</sup>. What this suggests then if you look at the top also the numbers are twice as high for underrepresented minority groups like African Americans. The number of chronic diseases are going up in summary. Health care costs are going up. Productivity is going down and economic growth goes down. If you were to go to the next chart, and if you had color slides you would see a color comparison, but if you look at the chart on the United States, you'll notice that the profile of Indiana does not reflect the Midwest. It reflects the South, which historically has the highest rates of poverty and public health concerns. So Indiana is a Southern state as far as public health goes. If you also look at that chart, you'll notice that a general trend over the last twenty years has been downward. And the trend seems to be going from 34<sup>th</sup> down to 36<sup>th</sup>. We continue on the downward slope. When we look at statistics like this in a state where we have public institutions that are already set up to help ameliorate some of the basic productivity, health and quality of life issues of the population of the state, it seems rather important that we in the university play some role. Where there are schools of public health clearly a lot of these statistics that I've been showing were

ameliorated. Everything from funding to the morbidity and mortality data. Therefore it seems to me incumbent that one of the reasons I came here was the engage in the ability to build our public health infrastructure. Being an academic, I think one of the finest ways to do that is through the academic system. We have to follow certain procedures to do this. So I want to talk about what the accreditation standards are. The national accreditation body is called CEPH. It's an acronym for Council on Education for Public Health mandated by the federal government to accredit public health programs, schools of public health. As you can see, that in order to have a bona fide accredited school of public health you need to have five core areas that are listed here: biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health sciences, health service administration, and the social/behavioral sciences. Must have five masters in public health programs across those disciplines and at least three of them must have doctoral training. We need to have five faculty in each of these cores, or at least five equivalents where you have the doctoral program, the faculty there need to be five faculty per one hundred percent faculty. In other words they can't be split positions. You can't come up to the five by having a fifty-fifty split to make an FTE. I want to then give you a sense of where we are in HPER in terms of our numbers to build a school and then to talk about the process by which we're doing it. Currently in HPER, if you noticed if you were to break down faculty according to these five disciplines, you'll notice that right now we're only three positions short of having what we need for a school of public health. And in addition to that, areas like the behavioral and social sciences, the community sciences where a lot of the interaction is with direct community groups the ability to build infrastructure with these groups in training and putting our students into jobs, suggests that behavioral and social science is our strong suit. In essence, to build a school of public health for accreditation we only need three more positions. However, right now we're hiring eight more positions because I don't believe that we should have just the minimum. We want to have the capacity to do bigger things so we're trying to start with a little bit above the minimum. Obviously, of those eight we're not necessarily recruiting a social and behavioral science now, but obviously it's biostatistics, health administration, more epidemiologists and environmental health sciences. Those searches are active and ongoing now. The challenge for us is actually in the next picture. What you have on the left side in the darker boxes are the departments or the concentrations that are necessary. What you have on the right are the current configurations of HPER. The challenge for us is to figure out how we integrate the two. My experience in HPER, one of the reasons I wanted to come here, was that I think that the HPER model is actually a better model for the 21<sup>st</sup> century than any school of public health I've been in. And having had a tawdry and twisted career I've been in several schools of public health: University of North Carolina School of Public Health, University of South Carolina, recently University of Pittsburgh, I was out at the Wake Forest School of Medicine in their department of public health as well, and I've probably missed a school of public health somewhere. But I can tell you that HPER schools, because of their focus more on wellness/quality of life which has been underemphasized in schools of public health that tend to focus more on the epidemiological side and the prevention of disease, HPER to me seems to be more holistic and comprehensive model for a school

of public health. It seems to me indefensible not to have departments like kinesiology or at least kinesiology specialists in the school of public health because they deal with some important public health issues. For instance, with the secular drift towards an older population, falls are one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality. Kinesiologists play a tremendous role in trying to rectify imbalance, you know, physical imbalance. Things like occupation health and safety which exists in our department of applied health science. We have a region five certified center, training center that's an OSHA center. Can help us deal with some of the occupational and safety health hazards that I've already pointed to. So it seems to me that our approach to building a school of public health is not to replicate the past but to start with the model that we have on campus and to feather in the things that we need. Now that's not to say we're necessarily going to have the same departmental configurations that we have now. We're embarking on a process to look at a way of rearranging what we have now without eliminating any programs, but adding more to the mix to be accredited so that we develop the necessary synergies to create not only a new type of school of public health, but one that's quite effective in synergizing opportunities and one that can become a paragon for others to look at as they try to construct things in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The method for doing this in brief, I know I don't have a lot of time to talk today so I'm giving you the overviews. If you look at the last diagram this is the construct that we've developed in brief for how we're going about our work. You can see that to the right of the dean, I have a transition team. The transition team is made up of tenured associate and full professors. They give me somewhat informal advice on the issues at hand. Things like, if you look towards the bottom, how we configure our new departments, new and revised degrees, obviously we need to build some masters in public health degrees and some doctoral programs. We do have an accredited master in public health program in applied health science and a doctoral program, but we obviously need to build new degree programs. We have 18 centers, I believe, centers and institutes in the school itself. Everything from the large ones, auxiliaries like Recsports to Bradford Woods to the Center for Sexual Health Promotion, to the Eppley Institute, many, many, many centers. So how do they configure into the new school? Then we need to talk about space allocation. Some of you who've been following the news know that the commission on higher education just approved our funding package to build 32,000 extra square feet in our courtyard which will allow us quite a bit more classroom/faculty space and laboratory space. But how we use that is important. We obviously have search and screen committees for the 8 new positions that are currently active. We want to link with all other schools on the campus. We have mechanisms for doing that but also the other campuses, public and private agencies through the state, we have a committee doing that. We have a committee that's looking at support structures, advising and so forth and ultimately the naming of the school. President McRobbie and the IU Board of Trustees has asked that we come up with a vision plan for this. I would say late winter would be reasonable of 2010. So a lot of the work that we're doing prefatory is being done in a highly participatory way around these committees which I'll amplify in a second here. If the IU Board of Trustees approves our vision statement, how we're going to go about things, then we'll go ahead and change

