

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
November 24, 2009
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)

IUB: Franklin Hall Room 106
IUE: Whitewater Hall Room 119
IPFW: Helmke Library Room B37
IUPUI: ICTC Building Room 541
IUK: Main Building Room 111
IUN: Hawthorne Hall Room 338
IUSB: Northside Hall Room 075b
IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112

MEMBERS: Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Karen Banks, Karl Besel, James Bonsall, Stephen Burns, Janice Cox, Erika Dowell, Zach Duncan, Mary Fisher, Charles Gallmeier, Stuart Green, Karen Hanson, Patricia Henderson, Jerry Hinnefeld, Brian Horne, Hitesh Kathuria, Joyce MacKinnon, Bryan McCormick, Michael McRobbie, Mary Beth Minick, Laverne Nishihara, Robert Noel, C. Subah Packer, Jonathan Plucker, Jamie Prenkert, Simon Rhodes, John Minor Ross, Jodi Smith, Fran Squires, Ellen Szarleta, Herb Terry, David Vollrath, Leslie Walker, Joe Wert, L. Jack Windsor

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jodie Atkinson, Jason Baird Jackson, Charles Bantz, Teri Belecky-Adams, Bruce Bergland, Jacqueline Blackwell, Terri Bourus, Christopher Bradley, Nicholas Clark, Jan Fulton, Brady Harman, Lesa Hatley Major, Jennifer Hehman, Paul Losensky, Eugene McGregor, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, Elizabeth Raff, Una Mae Reck, Alan Schmetzer, Robert Schnabel, Peter SerVaas, Michael Wartell, Michael Wolf

GUESTS: John Applegate, Arthur Bradley, Craig Dethloff, Elizabeth Johnson, Erin Rykken, Beth Whipple, Eric Wright

Agenda

1. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)
2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Simon Atkinson and Erika Dowell)
3. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Atkinson and Dowell)

4. Proposed Nomenclature Changes to the IU Bloomington Academic Guide. (15 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs -
Bloomington)[ACTION ITEM]
5. Developments in Recapturing the Scholarly Record (50 minutes)
(David Lewis, Dean of the IUPUI Library) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY10/Textbook%20Strategies.pdf>
6. Brief Recess (15 minutes)
7. Discussion on the Creation of Schools of Health at Indiana University (45 minutes)
(Robert Goodman, Dean of the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation)
[DISCUSSION]
8. Discussion of 18/20 Retirement Plan (30 minutes).
(Dan Rives, Associate Vice President, Administration, UHRS) [DISCUSSION]

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Atkinson and Dowell should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Okay, so let's start the meeting, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to move to agenda item 1 and I've just got some comments to make about our financial issues to bring people up to date although I think most people are aware of many of these facts. I don't think I have to tell people here about the severity of the economic situation both in the nation and also as it affects higher education. We have seen pretty much almost daily stories about very difficult situations at many of our brother and sister universities across the nation – at the moment, I think most recently, the continuing very severe difficulties at the UC system. It is worth commenting though that financially there was a Wall Street Journal article recently that said that twenty universities have had their bond ratings downgraded and another fifty-five had been issued negative outlooks going forward which is pretty remarkable. But in that context – again some people I think know this, but I'm just bringing everyone up to date – we started this year with one of the highest bond ratings of any public university in this country and we became one of only a handful, I think it was from memory about five, to which Standard and Poor's gave a positive outlook for future financial performance. And that is, among other things, very important because it means that money is that much cheaper when it comes time to issue bonds and so on to the various financial things we need to do. Money becomes cheaper to us. In justifying this rating, the rating by Standard and

Poor's cited the way in which we had responded during last fall's financial turmoil and specifically cited the financial leadership from the Board of Trustees and our financial team as well. And they noted they think this leaves us well positioned to deal with future issues. As you all know in June, the General Assembly lowered our ongoing funding for this financial year 2009-10 by 22.3 million. That is, about 4.5%. And that's the average across all the campuses. The funding differed a little bit from campus to campus. It ranged from about 3.8% at Kokomo through to about 5% here in Bloomington. So each campus has had to, through a variety of mechanisms, lower its ongoing spending so that by the beginning of the next academic year the campuses can start that academic year with a balanced budget. Now, at a time when unemployment – again you all know – in the nation is nearing or exceeding 10% and the same is true of the state. We were nevertheless able to recommend a budget to the trustees which they approved which avoided any layoffs. We have not had to lay a single person off which provided a \$500 dollar bonus to our lowest paid employees and which froze healthcare premiums for all employees at last year's levels.

What I think of as the main strategic foci of our budget plan for this financial year, are as follows. To continue to aggressively seek out and hire outstanding new faculty while doing what we can to retain our current excellent faculty. In the current year, we have added or are in the process of adding 129 additional faculty positions and will, I expect, continue to hire at least I hope we will continue to hire for the next financial year '10-11. Secondly, to continue to build new buildings and facilities that really are needed to fully support our goals of excellence in research and education. And then thirdly, to invest our investments over more than a century in the buildings and facilities of all of our campuses which some people value at five billion or in excess of five billion by additional R&R spending, by continuing to maintain all of those very substantial and widespread facilities and finally continuing to provide financial aid to families, many of whom are in more straitened financial circumstances than they were a couple of years ago as well so that we continue to increase our in-state graduation rates. So I can sum up our strategy in one sentence: It is to continue to hire and continue to build. And at this stage, there are very few universities around the nation who can say that at the moment. But I don't think I need to tell any of you who read the newspapers that we still have, even in spite of the fact that there seems to be some improvement in the economy nationally – globally for that matter – there really are still grave challenges ahead. Indiana has historically tended to lag behind recoveries and that seems to be no different this time around. Through the first four months of the present budget year, that is the months July through October, state revenue is running \$310 million dollars. That is about 7.4% below the projections on which the 2009-10 budget was based. That in turn was already based on considerably lowered projections which is why we've already had to deal with the cuts previously. If this revenue picture does not dramatically improve this month, next month, I expect that there is a very strong likelihood that we will face further cuts during this current academic year, probably similar to what we faced last year in type. I have to say whether we can still hire and build in those circumstances is unclear. If this does happen, we're going to have to

continue to look for further opportunities for expenditure reduction and expenditure control around the university. And the leadership of the institution, obviously the academic and financial leadership, continues to monitor this situation very closely. If there is going to be cuts of that kind, I expect that we will see them early in the new year but it's difficult to predict if we have a particularly bad November, they could come earlier. If November improves, they may be delayed. But that's – I have no special knowledge of that. That really is in the hands of the governor and others. So that's the situation with our state appropriation which you remember is not all of our income of the university, but it is an extremely important part of it, and we have so far been able to manage I think extremely well these very difficult circumstances, but I see that as going to be very much challenged by what may happen over the next couple of months. So that's my report. If there's any questions I guess we could leave them to agenda item 3, but if I could then just move straight on to the business of the Agenda Committee and ask Erika and Simon to report.

AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ATKINSON: Okay, thank you President McRobbie. First of all to follow up on the president's remarks, we have constituted the UFC budgetary affairs committee which consists of the leadership of the budgetary affairs committees on the individual campuses and they are planning to meet with Vice President Theobald and to discuss the budget situation and obviously if there is some terrible scenario that comes down to us from the state, we hope that that committee will be helpful to the administration in discussing whatever actions the university has to take and I think Vice President Theobald has been very open with the faculty leadership in discussing the current budget situation of the university so we hope that continues. We have had a vote on a number of honorary degrees. Craig do we have enough votes in for the honorary degrees?

DETHLOFF: Yes, they both passed.

ATKINSON: Okay, excellent. So obviously those names are confidential until the degrees are approved by the trustees and then until such time as the President's Office would publicly release those names. Honorary degrees are not conferred *in absentia* so it's a question of whether the intended recipient is able to attend the particular event where it's intended that the degree be conferred so please don't disclose those names at this point. And I hope that the posting of the documents on the Oncourse site and the online voting system worked for everybody. Given the reduced frequency of UFC meetings I think this is the way that we will need to approach the honorary degrees because sometimes there's a relatively short timeline between when the Honorary Degrees Committee has had time to look at the dossiers and bring it to the UFC and then the next trustees' meeting where they actually are approved by the trustees so sometimes we have to move relatively quickly on these.

As many of you know, the review of the Charles Bantz as chancellor of the IUPUI campus has been in progress. The review committee has completed its work, but there is a fairly complicated process that follows on from the conclusion of the review committee's work and I just want to speak with where we are with that process. So the review committee completed its initial report and has met with the chancellor and the chancellor has had a chance to respond to the review committee's report. And then both the chancellor's response and the review committee's report have been sent to the president. And I believe that, President McRobbie, you have met with the review committee, is that correct?

MCROBBIE: Yes, and I meet with Chancellor Bantz next week.

ATKINSON: Okay, and so then the president will meet with the chancellor to review the findings and then the committee's final report and the president's response will be made available to the UFC Agenda Committee and the Indianapolis Faculty Council Executive Committee sometime after the president has met with the chancellor and finalized his written response. The next step after that is to have a meeting of the IFC, Indianapolis Faculty Council, and the UFC meeting in closed session. And both the UFC Agenda Committee and the IFC Executive Committee have agreed to a joint meeting of the IFC and the UFC, meeting in executive session where both Councils together will hear from the chair of the review committee as well as from President McRobbie. That meeting will probably not take place until sometime in the spring semester. And I believe John, you're working with Craig and Karen to find a date for that meeting and the President's office and the chair?

APPLEGATE: Yeah, we'll sort that out.

ATKINSON: Good. And so look for a notice of that date sometime in the spring semester. A committee has been at work reviewing the review procedures for the deans of the core schools that operate on both campuses. We found that there is no procedure that allows for the involvement of both the core campuses in the review of those offices. This is people like the dean of the Kelley School of Business, dean of Journalism, dean of SPEA for example. So an ad hoc committee of the university has been at work on that and maybe Jack Windsor who is a member of that committee can just give us a brief update on where that stands and Craig, please chime in also.

WINDSOR: I'm going to refer to the chair of the committee, Jonathan for that update.

PLUCKER: I was going to let you do it, Jack. But we meet on December 2nd I believe and I believe at that time we will probably have a final document. I think we've worked out all of the issues that we talked about at our last meeting.

ATKINSON: And we will bring that document to the UFC at some point for a vote. Once I think both the committees on the two campuses have had a chance to take a look at it.

PLUCKER: Yeah.

ATKINSON: We had a discussion at the Agenda Committee right before this meeting about the issue of sponsor restrictions on research. This covers issues like publication; not publishing certain aspects of research results. It touches on the area of ITAR and export controlled research. This is a complex issue, and the reason we're looking at it is that a number of faculty in the engineering and technology school on the IUPUI campus are finding that the current restriction inhibit them from taking on some research projects that they'd otherwise wanted to be involved with. And that their colleagues at Purdue University are able to take on, sometimes snatched from under their noses. So this is a complex issue and Steve Martin has worked with Beth Cate in the University Counsel's office and also Fred Cate in the law school to produce a document that's laid out all the issues that need to be addressed. And taking on this kind of research has serious implications for the university. The next step will probably be to appoint a joint faculty/administration task force to look at this issue, and see if we can come to any consensus as to whether to move forward with some alteration in the university's current policies. I think that's all I have, Erika did you have anything?

DOWELL: No, I think you covered everything Simon.

AGENDA ITEM 3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Okay, we move to agenda item 3, the question and comment period. Any member of the UFC have any questions they wish to direct to me or the co-secretaries? Any questions? People must be thinking of their Thanksgiving lunches already. Any questions? Okay, there being no questions, let's move on to agenda item four, proposed nomenclature changes to the IU Bloomington Academic Guide. Professor Gieryn?

AGENDA ITEM 4: PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE CHANGES TO THE IU BLOOMINGTON ACADEMIC GUIDE

GIERYN: Some of you may remember a couple of weeks ago we brought this issue to the Council. In Bloomington, we've had a number of administrative changes. Those changes have required us to alter the Bloomington Academic Guide, the policies and discussions there, to reflect the proper names for offices and various titles at Bloomington that are assigned certain tasks. The chancellor became provost, the dean of faculties was divided into the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs and the vice provost for undergraduate education. New vice presidents were created and tasks were distributed differently among various offices. I won't repeat the entire presentation. We found, however, that of the policies that were changed the required a change, thirty-seven of these policies originated with the UFC, that is, they were university-wide documents. In order to make changes in UFC documents, we found it necessary to take the revisions before this Council and seek an omnibus approval of

these nomenclature changes. And I underscore that the only changes we have proposed are changes involving retitling and renaming offices to bring them in line with current administrative structure. Down the line when we hope soon to put the the Academic Handbook in a digital form, we'll make those same changes again to bring the two policy documents into sync. We opened up an Oncourse site, put the revisions there. We encouraged people to gain access to the Oncourse site and look over the changes and a number of you did. We received no questions or concerns and I'd like to bring this matter up then for a vote. Again, the proposal is that rather than go through the thirty-seven changes simply to propose one vote on all of the changes in policies originating with the UFC.

MCRROBBIE: So, that's – do we have that in front of us as a motion, Tom?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: For that motion, do we need a second?

MCRROBBIE: Are you moving that...?

GIERYN: I'm not a member of the Council, so somebody needs to move that.

MCCMORMICK: Move to approve.

MCRROBBIE: Okay, and we've got a seconder. Okay, my only concern is, have people seen all the changes? Okay, everybody's seen all the changes? Okay, we have a motion in front of us. Any discussion on the motion? Any discussion on the motion? Alright, I'm going to put the motion—all those in favor signify by saying "Aye," [Aye] against by saying "Nay." Any "nay"s? No, I think that's carried unanimously. At least without dissent. Alright, well done.

GIERYN: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 5: DEVELOPMENTS IN RECAPTURING THE SCHOLARLY RECORD

MCRROBBIE: Now we move on to agenda item 5, David Lewis. David?

LEWIS: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you this afternoon about a number of issues that are in my view both complicated and very important to the university and to the scholar community in general. I've come to the task because sometime last January Brad Wheeler asked me to take on an additional responsibility for a piece of the IT strategic plan and that section of the plan was modestly called, "Recapturing the Scholarly Record." And he had said I had a couple of years to manage that so I am at that work. What the strategic plan defines that as is it says, "Indiana University should pursue a position of leadership in the development with partners of new sustainable models for scholarly publication, dissemination and curation that

enables scholars and their collective communities to reassert control over rights to the scholarly record and its institutional preservation.”

There are a variety of sub-pieces under this, but today I want to talk about two general areas and they, the first involves how the university invests in the scholarly communication system. And we invest as a university in a variety of ways both through the work of our faculty in writing and reviewing and editing in support for a variety of scholarly journals and other initiatives in a variety of ways. We support the IU Press. But mostly we spend our money, at least directly, on library collections and their management. I think that it's important to understand the extent to which the scholarly work that we all do has been captured and exploited for commercial purposes for a long time. When I became a librarian in 1975, a gallon of gasoline cost 55 cents. And the average chemistry and physics journal was significantly less than \$100. Today, the average chemistry and physics journal costs well in excess of \$2000 and if a gallon of gasoline had inflated at the same rate as a journal, it would cost nearly \$15 per gallon. So there are actually only now only three commercial companies Elsevier, Springer, and Wiley, that control nearly all of the significant journal literature, particularly in science, medicine and technology. And they have ruthlessly exploited the universities – in my view – for as long as I've been a librarian which is well over 30 years. We have not found ways to deal with this and I think we need to be clear, they are commercial ventures. It is their job to take all of our money and give it to their shareholders and they're quite successful with that. The obvious answer in my view to this over time is to look at open forms of scholarly communication that will allow us to reclaim the control and the management of it. It is my very strong view that open access to the journal literature will over time be successful whether we do anything or not. It is obvious in my view that faculty will find that having their material openly available and one click away from everybody in the world is better than having their material locked up in a corporately controlled lock box, regardless of how gilded that particular box is. I was going to bring some slides and didn't, but the first one was a picture of *Cell* which is an Elsevier title. It costs IUPUI about \$10,000 per year. It is arguably one of the top five journals in medicine and science, but it is significantly expensive and it will continue to inflate. Even in these times Elsevier's inflation is—inflation is not the right word—their cost increases are 5-6%. One of the other top five journals in science is the *Public Library of Science*, which costs the university nothing and is an open access journal. So there are ways of doing this that bring quality of the highest level to bear and make our scholarship openly available to everyone in the world. The way in which I think we need to move this forward at least initially is to have the university provide some digital capacity to put on the table for faculty who wish to create open journals, and to encourage faculty to behave in ways where they manage their intellectual property responsibly and in ways that further the interests of the university and scholarship in general rather than further a number of large corporations. To that end, the university and a number of universities actually are working on a project that sometimes is called “the Big Digital Machine.” This is an attempt to take the established systems that we have available and upgrade them and integrate them so that we're in a position to not

only publish electronic journals but to make sure that material is curated and preserved over the long haul. I fully recognize that there are complexities in this arena around promotion and tenure. And I would say that it is my view that these are all manageable things to do. I will tell a story and Tom Gieryn is part of it, so I hope not to embarrass him, but I was having a conversation with faculty on the Bloomington campus about this issue last Spring and I was talking to Hal Evans, who is a high-energy physicist. And as many of you may know, in high-energy physics, there is a repository of scholarship called, "the archive," started at Los Alamos, is now at Cornell. And it is where all physicists put their work and where they all go to look at the work of their colleagues. They will then publish in journals in order to make sure it's on their resume, but they almost never read the journal articles and probably only cite them in other papers that they publish. So I was asking Al about this and he said that, "Yes, of course," that "The Archive" was what he used. And Tom asked him what he obviously had published as well and Al said, "yeah, I have to publish in the journals in order to be able to put it on my vita, but that doesn't mean that we have to buy the journals." And Tom's response was, "Well, if we don't buy them they'll go out of business." And what Al said I think is most important. He said, "Then we'll just have to figure out other ways to evaluate our colleagues." And I'm confident that we can do that. We have outsourced the evaluation of faculty to the commercial journal publishers in many ways for a long time. I'm confident we can reclaim that if we need to do that. So I think what we need to think about over the long haul or maybe even the short haul is that the university, just in libraries invests tens of millions of dollars to support the scholarly communications system. And in my view, there are, we need to begin to experiment with other ways of subsidizing various scholarly open enterprises and move those forward. So I would encourage all of you to think about these issues and to talk to your colleagues about them. IU has not been as aggressive as say, MIT or Harvard in looking at open mandates for open publishing. I'm not sure that that's the immediate approach that makes sense here but it is an issue that will be critically important. We're in an environment where we increasingly are taking money away from everything else in order to buy a small number of scholarly, scientific, and medical journals and that hurts the humanities, it hurts university presses, it hurts all kinds of other initiatives. So that's what I wanted to say in general about scholarly communication.