our name that will include public health in the title. Once we change our name, our so called accreditation clock, we're all familiar with clocks, in this case we have a two year clock to be fully accredited. In essence, we're spending our year now in what I consider a pre-formation stage so that we can align ourselves internally and with our colleagues across campus and other places in the state so that by the time our accreditation clock starts ticking many of the issues that will need to be resolved are resolved in advance. The committees, let me talk about them for a second. They're all set up. They're about to have full day retreats, the first four of these committees at the end of the month: October 29, 30, and 31. They'll be meeting here. The committees are composed of and based on the guidelines that are in our manual you have several senior administrators who sit across all of these committees for continuity. The chair of our Academic Council who's here, Dr. Jack Raglin also sits across these so that there's continuity between the Academic Council and these committees and then you have representatives from all three of our departments in the division, faculty in all three of the departments, staff on all of these committees, students both at the graduate and undergraduate level for a range of anywhere between 15 and 30 people on a committee, depending on what the committee is. Some of them are a little more complex. You can imagine like departmental reconfigurations they might require more input. We have therefore put these committees together. The first four will be meeting with consultants that I've hired to help facilitate the process. The committees that are more academic in nature like the departmental reconfiguration committees or the changes in our centers and institutes, I've hired Dr. Noreen Clark who's the former dean of school of public health at Michigan, one of our aspirational institutions. She's a fellow at the Institute of Medicine, former president of the American Public Health Association and the Society for Public Health Education and currently the Myron Wegman Professor of Chronic Disease. She runs the chronic disease center at the University of Michigan. She's also been responsible recently helping the New York City School of Public Health set up a coordinated school of public health across their system so I couldn't have brought a better person to facilitate the meeting. For meetings that happen more around practitioner issues and some detailed curricular issues like what courses do we need for our MPH program, how do we put staff configurations together, I hired Mr. Randy Schwartz who's currently the Executive Vice President for the American Cancer Society, New England region, former director of the state of Maine's Chronic Disease branch, former president of the Society for Public Health Education and editor for the last five years of the Journal of Health Promotion Practice, a leading practitioner journal in our field to deal with the practitioner sides of our committee work. I met with both of them in a pre-meeting to talk about how, you know, the issues that will emerge and surface and they will facilitate the meeting of the committees I've mentioned that are on your list here at the end of this month. Last Friday, I had a meeting of our deans associates. Deans associates are made up of people who are fairly well regarded in their fields, business people -- a senior administrator of Centers for Disease Control, a member of the Ice Miller legal firm which represents us and others of that ilk to start giving us some pre-feedback on some of the issues that should surface. That information will all go to the committees for their deliberation. In addition, the committees are getting

documents like, for instance, department configurations, we sent out maybe eight models of schools that are similar to ours in aspiration so that there's data or there is information going to these committees so that they can base their judgments on, you know, they don't have to reinvent the wheel, but they can look at things. I think the most critical thing I want to point out is we just did a survey of all of our faculty in terms of where the current programs best would fit in the new configuration. We received the results of the survey yesterday and we will feed this into the committees for their decision making. Data for their decision making as well. One of the nice things I can tell you in looking at the summary data, we asked questions like "When you look at how we're trying to fit these into new clusters, clusters, affinities by discipline, areas of interest and study, how many of them deviate from the spirit of starting with the HPER configuration and how many are quite consistent in building with HPER, one being not consistent at all, five being very consistent." The third pole and I know there are survey researchers in here was 'don't know/not sure' As a middle pole, I'm not sure that's the best middle pole, but it was there. I can tell you that by looking at the data, I didn't reproduce the chart, the preponderance of people rate things in the four and five. 50 people out of 80 or 90 responded between four and five, twenty of the category of three, so you can see very relatively few people, I think 18, are giving it a one or two rating. Then when we broke this down by departments, very similar. If you look over the ratings over departments, all departments were consistent in ratings and then we broke them down to look at tenure line faculty and others.

**DOWELL:** It might be time to open up to questions, you're getting close to...

**GOODMAN:** Okay, I'm finishing right here. What I'm simply saying is that the receptivity we're getting from the faculty in terms of this feedback tends to show us that we are following the spirit of looking at what we currently have and then trying to start with that to morph in another direction. So, in general, what I hope that you're getting from my presentation and in summary, there's a tremendous need in this state that can't be ignored. I think it would be irresponsible to ignore it. When HPER is already positioned to extend itself to develop a 21<sup>st</sup> century model, after all we're the oldest school of our type in the nation. We've been in existence for 62 years and after a while a routine can become a rut if we're not looking for the opportunities to grow and develop. Number three, the process is highly participatory and in the spirit of faculty governance and what we hope will result at the end of this is a consensus vision that we can then take to the IU Board of Trustees, obviously percolating up for some issues through our Academic Council, you know Bloomington Faculty Council, you can see them all listed here where appropriate. So I wanted to give you some sense of the process so that we can begin engaging in a discussion that's sort of open and the process isn't hopefully strange or convoluted or hidden. And I thank you for the opportunity and welcome questions and comments.

**DOWELL:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** I think this is very exciting. At the same time I'm struck by there's a certain silo-ness about this. You know, in particular, doctoral degrees are normally part of the graduate school. I don't see any discussion in here about the graduate school and another issue that jumps out, I'm not a statistician myself but the campus has struggled for forty years on the organization of statistics and we thought that we'd finally achieved some closure on that with the creation of a statistics department that does have biostatisticians in it and so on the one hand, it's described as participatory but I don't see anywhere in your diagram that the graduate school, I don't see any discussions with the College about the statistics department, and I don't see any Campus Curriculum Committee anywhere in your thoughts on this because the degrees are going to have to be approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee representing all the schools.

**GOODMAN:** Well let me, it sounds like there are about three things in there. Let me take them one at a time. I think that probably has to do more with the brevity of the presentation. HPER is a very siloed school. The department I'm in is Applied Health Science. The idea of a committee meeting there would be getting five health educators together, or in another department, five kinesiologists. The new structure is actually looking at aspirational groups; not professional identity, but aspirational identity. Are you, for instance, mainly working around a wellness issue? And then what we're trying to do is to provide clusters, and for research this is extremely important, and also for teaching that are made up of people from multi-disciplinary disciplines so that can become trans-disciplinary. That's very intentional in the way we're doing things, albeit it might not come out here. The reason I was emphasizing the survey is because the survey was organized around affinity clusters rather than the typical departments so that we can get away from siloing. The second way I believe we can get away from siloing is as we have discussions around our centers and institutes, faculty don't engage in them very much right now. But those are where the research engines are. And the more we can have faculty from all clusters and all departments focusing on central research issues that we have the capacity through grant writers in our centers to develop, that's another way we're planning on reducing you know siloing and creating more of a trans-disciplinary mechanism.

Secondly, as far as we talk about degrees, you'll notice here that we are talking about doctoral, masters and other degrees. These degrees obviously need to go through all of the necessary structures and in fact we're doing that. Let me give you an example; even though at the bachelor's level accreditation for a school of public health does not really encompass undergraduate work. Currently the Bachelor of Science in public health resides in SPEA. We've already signed a memorandum of understanding with Dean Graham and it's going through the necessary processes now to extend a coordinated Bachelor of Science in public health between SPEA and us. By the same token, we're developing a joint JD/MPH degree, you know, for people who want to focus on public health law. I can go from school to school to show you where we're trying to develop these types of linkages. I literally can do that with every school. At the

graduate level as these degrees are developing, obviously they need to go through similar types of committees and similar types of committee structures. Some of the degrees for instance in biostatistics where we already have a statistics department. We obviously need to have five biostatisticians because otherwise we won't be accredited. The first thing I did was sit down with the chair of biostatistics and a representative -- I'm sorry statistics -- and a representative from statistics is on the search committee. Similarly, where we have health administration hires, there's a representative from SPEA on those committees. So wherever there's been sort of an overlap with other schools, those schools are represented in our hiring process and we're also talking about joint hires as well. So those discussions are going on but not perhaps as well reflected in the document you're seeing. In actuality they are going on. Yes?

**ARNOVE:** You certainly have established a need for these public health practitioners. You propose reconfiguring HPER to provide a supply of these needed people. But here's the problem. Supply doesn't guarantee demand for these people. (Inaudible) in economics. That is without public policy that provides the funds or the opportunities for these people to be employed and this is the context, these people may go out of state or not be able to provide the service that's required. So what kind of demand is there? There's a problem, that doesn't mean there's an effective demand.

**GOODMAN:** You know, in my field which is basically public health community organizing, the kinds of things that you talk about are not stopping points they're starting points. Okay? We always see these types of roadblocks in the work we do and they always end up being starting points. I mentioned that, and you can see by the data, our strongest suit is in behavioral/social science and community science. Our approach because of the nature of the need in the state is to work at a community level forming community coalitions around public health with local community constabularies like the superintendent of schools, the mayor, the fire chief, the police chief, the judicial system, local businesses. We'll be using because inter—you know we have to have practicum interns—we'll be using faculty consonant practitioners and our students to start working with local communities to establish a base for coordinating local visioning around health and community wellness and then what we're -- we hope is and I think in other places this somewhat proves true -- is that when you engage in a dialogue like this and people start seeing the benefit at the local levels for the type of work you can do, it develops receptivity towards hiring people into the infrastructure which is woefully lacking now. Now being a social ecologist that's not the only thing we're doing. We're also trying to approach this on a policy level and levels in between like mediating structures which our school will be which is to provide the training institution. So by engaging very actively in local communities, and we're already sort of trying to start this in Bedford as a way of highlighting our approach, we feel that we can start developing receptivity over time to hiring more people. In my opinion, this is extremely important. When we talk about life sciences initiative, we often talk about high technology in jobs on the high end. To me, it's intimate to what life sciences initiative ought to be about, which is to develop a local infrastructure. Unless we have the opportunities to offer,

you know to educate, offer and train people and then engage with local communities so they see the benefit of doing this and at the same time developing policy avenues to make this happen, it's not going to happen. So, yes, you're right it's an impediment but we're trying to be strategic about overcoming that impediment.