The other subject that I wanted to talk about to some extent are textbooks. And there are ____, large, corporate entities that control the textbook industry. They are Springer, ____, Wiley, McGraw-Hill, and Pearson. And they also use the textbook industry as a way to move money to their shareholders. In this case, they take it from our students. I'll give you one example that I'm particularly fond of these days. The speech, intro speech class at IUPUI R110 is the second largest enrolling course, undergraduate course on the campus. It has nearly 3,000 student enrollments per year. The textbook for this course is *The Art of Public Speaking* by a man named Steven Lucas who is by all accounts a really brilliant teacher from the University of Wisconsin. The 10th edition of his book, which was the book for the Fall, was \$115 new in the bookstore. If you're lucky you can find it for \$85 on Amazon. That edition was published in 2008. In 2005, the 9th edition

was published. It's generally available on the web in many cases for \$20-25 dollars. My assumption is that public speaking is such a fast moving field that they had to issue a new edition every three years. This is the situation, the textbook industry is largely dysfunctional and everybody who looks at it in any critical way recognizes this. What has happened, at least in part, is that the internet has given students the ability to make the used market work very efficiently. And this is not different than the efficiencies that every used thing has gotten, the used market has gotten from the internet. The publishers argue that this cuts into their profits so they issue new editions more and more frequently. It's not uncommon now to have editions issued every 18 months regardless of whether the book needs to be updated in fields like intro physics and calculus where it hasn't changed in a long, long time. So the students respond to the textbook increases in prices by trying to get around this as best they can. It's the only part of their expenses for their education that they have some control over and they exercise that control. As an example of the dysfunction that's driven into the system, students will sell their textbooks to the bookstore before the end of the semester in order to assure that those sales will be under the quota that the bookstore is required to buy back at 50%. And the bookstore is required by university contractor to buy back books that they know will be used in the following semester. So in order to assure that their books will be bought back at 55% rather than after the quota whatever Barnes and Noble feels like which is rarely 50%, the students will sell the book before the final. So for those of us who grew up and probably still have our textbooks in our dens on the shelves somewhere, this is really quite remarkable. It's not pedagogically useful. And it's really dysfunctional. So this, the textbook industry is in crisis and everybody knows it but no one will talk about it. There are, in my view, two ways that we can respond to this. In the short term, and I sent out a handbook a handout that I'm passing around this Fall. In the short term it is in our interest to try to do whatever we can to make the used book market work for our students. The publishers will whine, the bookstore actually doesn't have a problem with this, but the used market we can do things like not changing editions. Certainly one of the important things is to make sure that we do an early adoption. And as a matter of fact, it will be federal law as of July 1st 2010, that students will be required to be told what their textbooks will be when they register. So if this was a year from now, all textbook adoptions would need to have been done by mid-October at the latest so students would know their texts for the Spring term. And that a year from now, we'll have to have Fall selection done by April. And this is Federal law. The students have been particularly effective nationally about lobbying around this issue. We've had pressure at Indiana from the Commission on Higher Education. So my view is where the feds are micromanaging how our bookstore operation ought to run, we've screwed up. And I think that's where we are with textbooks. There are a number of electronic textbooks alternatives and I think that is important to recognize the distinction which also exists in electronic journals is there's a distinction between electronic and paper. And the more important distinction is between commercially published and open access. So the model that in the long run we want to encourage is what generally is called an open textbook. These are materials that are openly available on the web and then can be printed on demand. This is a model that's been applied

both in a not-for-profit environment by an organization called “Connections” out of Rice University and has also been used in a private for-profit arrangement by a really interesting company called “Flat World Knowledge” which does business books primarily. So they’re giving away the things on the web, and then if students want to have them printed they can get them in general for about \$20-25 dollars which is the cost of printing. There are a number of initiatives that we are working on at IU to look at how to think about textbooks going forward. There is a small, experimental arrangement in the Kelley School this Fall looking at digital textbooks. These are textbooks which are published by the large commercial publishers but are being offered in an electronic mechanism for a couple of courses and there’ll be a similar experiment in the Spring. We’re trying to get a sense of whether the bells and whistles that can be added in an electronic environment make a difference or not. There are a variety of complexities around how to charge for these sorts of things in a way that’s reasonable. We’re also looking at partnering with the Connections organization. We’ve actually joined their consortium. It’s my current thinking that it probably makes sense for us to take their software and put up an iteration at IU so that it would be available for faculty who wish to publish textbooks in an open environment that is, the connections piece is an extraordinarily open arrangement which makes many faculty somewhat nervous. So if we have our own iteration, we can publish textbooks in an open arrangement that’s more manageable in a variety of ways. As we move forward with textbooks, the complexity that we have is that the money is outside of our control. So if we actually were in the money flow between our students and the publishers we could take some small piece of that money, invest it in ways that would create open textbooks that could be used for our students and other students in for significantly less money. The example that I like to give is that it seems to me quite reasonable that if the School of Nursing and a dozen other nursing schools in the country got this, sat down together. They could create the dozen or so textbooks that are required for the nursing curriculum and manage those independently and eliminate several thousand dollars of debt that nurses generally go out of, out into the world here. But we don’t have, we’re not in the money flow to capture some piece of it in order to make those kind of investments that would save our students money. So the kinds of, the goals that we have are to try to find things that work for faculty. We want to try to make textbooks cheaper and cheaper for students means it has to be less than 50% of the cost of what the list is. Because in general that buy it new and sell it used for 50%. So if the price has to be driven down to 20-25% of the list cost before we really start to impact our students. Right now, we’re looking at doing a lot of experiments trying to figure out what works and what doesn’t. This makes us, there are a lot of people around the country trying to do this. The one thing that I’m reasonably certain of right now is that device specific experiments have generally not worked particularly well. The Kindle is not the students idea of a useful machine. There’s no more room on their belt. They’re already carrying their laptop and their phone and their iPod. The last thing they need is another battery to charge. And we’re, over time, trying to find ways to make something that’s sustainable. And textbooks have a number of financial complexities. Many faculty get some income from textbooks. Very few have life-changing amounts of

money, but lots have some. (laughter) In my experience it's not a conversation they're always willing to have openly in large groups, but our sense is that many faculty make somewhere between two weeks in the south of France and a BMW every year or two. And the university has a strong and important fiscal arrangement with Barnes and Noble and we need to ensure that that moves forward in a way that's productive for both the university and Barnes and Noble. And there'll be, in the long run, some real challenges for bookstores selling paper books, but in the near term it's important to make sure that we maintain our relationships. So that's my plea. This is a really important issue, but it's also very complicated. It needs to be moved forward in whatever ways faculty think it should be. I'm prepared to put some energy into it and would welcome your comments.

MCROBBIE: Thanks David. That, as someone who's been at the periphery of those issues for years, that was an excellent summary. I think you really covered the key things well. I think this is open for discussion. Comments on David's...David raised so many important issues there.

ATKINSON: If I can ask something. So what do you think are the next steps for getting the faculty involved and engaged so that we can actually make some progress on some of these issues?