**DOWELL:** Herb?

**TERRY:** This is probably the largest restructuring of the focus of a school that I can remember in my thirtysome years here. On a much smaller level when programs or schools or whatever have similarly restructured/reorganized, they've turned out to need tremendous resources for some period of time for undergraduates and graduate students in progress to somehow or other complete the old degree requirements and the old courses before they put the new curriculum in place. Indeed in some places here it's taken six years for departments to stop offering undergraduate courses that people in progress need. Do you have a plan for those resources or a timetable or an idea of how long it will take to get the current students out and the new ones in to assure the students they'll finish their degree?

**GOODMAN:** Very good question! Number one, you know, I don't know what will surface out of our discussions. Certainly that will guide what we do. I think what we might do are consolidate a few degrees; for instance, it doesn't make sense to have a degree in health promotion and a degree in public health education that basically do the same thing. And in fact, one of them you get the MPH degree which actually has more marketability. So there might be some, you know, combining, okay? The nature of the process is such that it's going to take two years of transition anyway to move to a school of public health and since we're not going to be giving up many of our degrees anyway, you know we'll have public health degrees but we're not giving up any of our certification programs like the registered dieticians program would be a good example. Since none of these are going away, the public health ends up being value added. Therefore I think that for the very few people who might have a degree consolidated, they can always, you know – I think you always sort of have to go back to the original agreement that the student came in on and obviously we'll honor that. We have enough faculty in place to honor that. The school has 160 faculty. I don't anticipate that being a problem. We're simply not giving up that many degrees. I think in any case if you look at how many degrees HPER offers, we're very hyperactive. We probably need to consolidate anyway. So, Herb, whether we were moving to a school of public health or not we probably need to go through the exercise of looking at whether we are, you know, offering the best configurations of degrees anyway.

**DOWELL:** Mary?

**GRAY:** I was going to ask, too, a nuts and bolts question. Are there other schools of public health in Indiana at other universities and for the 48<sup>th</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> and maybe even 46<sup>th</sup> lowest publicly funded states, do they have schools of public health? So I think in a

lot of ways you're making a persuasive causal argument and I don't know that creating a school of public health even though I'd be the last one who wants to stand in that path, you know, I'm not convinced that that's going to produce better health outcomes for the state of Indiana.

**GOODMAN:** Right, there are a couple of -- first of all, the first question. There are zero schools of public health in the state of Indiana. Every state around us has at least one, okay? The argument about the causal relationship between a school of public health and ameliorating morbidity and mortality: in a way the problem in public health is you're always trying to prove a negative. How do you prove that your intervention stopped how many children from smoking? From taking up smoking? How many teens do not become pregnant because of an intervention? So we're always proving something in the absence. One of the ways we can prove this and yeah, then we get into the argument of whether the association is causal or spurious in a sense -- I tend to think it's causal -- is that we can watch trends over time. Everything from employment, do we end up with more employment, do we end up with better morbidity and mortality data? I know for this for sure, you know, right now last year we had our record year for bringing in research dollars to our school, probably around eleven/twelve million. This year we surpassed that record and hit our highest year at about thirteen million. By simply naming ourselves a school of public health, we open ourselves up to venues for funding that we didn't have before like the Centers for Disease Control. Our funding can probably go up about 10 million dollars just in a name change and that has to have a palpable effect. Now whether it extends out to morbidity and mortality, that's an open question. There are states if you go down the list, one of the schools, I don't think I mentioned it actually on that sort of tawdry list of my tawdry career. I was also at the Tulane School of Public Health, okay? Louisiana is way down there. You know we're playing with Louisiana which is okay if you want *étouffée*, but not if you want good public health. What I can tell you is in the notion of the absence, the state of Louisiana has woeful public health statistics but without a school of public health feeding the infrastructure for that state I fear to know what would happen. The former, and just to give you an instance, so subtle an instance of how this works, the former chair of the department that I was in, prior to that was the head of maternal and child health for the state health department and he's now the commissioner for public health for New York City because their commissioner moved to become the director of CDC. So what I'm suggesting to you is in all cases, while I might not be able to prove a negative, it has to be something we do because there are so many positives even if it's in bringing in more research dollars, educating our students better, providing more of an educated workforce for the state, being persuasive to hire people, how can we not do that, you know? And then we can track the data and we will track the data largely -- you can imagine we'd use trend data for some of these types of things that, you know, we're looking at in morbidity and mortality and other things. And there are sophisticated ways that we can use you know statistics to see if our programs are making a difference in our research.

**DOWELL:** Bob, I'd like to ask one more – I'm sorry – I have a process question. Do you want to ask one more?

**JACOBS:** I'm just curious, I looked this thing up on the web, you know, you're accreditation and there's quite a few requirements that you have to meet to be able to get, especially the whole school, accredited. It sounds like from the way you talk you want to keep everything that's in HPER right now and, you know, I think that for excellence, you have to have a focus of some sort, you know, in order to be able to do that. Is this a shift in focus of the school or is this really just a way to generate some more money through public funding or – what are you really trying to do here? Because you even said that you thought the structure of the current school is better, more responsive to what's needed in some ways in this whole, you know, the structure, that...