LEWIS: The question that I would ask, and when I've talked to people privately about this, people have said that IU is not prepared to move forward in the way that MIT and the College at Harvard has with an open-access mandate, which would in the MIT case, they of faculty who publish research give the university a license to use that material and make it openly available. MIT of course, has had a lot of experience with open courseware and other kinds of things. That's a message that is pretty powerful. It is much more important in my view in the sciences although I don't know that we could parse it. The humanities, the issues are less that the costs of journals are not driven in the same way and they're not as high. So that's one the issue of an open access mandate is one issue. I think that some relatively small experimental investment in textbooks could be very powerful. I've had conversations with a variety of faculty who are trying to figure out how to do an open textbook but because we are outside of the income stream it's very difficult to cover the costs of things like copy-editing, layout and design, those kinds of things. We have the capacity to do that, relatively efficiently with the University Press and other ways to do that. And I've had conversations with the press and they're interested in exploring how they could collaborate, but if we were to be able to put a hundred thousand dollars on the table to be able to run a dozen experiments with a variety of faculty to create texts, particularly in areas where we could see immediate return to our students. I've talked to the R110 people on this campus and they're interested in this general notion and they're in the process of redesigning their curriculum. So some of their ability to buy out a little bit of faculty time and provide some editorial support would you know if you put \$25,000 into that effort, you would have the payback in terms of money saved to our students you know,

sometime in the second week of summer session 1 given the number of students who are enrolled. So I think that some university investments in textbook experiments to create open textbooks will be an important piece. And I had a broad conversation that maybe the way to do it is to put the open access mandate on the table in order to get faculty to address it straight on might be useful. The danger with that second piece is that it would, people may not be ready to go there and they would set us back by having the conversation. And that would be my fear.

MCROBBIE: David, just to comment. When you say that the university's not willing or something like that, correct me if I'm wrong and maybe I'm missing something. I'm not certain that there's ever been a proposal that's come up through any part of the university for that. I mean, you're talking about...

LEWIS: I'm not—

MCROBBIE: You're talking about something equivalent to the MIT program, right?

LEWIS: The informal conversations I've had lead me to, people have expressed skepticism that the faculty would be ready for that strong a move. I would be, I would love to be proven wrong.

MCROBBIE: Erika?

DOWELL: Yeah, if I could just comment. Simon and I and Craig recently returned from the CIC faculty governance leaders meeting in Minneapolis. This issue was on the table. And there was certainly from that small room of people from CIC institutions, there was a lot of interest in developing some sort of statement or position at the CIC level that could then be passed down to individual campuses to talk about. And there was some interest in this although certainly there were you know, different views of the open access mandate were floating around certainly. But it was viewed as a, as something that people want to know a lot more about. And in general open access publication, there was a lot of interest there. Now that's just 20 people, but I think it's something that we're going to see maybe talked about a lot more publicly and specifically in the spring session of the councils I hope.

ATKINSON: If I could just add to that, I think there's a lot of potential for a sort of consortium of institutions to do something productive in this area that even an institution as large as IU can't really do on its own. The other thing that came up in these discussions is that there are some kind of maybe John Applegate can talk about this, there is some kind of antitrust implications for private institutions in doing this that maybe not such a concern for public institutions? I don't understand the law in this area at all, but...

APPLEGATE: Well, colluding in restraint of trade is frowned upon. (Laughter)

ATKINSON: Even for large publishers? (Laughter)

APPLEGATE: Well, yeah. If they're getting together and setting prices deliberately, they would have serious problems.

MCROBBIE: Herb?

TERRY: I have an observation that I guess is also a question. I kind of wonder if in focusing on the cost of textbooks we're focusing on something that really isn't all that important to today's student. I understand the cost issue but I think many of my students don't read their textbooks because either they're not very good readers or reading is not something they view as an efficient way to gather information, to learn information. We're all old fashioned. We read. But I think we have a generation that is attuned to visual depictions and podcasts and other sorts of things that they seem to think is their preferred mode of the acquisition of additional information. And in addition, I think with the internet and other sorts of things, student learning is changing. The idea that we fill them full of knowledge that they carry out of here has changed to something that what they carry on their belt, they can always go to the internet and access and learn something that we were trying to teach them and they'll learn it up to date. I'm kind of wondering how we are thinking about the next generation beyond the text static things like that. Of the devices that facilitate student learning. And maybe if our strongest goal wasn't to get a hold of that before it falls into the hands of enterprises rather than to try to publish texts that I'm not positive many of our students, unless we make them really required parts of the course and test on them alone, view as that central to their learning? I'm wondering what we know from educational research and other sorts of things about the importance of text in college learning these days.

LEWIS: What I would say is that, I mean clearly this is a direction that we would want to explore, but I think what we need to understand that when we're talking about text books we're really not in large part talking—we can have a lot of impact with a relatively small number of texts. You look at the top 100 enrolling undergraduate courses on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, they are responsible for about 20% of the enrollments. And if you take the top 200, it's close to 40%. So it's a relatively small number of courses and they're all the courses that we'd imagine they are that can have a significant impact on students. And at least at this, these are the big large enrolling multi-section courses with enrollments from 3,000 down to several, 5 or 6 hundred. And in those courses, they're generally introductory courses, and the sort of summary of the knowledge is probably really useful for a while to come. Once you get beyond that, I think increasingly we'll see people using, faculty using different kinds of supplemental course material and but we're still going to have to have ways of developing it. The interactive stuff isn't something that most faculty can sit down and do in a weekend. It requires...

TERRY: Do we actually know right now what percentage of students are buying and reading the text materials in those large courses?

LEWIS: Um, we could probably get the buying. I'm not sure we could get the reading. (laughter)

TERRY: There's sampling devices you could use to try to get a handle on that...

LEWIS: But they're, I mean, on the IUPUI campus, the bookstore does \$15 million worth of textbook business every year. I assume it's substantially beyond that in Bloomington because there are probably more options in Indianapolis. But it's a, the students are spending a lot of money.

MCROBBIE: Sorry, Brad Wheeler's here. I didn't see you Brad.

WHEELER: I'll offer a follow up to both Simon and Herb's questions. Herb first. David and I and in many conversations we're involved in, the term educational resources has become the umbrella term that incorporates texts or simulations or games or whatever it may be. And so on the open side of that you often hear, OERs. Open educational resources. But I think for lots of this stuff, whether it's—drifting a little bit to Simon's point—whether it's journals or textbooks or monographs, I think one point of faculty engagement right now would be to think about there's a lot of similarities across these things. We've tended to think of this stuff as all very separate kinds of endeavors, but if you think of faculty authoring whether they're authoring a monograph that may work with an editor that becomes published by the IU Press or they're authoring materials that may be used in their courses or shared with others or journals that go through a peer review cycle and then ultimately end up in a volume, if you look at the components of activity across those, there's a lot of similarity. And so for the faculty to begin thinking about how things have historically been discrete activities, maybe instances of the same thing and where our activities in some segments would best align around open pacts using connections to share course content or open journals like our library is helping to publish some of those, and others are out there. Or where in some fields and some endeavors the commercial path is going to be better. I don't think it's completely either or. There's going to be a blend of commercial models and open models, but I think we can become wiser in how we think about the choices and the paths of where we go. And it may be useful, Provost Hanson and I have talked about this on several times, to what extent we are thinking about our strategy for open or we're just kind of tripping along with it as things happen. There, like you say Harvard's made a declaration about what they're going to do for an institutional copy and others. But that's really just on journals. That's on a narrow part of the domain. And there is no doubt over the next twenty years, open in university, they're going to, we're going to have to figure out our dance there. If maybe the opportunity, Simon, for the faculty is to be more purposeful in thinking about how that path would evolve across a range of these topics rather than

in discrete elements. And I do just want to give a callout. David has done a lot of work this year. He's been to many, many, many meetings, continues to go wherever he can on the campuses with various groups that are gathering just socializing talking about these things as well as his involvement outside. On the journal front, we did round up about \$175,000 from the CIC, all the institutions pitched in a little money, and David's leading a project that's taking some pieces that are already out there, open journal system, Connections, something called Fedora in D Space or now Dura Space and spending a little of that money talking about well how can those projects come together to be the kind of platform that your professional association might want to publish its journal through over time. And ensuring our libraries have a right of archive rather than having to buy our scholarship back over the years. So I appreciate David's attention to this over the last year.

MCROBBIE: Thanks Brad. Other comments or questions? Any of the campuses on video conference? Questions comments?

FISHER: Mary Fisher at IUPUI. It seems to me the biggest job we have is to help faculty see their stake in this and how what they assign students impacts them financially. And many times faculty, and I know this is true in my field, they get a book from a rep and they don't even ask how much the book costs and they assign the book. And faculty don't even consider the economic impact of their decisions. And that is a culture change that we have to work on and as faculty leaders I think we need to try to begin to make an impact on that.

ATKINSON: If I can add to that, there's a really a very broad kind of cultural change. All these issues that David's been talking about affect all aspects of faculty work including how we evaluate scholarship using new publication models when we go through the promotion and tenure process. It's something that the faculty need to get to grips with.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? From anybody out there in cyberspace? Any...?

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne Nishihara from IU East. I'd like to comment that at East we're very aware of when our textbooks are too expensive because we realize when our students don't have any books and it's two weeks into the semester. I'd also like to comment that I think the open-access materials have more potential than turning in our textbook requests early. I got my textbook requests in maybe late September early October for Spring by telephoning about a half a dozen publishers and I came to realize that even publishers don't necessarily realize when they'll have to reprint or go into new editions. One of them explained to me that they had several thousand copies left and they thought they'd have enough for Spring semester but they'd have to wait and see. So I did my best with ordering that early, but when even publishers don't have answers to my questions, I have to ask how helpful that tactic is going to be.