**GOODMAN:** The thing to know is that schools of HPER are on the decline around the country, okay? A lot of schools are now moving to schools of public health for very good reasons. Part of the issue then becomes what's your niche in the marketplace, you know, because we're going to be competitive on grants. The thing that a school of HPER offers that I have never seen in a traditional school of public health is a focus on quality of life and wellness. When you look at departments like Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies, you know that might sound counterintuitive for a school of public health and yet as a result of the work we did with – you know, you all know about the Captain Kidd discoveries in the Dominican Republic. Today I just left a meeting with the Batey Relief Alliance, one of the largest non-profit organizations working – *bateyes* are poor communities in the Dominican Republic – as a result of that, we now have students last summer going down and doing GL coding, looking at levels of poverty, developing capacity for local communities there to build their infrastructure. We went to places where doctors were working in hospitals without gloves, latex gloves. We connected them with the Timmy Foundation which many of you know is in Indianapolis to provide supplies for these. And we can do the same thing in Indiana. So, my overall point here is what the school of public health has to offer, this new school, is a focus on wellness/quality of life and one that tends to focus more on community behaviors/social science approaches for community development and wellness. That's our place in the marketplace, you know we need to think about these things I think as social entrepreneurs sometimes. That's our place in the marketplace and it's a competitive place for us to be. When I say building on the HPER model, when you think of HPER I think of HPER, it's very easy to see it as an oleo of so many things but if you think at a grounder level the thing that connects all of the departments is a focus on health, wellness and quality of life. And so we're building on our strengths. And we are repackaging it because we think that if we don't, we die. And if we reconstruct it we can be very powerful as a model for the future and bring a lot more, you know, resources to the state for the benefit of the university, the citizens of the university, and ultimately, you know the nation. And we do a lot in global health as well. I know we're, I imagine, we're close on time.

**DOWELL:** Well, I mean, what's your question about?

**HORNE:** It's not a follow up to that. I'm sorry. Just appreciate you coming forth, I mean asking to be on the agenda and, you know, and recognizing that kind of the value to sharing with us on the faculty governance body.

My question is not about the academic (inaudible) so much as the personnel in the currently in the school. And I wonder, one can never know about what economic implications are going to be across the university and state legislature and things like that, discounting that, talking about only your restructuring; do you anticipate that you're going to be able to, you know, essentially keep employed everybody who is now employed in HPER, both faculty and staff, in the new restructuring?

**GOODMAN:** The short answer is yes. The slightly longer answer, not very, we had a very hard economic year as you all know, HPER actually increased its budget by \$1.8 million last year. We have a very highly diversified portfolio because we're in a field where we can do contract work, we can do research, we can do distance education we're picking up on, there are philanthropic organizations that are interested in us; so even in down times we've been very –by the way, the health care profession, problems with insurance companies notwithstanding, it tends to be a recession-proof area. Jobs have not decreased in the health area. So, in fact, you know, we're not entirely immune, but we're somewhat immune to the vicissitudes of the economy because of the nature of the work that we do.

**HORNE:** But as you restructure into public health from physical education recreation which might be more susceptible to...

**GOODMAN:** They will remain in the school, though, as disciplines. We're not eliminating them as disciplines.

**HORNE:** I appreciate that so much because we have that on tape now.

**GOODMAN:** It's been on tape since the day I got it, so I've been very consistent with that and I'd be happy to say it on tape again if you'd like.

**HORNE:** And the eight new faculty members will not be at the cost of any staff?

**GOODMAN:** You know that's where that whole thing with the aging faculty you know the end of life thing? [laughter] You know older faculty they fade away very quickly sometimes.

**DOWELL:** Okay, last question!

**WISE:** I have two questions, but one's been reduced to a comment. You've already answered that there will be program mergers, reorganizations and eliminations and I want to...

**GOODMAN:** Not eliminations, I didn't talk about that...

**WISE:** It's the buzz word in this room that the committee, addressing not you on this, but the leadership of the Council, we need that committee!

**DOWELL:** It's being formed as we speak actually. It's a question of getting members from certain areas...

**WISE:** Good. The question for Dean Goodman is, coming from a school that bridges two campuses, why two schools?

**GOODMAN:** Well, having just sat through the discussion about deans here and how you don't review them? I think I just want to be a Bloomington dean...so that's the – no, I'm kidding, the reason for it is actually very practical. It's an accreditation reason. It...

**WISE:** Okay, that's enough.

**DOWELL:** That's enough? Great. Thank you very much.

**GOODMAN:** And by the way, I'm happy to come any time to talk about these issues, so please feel free to invite me back any time.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW DEAN OF STUDENTS**

**DOWELL:** Very good, thank you. And now Dean Goldsmith? You stuck it out? Alright, we're very happy to have a new Dean here of, the new Dean of Students, Pete Goldsmith to kind of introduce himself to this body. Some of you have probably met him at other venues and so we are happy to hear what you have to say and follow up with our questions.