MCROBBIE: Thank you.

LEWIS: I don't think it's a good idea, I mean, it's not the right way to solve the problem, but it's what...The congress isn't going to know how to solve this problem. I mean, it's one we have to grapple with. So I agree completely. This solution makes little sense in the long run, but it's an indication of how serious the students have taken this and how political they've gotten about it. So I think the lesson from it is we don't want the congress doing the next thing. We need to solve it ourselves.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Other questions or comments? Questions or comments, anybody else? Anybody else out on the other campuses on video conference? Yes Herb.

TERRY: I have one question that maybe it'll hurt a little to answer. I do teach in one of these areas where things change. It's a legal area. And where new texts and new editions are significantly different from their predecessors when cases come down you have to include them. Does anyone know if the deadlines that congress has set would permit a faculty member to change their text selection assuming, let's say that they had to make it in the Spring for a Fall class? In my field it's very good, useful materials for students could be published in that time period. Am I going to be barred from using them?

LEWIS: My understanding is that there is some wiggle room in the legislative language and my guess is they're not going to come after the university, but my understanding is that universities need to show good faith and significant progress in this way or they're going to come back and do the next thing.

APPLEGATE: I think that's correct.

LEWIS: So I don't think you need to worry about individual liability, but the university as a whole can't ignore it. But I'm not a lawyer.

MCROBBIE: Okay, let's draw the discussion to a conclusion unless anybody's dying to say something. Thanks, so much David. That was a very fine briefing.

AGENDA ITEM 6: BRIEF RECESS

MCROBBIE: I would like to propose if people are agreeable that bearing in mind we only have two agenda items left that we might dispense with a brief recess and just go straight on to agenda item 7. Does anybody object to that or are people happy to do that? It seems to be agreeable so let's move on to agenda item 7.

AGENDA ITEM 7: DISCUSSION ON THE CREATION OF SCHOOLS OF HEALTH AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MCROBBIE: Let me just make some comments by way of introduction here and we're going to go slightly off what's in the agenda just by way of providing some context for this agenda item. And then after I've made some comments, I'm going to ask Vice President Marshall to make some comments and then Dean Bob Goodman. I was faced with a situation over the last couple of years of there being two very strong different cases having been made and I've talked to the Faculty Council about this before for the establishment of a school of public health or schools of public health. One of the major constraints we have to labor with here is that the accreditation body basically would not allow the formation of something like what we at IU call a Core School and a school has to really be a campus entity to put it in a summary form. So faced with strongly compelling cases on both campuses, I took the decision to move us forward in the direction of establishing two schools with the understanding that were the accreditation rules ever changed that the schools would then merge into one. And then I sent out a memo which many of you may have seen, describing the sort of process bearing in mind that obviously the respective campus Faculty Councils have a role to play here and many other bodies do too and that ultimately goes through me to the trustees for final approval and then there's an accreditation process that takes place after that. In order to ensure that the two schools in their formative phases were properly coordinated and that we had did all we could to avoid any destructive, non-productive competition between them and instead did all we could to enhance and build collaboration I established a coordinating council chaired by Vice President Ed Marshall who has, in fact, a distinguished public health background, but who is associated with neither school. And I asked Ed and the two principals—Dean Bob Goodman on this campus and Dr. Mary Swanson and Indianapolis—and then a number of other people, a number of other deans and some others to comprise the coordination council which I think has met reasonably regularly, and what I'd like to now do after just that little introduction is to ask Ed to make some comments and then hand it over to Bob Goodman. I should comment that Dr. Mary Swanson will be presenting as I understand it at the next meeting, that's the proposal. I think which is in February she will be presenting about the plans for the School of Public Health at Indianapolis. So that's the background, and Ed would you like to make some comments?

MARSHALL: Certainly. Dean Goodman's going to take you through a lot of the specifics of how we got to where we are now and where we hope to go in the future, so I won't belabor that point, but just to say that Indiana is on the wrong end of whatever indices you might want to look at as it relates to public health. We are among the least healthiest of states in terms of morbidity and mortality indices. We are fat, we smoke, we drink, we don't exercise, and we don't eat right. And when we look at the cost of healthcare in this country, you know we're going through a national debate in terms of what we should do about reforming our healthcare system, but a lot of that is predicated upon the cost. And we do know, both anecdotally as well as from empirical

data, that prevention is the least costliest way to go. And that is essentially the lynchpin of public health. It's about preventing disease, preventing mortality/morbidity before we get to that level where it's going to be most costly and less optimistic in terms of healthcare outcomes. Also as a state we do not invest as we should in terms of healthcare, monetarily and otherwise. Nor do we receive the returns on the investments that we do make. We do not receive a sufficient number of funds externally that are available to support public health, and a lot of that has to do with our lack of having a school of public health because many of the funds that would support public health initiatives that we would like to secure are designed primarily for schools of public health. We do have programs of public health both on Bloomington campus as well as the Indianapolis campus, but those are programs. They are not schools. And many of the funds that we are looking to seek are essentially designated for schools, and I think Bob will talk to you about that in a moment.

As President McRobbie said, we did put together a coordinating council. This council currently is made up of ten individuals including Dean Goodman and Mary Swanson from Indianapolis as well as a couple other deans and also individuals somewhat tangential to the university. There's a slide in here that talks about those individuals. We have a former chair, I'm sorry—a former president—of the American Public Health Association which is the largest, the oldest, the most diverse association of public health professionals in the world. We have a current state health commissioner. We have a former state health commissioner. So I think we have the requisite knowledge and expertise. We have individuals who've had experience with accreditation, putting together schools. So we have the expertise, I believe – the knowledge to move this agenda forward in a very, very aggressive manner. And the coordinating council will be there essentially to make sure that the two programs play nice. That they are in fact coordinated, that they're complementary, they are supportive of each other. It's not designed for them to be competitive in any sense of the imagination. So I've been fortunate enough to serve as chair of that council. We have met twice to date, primarily kind of laying out our game plan. Much of our work will begin probably next semester as the two programs begin to put some meat to the bones of the plans that have been developed so far. So as the committee gets into its work of vetting those plans, looking at seeing how they may how they will work together, how they will mesh in terms of both the admission and the scope, that's when I think we will see a lot more activity a lot more frequent activity coming out of the council. The council then will act on those proposals and once we are ready to advance them, then we will advance them up through the normal channels of the university, through the president, through the board of trustees, for their approval. In Bloomington we fully expect the school of HPER to essentially morph into a school of public health. In Indianapolis, there is a Department of Public Health within the School of Medicine. We expect that department to essentially expand – separate from the School of Medicine – and become a separate, freestanding school of public health. We expect that these plans for both campuses will be developed and will probably come to the council probably later this academic year or the early part of next academic year with probably movement to the provost or the

chancellor and the president. Later on next year, early part of the next academic year, we will ultimately move on to the board of trustees. There is usually a two year lag period between the time we say we're ready to go and the completion of the accreditation process by the Council on Education for Public Health. So hopefully about two to three years out somewhere within that window, we expect to have fully operational schools of public health. So I think with that sort of introduction, I'm glad that Dean Goodman's going to talk to you specifically about the program in Bloomington and Mary stands ready to talk to you about what's happening in Indianapolis. So, Dean Goodman?

GOODMAN: And I want to thank President McRobbie and Vice President Marshall for inviting me. Also, thank you for the opportunity to speak to all of you. I'm going to put some slides up for us to look at as we go, so you're about to see that. Let's see if that works.

MCRROBBIE: Are people going to be able to see them on the other campuses?

GOODMAN: Yes, I just did. You notice I will speak a little bit about IUPUI in terms of some of the coordination. Ed mentioned, and I'm hopefully not embarrassing anyone, but we have several august people who sit on the board. Former presidents of the American Public Health Association. Ed has just been elected the current Vice President for the American Public Health Association, so that even makes us more stellar.