**GOLDSMITH:** Thank you, and I will be brief and get to the questions sooner than later. But I'm delighted to be here. As many of you know, this is my third time back in Bloomington. I was here as an undergraduate student, majored in government. I came back and graduated from higher education with a doctorate in higher education leadership, education administration program and now I'm back as the dean of students.

For me, part of the joy of coming back is that my mentor when I was here was Bob Schaeffer in the doctoral program and to be able to sit in the chair that he occupied is indeed a very special one for me.

So I think as I have come to understand the division has gone through several reorganizations in the last several years so I would like to tell you kind of what currently is in the dean of students' portfolio. And that is the career development center, the health center, student ethics and anti-harassment programs, student legal services, student advocates, disability services for students, alcohol/drug information center, the GLBT student services, student activities, and veterans' affairs. And so if I were to give you a *précis* about what my role is or what the role of the division is, it's to help students be successful. And we do this by providing support for students, by removing barriers and supporting and contributing to learning. And so that as I think about the role of the division that it is to work with whatever bodies that I need to work with to represent students' interests but also then to help individual students or student groups. And I think perhaps the best way to do that is to talk about two issues that we're currently spending a lot of time on.

The first is the H1N1 flu issue that over the past several weeks we started early in the semester and I know you got a letter from Vice Provost Gieryn and students got a letter from me talking about the H1N1 and our concerns and asking for consideration and asking students to be responsible. What we're experiencing now is over the past few weeks we have doubled every week the number of H1N1 cases that we are experiencing. Last week we were up to about 285. We expect that we will probably double that again this week so that we are just coming into what we hope is the approaching what we hope is the height of this issue. The CDC is putting out information that it could be November before we see a downturn. So what does that mean? Well we have certainly individual student concerns. We currently have two students who are in the hospital with complications from H1N1, but it's working with parents and students, working with you, and individual student cases as we try to help students kind of to help us kind of weather this issue.

Another issue we're spending a lot of time on is traffic and pedestrian safety. And obviously we had that very unfortunate death early in the year, Peter Duong, lost his life on Fee Lane. That resulted in the provost appointing a task force with a very short timeline as we take a look at how we can enhance traffic and pedestrian safety certainly on Fee Lane but also on other areas of the campus. And so I think what I see my role as is trying to connect students with resources, trying to connect people who have similar interest in problems, trying to work toward solutions and trying to assist, and trying to improve the overall learning environment here at Indiana. So with that I'll stop and respond to questions or...?

**DOWELL:** Okay, you're succinct! Questions?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Two days ago I heard a report on National Public Radio about the increase in mental health issues on university campuses.

**GOLDSMITH:** Yes.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Could you speak to that issue with regard to Indiana University? Has there been an increase?

**GOLDSMITH:** There has been an increase nationally, we certainly have experienced that. And what happens to us, or what's happening to us is that we are seeing many more students come with mental health issues. And many students have long histories on psychoactive medications, many students have been diagnosed with mental health related issues and so that we are very fortunate here that we have two psychiatrists on staff and we have an extensive array of mental health services so that we can respond to our students. So yes, it is true here. It is true nationally. And I think we will see it continue to increase. Yes?

**ARNOVE:** I would like to bring up the issue of rape, sexual assault, violent behavior on campus and also off campus. A lot of these incidents could be referred to the criminal justice system because they are crimes.

**GOLDSMITH:** Yes?

**ARNOVE:** But often universities will respond more with victim or offender reconciliations. So what is your response to things like rape, assault? Or people with a history of violence on campus and violent behavior?

**GOLDSMITH:** Right. I believe people should be prosecuted for those particular activities but as with any of these, particularly rape, the victim is the one who makes that decision. And so we try to honor his or her preferences or desires in this regard. We urge students who have been victims of sexual assault to prosecute but sometimes they are not able for a variety of reasons. We often students will find themselves going through not only a process on campus but a process downtown and that's not inconsistent nor in conflict, but my personal view is that these cases ought to be prosecuted.

**ARNOVE:** We have a case for example of Benjamin Smith who came here and of course killed people. And if you found out that a person had a history of some violence on another campus and applied here, what would your response be?

**GOLDSMITH:** Every Tuesday morning there's a group that meets in my office comprised of the police department and several members of my staff and that our goal is to review police records, disciplinary records, encounters that various bodies have had, and to determine if we need to do further intervention with particular students and it is our belief and hope that as students as you describe show up on many radar screens and that we can do interventions. As you know, disciplinary process is based on behavior so we have to have behavior that's sufficient for us to take action against a student.

**ARNOVE:** In the other case of Virginia Tech when there were all kinds of danger signals about the person, I don't remember his name.

**GOLDSMITH:** That's the reason that this group meets so that we don't miss those signals.

**CLARK:** I'd just like to remark, you know I think that everyone knows that Dean McKaig did an excellent job and that his door was always open to every student. But I think also that the office of the dean of students has in the past been very disproportionately focused on undergraduate students even while its jurisdiction covered all students. And since Dean Goldsmith has come in the last two months, he's spent a lot of time and effort reaching out to graduate students and graduate student groups and organizations. And I know that that's been very much appreciated by all of these groups. I'd just like to note that to all of you that to see the office kind of expanding in its scope like this is very refreshing.

**GOLDSMITH:** Thank you.

**TERRY:** Actually I have a question or comment that follows on that. Dean Wimbush-Watson over there representing the graduate schools is someone involved. [laughter]

**WATSON:** (Remarks inaudible)

**TERRY:** Actually I have one further comment on that. One of the odd things that I think has been happening to the Graduate School over the last decade or so as we have particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences moved responsibility for graduate courses and curricula more sort of into the fore view of the College and less in the Graduate School than there used to be when I first arrived here, in some ways the Graduate School has also evolved into a graduate student services organization to some extent. A dean of students for graduate students in many ways. So I'm kind of wondering what you see in the future in terms of your relation with the Graduate School and the services to graduate students and undergraduates.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> While the University Graduate School (UGS) has played and will continue to play a significant role in assuring a high quality of life for our graduate student population, the primary responsibilities of UGS relate to the academic mission of the University. UGS is an academic unit; all PhD degrees and all non-professional master degrees are granted by UGS. Working in concert with the academic units, UGS works to ensure the quality of extant academic programs and to assist in the development of new graduate programs across the IU system.

- Response to a statement made by Herb Terry at the BFC meeting of 20 October 2009 from Maxine Watson.

**GOLDSMITH:** Well, I'm not sure my crystal ball is that good, but I think what's happened so far is that Dean Wimbush and I have met regularly and meet regularly with Nick. I think what we're trying to do is make sure that services that graduate students need are made available from whatever source.

**DOWELL:** Oh Maxine, you want to follow up on that?

**WATSON:** I just want to follow up because Dean Wimbush is really concerned that we acknowledge and celebrate the cooperation we've had with you and the Graduate Schol. It's been really important to us.

**DOWELL:** Are there any gaps that you've identified between the two groups at this point? Or you got it all covered between the two...?

**GOLDSMITH:** Part of my analysis is the biggest gap right now.

**WATSON:** The post-doc population is we need to think about right now...

**DOWELL:** I'm sorry, what?

**WATSON:** Post-docs.

**DOWELL:** Oh, right. Jim?

**CAPSEW:** I've got another health and safety question about drinking on campus and off campus, too, in terms of the culture of drinking that you find particularly among the undergraduates and particularly in the Greek system. I'm just wondering, you know, if you have ideas about ameliorating that or combating that in ways that you might not have seen before?

**GOLDSMITH:** Sure, I first of all, Indiana is not unique. Alcohol is the drug of choice for most of our students. Over roughly 90% of students who enter college have had some experience with alcohol. And so that it is exacerbated by our environment. And sometimes there is a rite of passage notion about being in college that it's okay to drink to excess and drink underage. First of all, I think part of my responsibilities is to hold students accountable and so we will certainly work with students through the student ethics office to confront underage drinking, drinking in public, drinking to excess, but I think largely, the larger issue is with the Greek system, but not just the Greek system. It's changing the culture. And so part of that, I could come back to this group and say can we revisit what happens on Fridays. Can we revisit what happens on Mondays. Because sometimes we unwittingly buy into the notion that no one's going to show up on Friday so we shouldn't have class. Or we shouldn't assign stuff over the weekend because (inaudible) not going to be in shape to perform on Monday morning. I believe that students will rise to the expectations that we create for them. And so part of my

message and you may have seen some of the conversations I've been having with the Greek community is to raise expectations. Greek organizations were founded as values-based, academically oriented institutions and organizations. And somehow we've lost that. And so we've got to recapture that because I think at their best, Greek organizations are almost the ideal living-learning environment. At their worst, they're antithetical to the ideals of the academy. And so part of my, I think, my goal is to work with groups and to confront groups and individuals and to try to over time change the culture around drinking. But as you turn on the television on Saturday or you turn on the television anytime, it's an uphill battle.

**DOWELL:** Further questions or responses? Bob?

**ARNOVE:** I'd like to build on Jim's question and the response. In terms of specific responses of the dean of students' office to let's say a violation of expectations on campus or off campus because there's a big problem off campus too; and then what specifically does your office do in that violation?

**GOLDSMITH:** Well certainly off-campus, we can take students to the student ethics office. The same is certainly true on campus. And that's the typical response is that they will go through the student ethics office and have sanctions applied if they are found in violation of university regulations.

**ARNOVE:** What would the sanctions be?

**GOLDSMITH:** It could vary from probation to expulsion.

**ARNOVE:** And for off-campus as well?

**GOLDSMITH:** Same.

**CAPSHAW:** I guess I want to press you a little bit on the health aspect. You know in the past, you know, one or two students dies every year because of alcohol poisoning.

**GOLDSMITH:** Yeah.

**CAPSHAW:** And, you know, part of the reason is that people don't know what to do when people are that drunk and it doesn't matter about whether they're breaking the law or whatever it's about saving their lives.

**GOLDSMITH:** Sure.

**CAPSHAW:** And I'm understanding that the Residence Halls Association do have a program in place where people of the RAs are trained to recognize that and then call the ambulance and things like that but I'm just wondering generally...

**GOLDSMITH:** Yes.

**CAPSHAW:** ...people are still thinking that well, you can sleep it off or whatever. But you sleep it off, you die!

**GOLDSMITH:** Right.

**CAPSHAW:** Okay. What kinds of things are there that – not just the punishment thing – but in terms of protecting the health and safety?