You won't be able to read all the details here, but you notice this comes from the Indy Star and the date here is, I believe, March of this year. The headline, and I want to thank Ed Marshall for bringing some of these, these are a combination of both of our slides. I do want to give credit where it's due. We are overall considered the sixth worst state in terms of well-being. These were ranked by the Gallup-Healthways survey corporation and it just sort of represents – the article represents – how poorly we, as Hoosiers, tend to do in public health. This is, you know, really brought home in some of our areas, Gary, for instance, South Bend. These are areas – if you look at congressional districts – the South Bend district, the Gary districts, they ranked in terms of the 435 congressional districts, way down by the bottom; ranked last for healthy behavior. So the needs in this state are clearly important. Indiana is primarily a rural state and the rural statistics really are as dire as what you see here. If you were to look at the overall conditions in the state, and I'm about to show some of them to you, Indiana currently ranks 34th out of all the fifty states in terms of its health profile. If you look at the states that are somewhat like us, we really don't represent the Midwest very well. We actually look much more like Louisiana and Mississippi which are sort of at the bottom of the heap in terms of morbidity and mortality data. In addition if you look at the inset at the lower right, you'll notice over almost a twenty year period, that Indiana has actually slid ten places. And the direction if you look right above it is continued downward. So it's not a happy picture in this state and we're one of very few states now that have no school of public health. The *Indiana Daily Student*, our paper here, indicated that

Indiana is ranked 49th in terms of its ability to garner federal funding in public health. Now this ranking is open to debate because other surveys tend to put us 50th. So we have the choice of putting it 49th or 50th, but I think most statisticians would say there's really no significant difference. The only thing significant about it is we're not getting our share of what we should and it shows up in terms of people's health. This gives you a sense of why we fall into the categories we do. On the right hand side, the outcomes in the state puts us in terms of CVD – which is cardiovascular disease, mortality, deaths from heart attack, strokes – we rank 37th out of fifty states in the nation. The death rate due to cancer puts us 40th out of fifty states. Infant mortality is 34th and deaths due to occupational hazards, injuries, we're 32nd. So we're clearly in the lower half and quite, you know, a way down in the lower half. A lot of these things that you see as outcomes are often the medical enterprise deals with. When you have cardiovascular disease, you go to the doctor. Cancer you go to a doctor. When you have infant complications, congenital complications, you know, you go to Riley – places like that. The factors that tend to cause these morbidity/mortality outcomes are risk factors and they're on the left hand side. These are the things that will lead to CVD and cancer and so forth. So from a public – these are more the public health side – where we can intervene for around prevention, cessation, improvement. We're 45th and the latest statistics tell me that we're 50th now in terms of smoking prevalence. That doesn't mean we're 50th best. We're 50th worst. We smoke a lot. We also – it's quite a cocktail – we're 30th in terms of overweight. Our graduates, our high school graduation rate, is 36th in the country. And here's a study, this is from the Henry Kaiser Foundation and the United Healthcare Foundation, both conclude that we're 50th in terms of public health money. So the sources I'm sharing with you are governmental sources. They're non-partisan public think tank groups. If you were to look at this in terms of race, you'll notice that African Americans, particularly those in urban areas, tend to suffer twice the rate of risk factors than others do, which tends to point towards the disparities in this state around race. There are also great disparities in terms of rurality, as well – a little more hidden though. So, in summary, chronic diseases have gone up, healthcare costs go up, productivity goes down and economic growth goes down. I'm going to show you a slide that's a little bit difficult to understand, but let me explain what this means. In total economic cost in billions of dollars, we in this state have the potential, if we don't change anything to lose four hundred...let me see...I have to have the...

MARSHALL: A lot of money. (laughter)

GOODMAN: ...four trillion dollars. Yeah, big bucks – four trillion – in terms of lost productivity. Now, I might mention that these studies – this comes from the Milken Institute on unhealthy Americans in 2007 – they're not only talking about absenteeism. The concept that they talk about is called presenteeism. It's the idea of not getting your car built on Monday because somebody's had a really wild Sunday, right? And so a lot of this has to do with the loss in productive work when people actually show up. When you do some extrapolations to the costs that can be avoided in terms of billions of dollars, about one trillion dollars over a period of twenty-three years, extending out to

2023 can be saved simply by having better public health profiles. Another way to look at it is you look all the way over to the right, the difference between the costs you see in parenthesis in billions, and the avoidable costs on the bottom line if you look at the lowest cell on the right hand corner, we can potentially save 26% of those expenditures – 26.8% of those dollars lost – due to reductions in treatment costs, for early prevention and the indirect costs of lost productivity based on the Milkin Institute’s economic forecasts. So the gains, just in terms of what we can save through prevention, is certainly great and what that also represents is an improvement in morbidity and mortality and the quality of people’s health in the state of Indiana.

Indiana also – the picture is no better in terms of how many health workers. Trained health workers per hundred thousand population on the national average, there are 138. We, in region five, that’s the Midwest region that comes out of Chicago, Indiana is included in this, most Midwestern states are. There are 76 workers out of a hundred thousand. Indiana falls to the bottom of the pile, way out of the Midwest region, down to 46 trained workers in public health out of a hundred thousand. That means even workers who are currently doing public health jobs, for the most part, they’re not trained in public health. The national average is something like 18% of the workforce is actually trained in public health, so that has some dire consequences for even how we do what we do when we have people to do it.

Okay, as a result of these kinds of dire statistics and, of course a state university more than most, has a responsibility I think to the citizens of the state and health is certainly a primary – the United Nations calls it a right, not a privilege. And so, on May 5th the president had made an announcement that we are establishing two schools. The school that will morph out of HPER, you see at the bottom of the slide will tend to focus on rural health. For one thing, we tend to sit in more of an area that can be defined by its rurality. IUPUI obviously sits in the center of Indianapolis and so there’s a greater focus on urban health. And this is also an attempt to use our strengths, which I’ll talk about in a minute, to make sure that we’re coordinating what we do in a complementary way and a non-redundant, duplicative way. The IUPUI campus will be developing their department out of the School of Medicine and focus more on urban health. This isn’t to say we wouldn’t collaborate with their expertise on one or the other campus, you know, we’ll certainly do this. But I’m already meeting with – I just had a luncheon meeting – for instance with the rural public health association just today. And so we are starting to generate a lot of activity in these areas. This is the famous ‘Ed Marshall’ slide that I’ve made an addition to. It’s probably the first time he’s seen it with the addition. If I get this wrong, blame it on Ed, not me. Ed tends to see health outcomes on a fulcrum between public health and medicine. If you tend to look on the medical side, you know, why do we have schools of public health? On the medical side we’re dealing typically with individual care. Often in confronting a medical condition that requires treatment, more and more, the basis for a lot of medical care is based on biophysiology, particular genomics. The environment certainly does play a factor in people’s lives, the air we breathe and so forth, and so if you go further we can talk about the social environment

in terms of safety, accidents and so forth. As we move there, we're starting to move more towards public health which deals with prevention. One of the things that I think separates the Bloomington campus from the IUPUI campus, besides the rural and urban split, is I would add to this that at Bloomington, we see our job as the promotion of wellness and quality of life. The World Health Organization, you know, describes and defines public health not merely as the absence of illness, but the promotion of wellness and quality of life. And we feel that, in HPER, many of the programs that have existed so far wrap very nicely into an innovative, 21st century package that doesn't merely look at the aitiology of disease, but it translates into community wellness types of programs. So, for instance, we're starting a pilot that if it works well, will become sort of emblematic of what our school does. I just met for lunch as part of the rural piece with the mayor of...of...

MARSHALL: Bedford.

GOODMAN: Bedford. Thank you, Ed. Bedford. Ed wasn't at the lunch but he knows about it. And with several members of the rural public health association. The mayor of Bedford was the former president, and she's a nurse. We're working with the Bedford community getting all of their local stakeholders together that are consequential in public health. That would be the local hospital, the business community, law enforcement, physician groups, nursing groups, the schools, some of those stakeholders who have a concern around community. One of the attributes at our school including my own expertise is in community public health and community development. We're going to work with local communities to develop local visions for community health improvement, and working with public health techniques, helping the community improve their capacity and competence to sponsor the vision and see it through. And the partnership with the Rural Health Association, with our school, with other significant stakeholders in the community, we feel we can do the necessary mobilization by building critical mass of partnerships. We're starting to do this with Lawrence County, particularly Bedford. But as we are successful, we'll start disseminating the model to other places. Now the way we're going to do this is we're going to set up an office of community public health engagement, run by a faculty member who has quite a bit of experience working for local health departments and doing local community and public health; and that's sort of our model, to focus on our rural communities doing basic community, public health development work, resource development. Schools of public health at the master's and doctoral level require internships and practicum experiences of several hundred hours as part of six credits worth. Our students will be working with these local coalitions, learning how to do public health development work under supervision of faculty members, and by doing that work that way through the center of engagement, we will have consistent follow-through if students turn over as they graduate. And our hope is by working with local communities and by developing partnerships with organizations like the rural public health association, we will be able to leverage grants. There are a lot of grants out there that we're not eligible for now simply by not being a school of public health. Most notably, the Centers for Disease

Control, but there are a lot of rural health grants that have been considered minority, disparity grants because of the nature of rurality that certainly apply. Right now, my school has had its best year in bringing in research and service dollars. I think we're up to about \$14 million and we're about to surpass that and we estimate with a school of public health within five years the number of grant dollars should go up to about \$30 million which is of significant import to the state. I looked at the recent report done on IU productivity. It was done for all of the campuses on IU Bloomington campus. The amount of in-kind resources we have now by students doing internships about \$10,000 a year. That will go up significantly just in terms of income contribution. So, the training mechanism, the ability to bring other experts into the state, the ability to track money that's not available to us and to focus it in rural areas, I think will be a tremendous benefit not only to the way we train and to our ability to stay vital as a school, but also to produce the necessary benefits for the citizens of Indiana both in terms of our rural populations and our urban populations. There are enough grants out there, there is enough work to do in health in a highly complement-tailored way, that has a lot of complementarities that the two schools working well, playing nicely together in the sandbox to paraphrase Ed, we can do a lot of powerful things. It's one of these things where – I don't think the cost of these things – although we'd like to build and it's hard economic times – I think the amount we would benefit from them would derive from professional training and development in terms of returning students to important professional positions in the state that pay fairly well is an important return. So I think there's a lot of value added in bringing these schools online. The two schools because of what Dr. McRobbie said – the president said – earlier, we have to develop the accreditation for both schools independently. It's the nature of the accreditation. We will function collaboratively. We'll both be Core Schools and then of course the president established the two schools, this coordinating council to avoid competition to ensure that we reinforce each other in a complementary way and to work closely together. I think partnerships are very important in the work we do and the fundamental partnership is to work collectively across the two schools. The coordinating council will report to the president. It oversees – with Ed's leadership – it oversees the work we're doing. Ultimately when we pull our plans together, the coordinating council will report to the president, provost and chancellor about the plans we've developed.

Now, when does all this get done and so forth? The campuses are presenting the progress they're making to the council now. I'll tell you what we're doing here on the Bloomington campus in a minute. They will, you know, the council will work with us to finalize our plans. And even after the schools are set up, the council isn't going away. It's meant to be there to assure coordination happens between the two schools. Here are the people. I'll leave this up for a second so you can see it. These are the people that Ed mentioned earlier. Ed being the chairperson of this group is on the bottom, but you also see Virginia Caine is the former president of the American Public Health Association, the current and former commissioners are listed further up. Several other deans sitting around the table. According to the plan we were given by the president,

HPER should be presenting a proposal sometime after January 1 of this coming year. School of Medicine after January 1 of the next year. Some of this has to do with technicalities in accreditation that I won't go through. I think the School of Medicine is trying to hasten their process, but when I shared this with my faculty at the beginning of the semester, I threw this little piece up, which means that we have to work pretty fast. So we're working in a deliberative fashion – but quickly – to get down the road to meet these deadlines. What are we doing?

First of all, we're starting with a vision. I'd like you to sort of see what we have now. The yellow represent the current departments and divisions in the school. The others in, I guess – what would you say – sort of a tawny color? Those of the ones that are required for accreditation. We looked at how these might integrate and we're working on the integration across departments into various clusters. And these tend to be some of the clusters we're looking at now. I'm going to show you a couple of slides later that show you that we have committee structures set up with faculty from all the different parts of the schools, engaged in discussions about reformulation of our departments so that they make sense for a school of public health. A couple of weeks ago, we've done internal surveys to see where our programs are, how they ought to be reconfigured, and I've hired a former dean of the School of Public Health at Michigan who's now the Myron Wegman Professor of Public Health and runs their chronic disease center. Dr. Noreen Clark, a very well regarded public health person, came in a couple of weeks ago to do recruits with our faculty, to discuss ways we might reconfigure. She also looked at ways that we should consider reformulating that curriculum and what other degrees we need. We had Mr. Randy Schwartz who's the former director of chronic disease for the state of Maine's health department and is currently the vice president for the American Cancer Society, come and meet and do retreats around staff related issues, staff reconfigurations and where our centers and institutes might fit into this new structure. So, what I want to emphasize here, particularly because this is the Faculty Council, is that we're trying to pay attention to this being highly participatory. That faculty governance plays a role in how we're putting things together. The academic council and I will be meeting in December after the recommendations coming out of the retreats are now being vetted with the departments and I imagine in December we'll have some votes. Latest, January we'll come up with a name change and then I'll have a vision statement and recommendations ready to come to our coordinating council and then up the line. So I would expect that, you know, the spring semester is reasonable for our timeline. We also have centers that might need to move from one department to another. We are an accredited, certified OSHA training center, in occupational health. That might have to move from one department to another. So we have a lot of internal workings that we're doing. On our campus, we see linking. We're doing a lot of linking by joint degrees and shared faculty with other units on the Bloomington campus, but more appropriately for this discussion, I want you to see sort of our vision on this campus for how I think the two schools ought to be collaborating. First of all, you see that we'll be transforming our school – as in what hopefully looks a little like crimson – with an overlay of kinesiology and other departments we have. The IUPUI School is in

the vertical on the right hand side. And collectively, we should we working with all the campuses – and it's not to leave anybody out – but just to abbreviate going from all the way in Northwest to Southeast where campuses are interested in linking through programs, bachelor's programs, shared courses, shared faculty where we want to make sure that we're linking with the campuses and in fact we're already having active linkages with IU Northwest, the campus in Gary. We also see ourselves working with other universities and other non-profit private, you know, state health department, philanthropic organizations out of our system and others. So that's just a general plan. The main thing for this meeting is to emphasize that we see linkages. We welcome discussions with the other campuses. From our standpoint, since many of the campuses are in rural areas we particularly want to work here at Bloomington with those who aggregate in rural regions.

Finally, this is sort of an internal process on this campus. We set up internal committees of faculty and students and so forth on the reconfiguration of departments, new degrees, what roles our institute centers will play, how we allocate space. Some of you know that we've been permitted to build about 32,000 square feet to our current building. We'll be adding laboratories, more offices, a large classroom, you know, auditorium and the latest we've heard is that the building will start in May, though I won't say of which year. I was told it's this year, but we'll see. Other committees are of school naming, staff instructors and linking with other schools' programs and localities. So this is a structure that we're working with through our academic council, through Tom's office as vice provost in terms of hiring, and the Bloomington Faculty Council are involved in this. A few things as we've been going through our work, is we want our people to work well with each other, so these are sort of our rules of engagement. No pontificating off to the side. We are meant to work collectively well. Our vision of working well collectively is that we're not looking at people as objects. Everybody around the table, you know, ought to have a say when you're trying to develop civil discourse. The 70% solution is our way of trying to come to consensus. We expect that none of us are getting 100% of what they want, including the dean. But if we walk away 70% happy, that's better than 100% of nothing. So our goal is to, you know, – in the spirit of compromise – to try to come up with arrangements that satisfy, you know, that optimize what we're doing. And if everybody walks away with a little of something, that's better than a lot of nothing. Finally, I would say that you know this is a very exciting project that we're doing. Sometimes it's kind of like a rollercoaster going downhill, but I think at the end of the day if we do this the right way it will have a manifest benefit for the university, the citizens of our state, the students that we train and, you know, I think this is a tremendous responsibility and I'm grateful for being given the honor of doing it and I hope we do it well. Thank you for your time.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Bob. Alright, the floor is open for questions and comments. Herb?

TERRY: You alluded to the idea that it's difficult to do new things in tough times. And the president began by observing that we're facing tough times that are likely to get

tougher. I have a couple of questions that relate and that flow from that. Number one, while we expect to get more money back, we expect to get grants, we expect to get other sorts of things that will benefit the state, do we have an idea of what it's going to cost us to get this going over the next couple of biannuals?

GOODMAN: On the Bloomington campus. I can talk about that.

TERRY: And then related to that, if I were a skeptical member of the General Assembly or something like that, I'd say, 'Okay, you've shown that we're not a very healthy state. You've shown that we could do a whole bunch of things. We could hire more healthcare professionals and other sorts of things and rise.' How could you convince me, the skeptical member of the General Assembly, that it's a good idea in these tough times to specifically spend money creating a school of public health? If you took this map, could you map over it state expenditure on public health education and would you discover a correlation? Would this part of the country be spending less on public health than this one on education?

GOODMAN: A number of questions. Number one, what would it cost? In our case, we have the advantage of being a freestanding school now. We have about two hundred faculty and many of the faculty already fit the categories that we have to pass muster for accreditation. I would say currently with the positions we have in place, of the 25 minimum that we need, we probably at this point have 23. Additionally, I've been able by being prudent, I think, in terms of being fiscally conservative as we all have, I've been able to put aside over a million dollars in base dollars that are through my office to hire the other positions that are advantageous to us. Like in our case, since we'll have a doctorate in environmental health, a chair of that department with an endowment and enough faculty. So in fact, I'm not at this point counting on other dollars. I think I've been told unequivocally they're not there. (laughter) And so...