**GOLDSMITH:** Sure, one of the things that, and again I don't know if we do it here, but we certainly ought to if we don't is passing out information about what you just said, is what to recognize what to do. A place I was at previously we passed out little cards and it was kind of, you know, buddy cards. And say here's what to do in these kinds of cases. Sometimes students are afraid that they will be in fact cited if they call and so I think part of the education process needs to be to encourage students to take care of each other. And I will say to you that if a student is so drunk that he or she cannot function then sometimes it's better for them to go to the hospital or in some cases to jail where there are folks there to watch them for 24 hours until they get to a better place. The other thing I would say to you is part of the issue with alcohol goes beyond legality. I think it is one of the biggest factors in inhibiting student success because excess drinking results in missed classes, missed assignments, poor academic performance. So I do think this is a university issue. It's not just a student affairs issue. How can we change the environment so that it's not done to excess and unfortunately one of the things that's happened in the last 10 or 15 years is the so-called binge drinking that where students go out with the express purpose of getting drunk as quickly as they can, as much as they can. Some of our students have BAC levels that are quite frightening when they are encountered. I'll also hasten to add that both the residence hall staff and the police department do a terrific job of getting students help. I've been thoroughly impressed with both organizations.

**DOWELL:** I'd like to follow up and just ask are there groups you have working on new ways to address changing the culture? I know you're new in your office, but what paths do you see some of these changes taking?

**GOLDSMITH:** Both the drug information alcohol center and the health educators in the health center, this is really what they focus on is trying to do promotion and prevention. And alcohol is the focus of what they do. We also try to have brief intervention program through the student ethics office that students who are already exhibiting problem behaviors with alcohol that we can get them to help and professional help to try to do intervention before it gets worse.

**DOWELL:** Tom, then Herb.

**GIERYN:** Excuse me. I'd also like to commend Pete for emphasizing the academic side of his job. We've met, we've talked about some exciting possible initiatives and I really do believe that defining the dean of students' role as connected to the broader academic mission of the university is altogether healthy. The one specific thing that we've talked about in terms of changing the culture which is our move really and that is increasing the number of Friday classes as a way to in effect try to reduce the length of the party week or to delay the onset of the party weekend. It is something that we might want to revisit from this particular perspective as faculty. Would this contribute to a reduction in the number of days students see as available for drinking?

**DOWELL:** Herb?

**TERRY:** Just a comment. In my role last year as the president of the Bloomington Faculty Council I ended up as a member of an alcohol and drug free communities task force that the predecessor Dean McKaig had created. It turned out that Indiana University Bloomington was not in compliance with a federal law that for a number of years has required us to have a very comprehensive report on all the policies and all the institutions that we have that relate to alcohol and drugs and students and faculty and staff. We were supposed to have that report, we didn't have it, we realized we needed it and this task force was created to create this report which we're just about done with. But we had focused so far on simply creating a report because it was mandated by the feds and we didn't have it. It's been an interesting group. It's a group of faculty, a group of staff, there are people from IUPD, it's a very comprehensive group of folks all of whom in one way or another have to deal with alcohol and drug use as problems on the campus. Our next goal once we submit this report in a form that we hope the feds would happy with if they ever ask for it is to go a step further and continue as a group and come back to the dean with some comments based on everything we've learned about how what we do with alcohol and drugs might be more effective. Not simply in compliance. But will look at the interaction of the various bodies that we have on this campus and assemble a fair amount of expertise. And I hope the group stays together and the next thing it does is offer some recommendations to the dean perhaps here if they have something to do with the code of student rights and responsibilities. It has taken almost more than a year to take a very comprehensive look at how this works at IU Bloomington.

**DOWELL:** Okay, Sue?

**WHISTON:** Well, I would like to make an abrupt change and I don't want to diminish the talk about the problems with alcohol but my research area is related to career decision making and when you look at the IU campus there's a number of career development centers. I know the career development center for the College of Arts and Sciences is under you but yet the business school has a career development center, we have a couple of staff in the School of Education, so I think there's duplication in this campus

related to career development and I know this is a turf war, but I'm wondering when somebody new comes in if they can't look into that and see if there's any way of maybe bringing things together so they can be more efficient and effective in terms of reaching students.

**GOLDSMITH:** I think one of the things that the centers have done is to kind of coalesce themselves and to create kind of a council so that they can be more effective. You know, I don't know the history and how all the centers developed, but I'm sure there were, you know, good, cogent reasons at the time that this was done and so I'm not going to presume to question those.

**WHISTON:** And I don't know that either. I've only been here since 2000, I just know that at other universities there, they reduce the duplication.

**GOLDSMITH:** What I would like to, I think, focus on are those students. We have a great retention rate here, first and second year. It's above 90%. That's just a rare place to be. But our graduation rate is closer to 70, I think 70%. So that the issue for me is what happens from that second year to the fourth year that we lose that many students. My guess and kind of my working notion right now is that students, we lose students because they are not either qualified for their academic major of choice and don't have a good mechanism for making another decision or they're having trouble making a decision. So can I be helpful in working with groups to try to see if that's true then also try to figure out if we can help, what mechanisms we can use to help students be able to make better choices and then hopefully do that at Indiana.

**DOWELL:** Other questions or comments? Alright, well thank you very much Dean Goldsmith. Do we have a motion to adjourn? Motions everywhere! Okay, and I think we're all in favor of that.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:21PM**