MCROBBIE: It's the answer to your question, Herb. (laughter)

GOODMAN: You know, Herb, we can build this school, we can mount the school here without additional dollars. I can't say you know what'll happen if we keep getting hit, like, next year this way. We even had a rainy day fund put aside. So we anticipated a down economy. Therefore, I don't expect, you know, in order to reach accreditation that we'll need new dollars. However, over time, you know, if we want to build that makes sense that we'd do that. So those who are skeptical and saying, 'How much more will it cost?' Actually what I would say we're going to do it on the dollars we have now. To me the issue is to understand how much more we will receive as a state. We will be able to train students in the field that's—what's more relevant than health? You know, national debate. We will have people who can work in that infrastructure. Part of this is the STEM's initiative, particularly fields like epidemiology and kinesiology. There are a tremendous number of grants out there. I've just listed them for Ed to look at. But we're not highly competitive for as a school of HPER, but would be just simply with a

name change and good grant writers. And we have a lot of those in our centers right now. So part of it is doing what we have with the resources we have now, but I think reconfiguring them in a wise way. Let me give you one quick example. A lot of our professors, you know, who've been here for a long time, they're used to bringing in dollars through credit hour production. We find that we can get a lot of mileage by increasing our research production, particularly with federal grants that bring us over a fifty percent in direct cost return. So a million dollar grant brings in \$500,000 in indirect costs. That's a lot of money, and a lot of money that can offset some of our losses. There's a tremendous amount of the monies available and most of our, you know, grant writing ability resides in many of our centers, and the centers haven't interdigitated with faculty very much who really have an incentive to go out and do grants. What we're doing internally is we're having discussions about how we can de-silo, if that's a word—un-silo—ourselves so that we can work more cooperatively with the grant writers that are now in our centers. And we're starting to do that with great effect. So I think in some ways it's using our resources in a more cost effective way, but of course I'm not going to – as a dean who shakes hands like this – I'm not for the moment going to suggest that we're not looking for money. It also opens up our opportunities for philanthropic giving and for naming opportunities that are more attractive to a school of public health than it would be to a school of HPER.

MARSHALL: If I may add, too, it's also the risk of not investing in our public's health going forward, particularly from an economic development perspective. That map, when you look at the fact of our state of unhealthiness, and you attach to that the cost of providing – I want to say healthcare—sickness-care in this state and you look at who wants to invest in coming to Indiana as a corporate entity, they have to look at those costs because they flow directly to their bottom line. So in terms of future economic development, viability, sustainability of our state and our society I think we cannot afford the risk of not investing today in the future of this state.

GOODMAN: And it also opens us up to other possibilities. We've been talking with the business school and at the provost's meeting last week about hidden assets that we had. Well our focus on wellness, you know, there are some ways to be entrepreneurial in these areas that we can't be without the rubric of a school of public health. We have programs in registered dietetics, nutrition, exercise science, athletic training, health education, health risk appraisals. If you bring all of these experts that we have in the school together, and let's say we also have Bradford Woods, 2400 acre environmental center that can help us with environmental health, think about the idea of putting some kind of wellness center that can draw in—you know we have to do it the right way obviously—think about the possibilities of doing something like that in a setting like Bradford Woods. So it really opens us up to a field that now universities like Chapel Hill, Duke, Johns Hopkins, they take advantage of these things. We also are fairly significantly invested in global health and so this will also help us with those types of grants as well.

MCRROBBIE: Other questions?

GALLMEIER: Chuck Gallmeier, IU Northwest.

MCRROBBIE: Yes, Chuck?

GALLMEIER: Dean Goodman, I think I heard you say something to the effect of reaching out or collaborating with IU Northwest on this, but I couldn't hear it very well. We also couldn't see the chart and I just would like you to repeat that if you could, because I know my colleagues in CHHS in the college would welcome such collaboration because I know that they are going to offering a course in public health in the Spring and we of course have concerns about urban public health in Gary. So I wonder if you could repeat what I think you heard about the collaboration with regional campuses and particularly IU Northwest. I think I heard that. Maybe I didn't, but I think I did.

GOODMAN: You did. And a couple of connections: I think the courses you're talking about will be offered by IUPUI next semester. We're going to talk about our coordination at our next I think January or February meeting, Ed. But even more than that, for instance, we've had a meeting with your local YMCA and David Malik who is I think acting vice chancellor now and several of our faculty are working on a grant development project with several of your local community health entities and we're now working with David Malik to include faculty on the IU campus into the development phases of the grant so that faculty will have part of the resources. It's part of our ability to do capacity training and transfer some of the technical knowledge that we have about community public health partnerships. The whole idea on this one I think has to do with nutrition and fitness in the Gary area. So it's several local organizations and that's sort of an example. It's our first foray into significant projects, not just the talking but the actual doing. And that's going on right now.

GALLMEIER: Well, I totally would welcome that. It sounds good. I'm currently chairing a urban studies critical task force and we're working on some public health—well, I'll tell you that disciplinary courses in urban and public health and I just wanted to make sure that we're not encroaching or that there is a collaboration here before we continue to move forward. Could you comment on that?

GOODMAN: Yes, I – you know, I mean we often use the word “encroaching,” but I think this is something that we welcome. And when I was first hired, President McRobbie talked to me about the importance of using our distance technologies and other things to really develop the school as a state-wide entity. So, you know, to me if, you know, I've talked to the chancellor, I've talked to Bruce Bergland, about developing a bachelor's program there. Now we have a bachelor's program here. We wouldn't – you know, we encourage that. We don't want to see a remonstrance because the students in Gary are not necessarily going to come down here, but we would love for them to gain the kind of development work and stay in Gary and to do the work, or come to one

of the places where we offer the master's training or the doctorate training. And we want to be very careful about bringing, you know, students, you know, who are residents of the state, who will stay in the state and continue to practice in this state. So, for instance with Gary, I think it's quite feasible that we'd be looking at a bachelor's program, a bachelor's of science in public health and I think both campuses, IUPUI and we don't see that as competition. We see that as furthering the system within the state to improve public health. I mean, at this point in my career, I'm not that much looking to compete with other campuses. I'm looking to leave a legacy of improving you know public health. That would be a nice way to, you know, top off a career.

GALLMEIER: I believe it would be welcome here, too. Thank you.

MCRROBBIE: Thanks, Chuck. Other questions?

NISHIHARA: This is a question from IU East. Could you address the relationship between the schools of public health and the schools of nursing?

GOODMAN: Yeah, I think they're highly complementary and we need to do more coordination. I've been meeting with the School of Nursing faculty at IUPUI, for instance, and some of the nursing presence here on our campus in Bloomington. We started conversations this semester on ways that we can cooperate and coordinate. I had been working on a grant with the Albert Einstein College of Medicine and the nursing school up at in Indianapolis on a joint research grant, and these are the kinds of things that I could see us doing more of. But we've started the conversation with those two campuses and welcome expanding the conversation beyond that.

MCRROBBIE: Yes, Herb?

TERRY: It may be nothing but an oversight on these two charts, your campus vision and your state-wide vision. But it strikes me that there's not a single linkage in either of these to the School of Business.

GOODMAN: Oh, it's just – the School of Business has been extremely helpful in what we've been doing. In fact we've brought them in quite early to help us think of a business...

TERRY: What I'm thinking is, I don't see the school of public health being able to solve itself many of the state's problems. You're a catalyst for getting the state, including its business entities and other sorts of things, to address these three. You can turn out public health professionals, but if there's no jobs for them in this state, they'll leave. And so I'm wondering, you know, where the coordination of the activities of the school with externalities in the state of Indiana; its political bodies, its major businesses, and these sort of things...

GOODMAN: Well, you know, I assure you it's there. Let me say, you noticed that that diagram is very busy? I didn't mean to put every school on there, so those that are left out are not meant by omission. They're meant by running out of paper. And, you know, how we coordinate really depends on what we're coordinating. So, for instance, we're developing a JDMPH degree on this campus. There's already one on the Indianapolis campus. That will largely define, you know, some of the relations with the law school. We are doing coordinated work with journalism for instance around information technologies, health messages, and journalism. So it really depends on what we're doing. The nexus of coordination depends on what level, what unit, that's being done at. I think that public health, if you look at it, it's a multifaceted business and we need to work with our assets around the campus, but in addition to that, I want to make sure I'm answering your question about so what happens if students leave. Even in a down economy, public health notwithstanding this state which has cut its state workforce, public health tends to be a fairly durable field. To the point I would say it's not quite recession proof, but, you know, we offer a lot of jobs. Our strategy in working with local communities and partnering locally is to develop a climate of receptivity with the public health workers because first of all we don't think that localities understand what they do and what their potential is. The more we can place local students in guided activities as they're developing their degrees, and the more we work with the constabulary of local organizations and we work collectively on bringing in grants with the rural public health association. The more we work in partnership and can develop a critical mass of partners, what I've learnt over the year through my research is, one of the byproducts of doing things that way is you find the money to establish positions. A lot of my work is on – and, you know, I've done research on this for twenty years – on how you sustain community public health movements. And well first things people say is, 'Just give us enough money, and we can do it.' Well money ends up being the byproduct of this type of organization we find. So it's a highly calculated strategy, Herb, to develop an awareness and evaluating and then a need for these types of positions in our state.

MCROBBIE: Okay, I'm mindful that probably we are about ready for agenda item 8, so I think we should draw this discussion to a close. Dean Goodman, thank you very much for your presentation. Although I noticed that Dan Rives isn't here, but is he...?

DETHLOFF: He won't be here until four.

MCROBBIE: Won't be here until four? Well, we're not going to...I mean, I think we just postpone it until the next meeting in that case. I mean, I don't want to shoot people who've got research and teaching to get back to. (laughter) Alright, in that case, there being no other business, I think the meeting is adjourned and we'll postpone agenda item 8 until the next meeting. Good. Thanks everybody.