

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
December 13, 2022
1:30 P.M. – 4:40 P.M. (EST)
broadcast.IU.edu

Members Present: Arshanapalli, Bala; Baer, Mark Christopher; Ben Miled, Zina; Blum, Janice S.; Buckman, Christopher; Carlton, Rebecca; Cohen, Rachael; Cole, Shu Tian; Daleke, David L; DeSawal, Danielle; Eisenstein, Marie A; Elliott, Rob; Evans, Cindy; Foughty, Trevor; Goff, Philip; Herrera, Israel; Jessie, Bernadette Faith; Johnson, Colin; Klein, Andrew; Lammers, Sabine; Lee, Karen; Letsinger, Sally; Marr, Deborah; Marrs, James; Maxcy, Brendan; Mayo, Lindsey; Mc Donald, Heather; Medina, Monica; Miller, Leslie; Morgan, Gin; Nichols-Boyle, Shawn F.; Pinkney, Dwayne; Polly, P. David; Quenette, Andrea; Reck, Cathrine E; Rybas, Natalia; Schult, Carolyn A; Sciame-Giesecke, Sue; Seibert, Kyle; Shrivastav, Rahul; Simpson, Marietta; Singh, Kashika; Spendl, Lana; Stucky, Thomas; Surma, David R; Tanford, J. Alexander; Wert, Joseph; Whitten, Pamela; Windsor, L. Jack;

Members Absent: Eskew, Kelly; Bruzzaniti, Angela; Fowler, Shari Lynn; Keener, Joe King Thorius, Kathleen Ann; Kravitz, Ben; McMillen, Douglas; Pellegrom, Colin William; Polites, Mike; Raymond, Angie; Rozelle, Carol N; Trinidad, Jonathan

Guests:

AGENDA:

1. Approval of [minutes of April 26, 2022](#)
2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes); Cate Reck, Joseph Wert, and Philip Goff, Co-chairs of the University Faculty Council;

[U1-2023: Membership of the UFC 2022-2023](#)

[U2-2023: University Faculty Council Committees 2022-2023](#)

[U3-2023: Summary of Actions Taken 2021-2022](#)

3. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes); Pamela Whitten, President of Indiana University
4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes); Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to President Whitten or Co-chairs Reck, Goff, and Wert by emailing UFCoff@IU.edu at least two business days in advance of the meeting.
5. Graduate Faculty Council Updates (15 minutes); David Daleke, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences and Interim Dean of the IU Bloomington University Graduate School, IU Bloomington; Janice Blum, Dean of the Graduate School Indianapolis and Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education, IUPUI; Bala

Arshanapalli, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, IU Northwest;
Natalia Rybas, Associate Dean School of Humanities and Social Sciences, IU East

6. Questions/Comments on Graduate Faculty Council Updates (15 minutes)
7. Report on Commission's Funding Formula Proposal and Affirmative Action (15 minutes); Dwayne Pinkney, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration; Trevor Foughty, Associate Vice President of State Relations
8. Questions/Comments on Commission's Funding Formula Proposal and Affirmative Action (15 minutes)
9. Updates from UFC Research Affairs Committee (15 minutes); Sally Letsinger, Senior Research Scientist, IU Bloomington; Deborah Marr, Associate Professor, IU South Bend; Tom Stucky, Professor, IUPUI
10. Questions on Updates from UFC Research Affairs Committee (10 minutes)
11. Motion to Amend ACA-33 Code of Academic Ethics (5 minutes); Alexander Tanford, Chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee
[Action Item]

[Current ACA-33 Code of Academic Ethics](#)

[Report to the UFC on Revisions to ACA-33 Code of Academic Ethics](#)

[Motion to Amend ACA-33](#)

12. Questions/Comments on Revisions to ACA-33 Code of Academic Ethics (35 minutes)

AGENDA ITEM ONE:

Whitten: Good afternoon, everyone. We'll officially call this meeting to order. Let me congratulate everyone--somehow we all made it just about to the end of the semester. So when I congratulate everyone, I know everyone's kind of scrambling to get those last things done before the holidays, but the end is in sight. I think it was a terrific semester. We'll start the meeting with the approval of the minutes from April 26, 2022 Can we have a motion for approval?

Goff: So moved.

Whitten: A second?

Marrs: Second.

Whitten: Any discussion? {Pause} Hearing none, all those in favor please signal by saying, Aye.

Marrs: Aye, aye

Morgan: Aye.

Cole: Aye

Whitten: Any opposed, nay.

AGENDA ITEM TWO:

Whitten: okay, the minutes are approved. the next item on our agenda is for executive committee business. So we've got our co-chairs here, and I'll invite Cate Reck from Bloomington. to lead us off

Reck: great Thank you very much, President Whitten. So thank you everyone for being here today. We have a lot of returning members to the UFC. And we have actually a lot of new members. So we only typically meet about once a semester. Historically we have two on the calendar often, but we often only meet once, so a lot of us don't know each other. So one thing I'm going to request is, if you have the opportunity. Do you mind actually putting in the chat, maybe, what campus you're from, so that we can start actually familiarizing each other, you know ourselves with each other and what campuses we're coming from. I think that would be really helpful. In that same vein, if you have questions about process or procedures, or what's going on, please ask. I've been in, I think six UFC meetings, and I'm still trying to figure things out and, you know, figure out what needs to be done, at what time periods and procedural things. I'll tend to talk to my colleagues about things.

So I want to start off today with some exciting introductions. First one is Lana Spendl, who you've kind of seen on here. She's our new director for the Faculty Council offices. She started in the office in September. So welcome. Lana comes to us from the provost's office as her last position was the provost for the Bloomington campus Provost Shirastav's speechwriter. So Lana is a creative writer, and she holds an MFA in fiction, and an MA in Spanish literature from Indiana University Bloomington. Lana is originally from Bosnia, and her childhood was divided between time in the Balkans and Spain to due to being displaced from the Bosnian war in the early 1990s. Secondly, and equally we have a new staff member in the office. She's been in the office a whole 2 weeks. I'd like to introduce our newest member, Heather McDonald. Heather started 2 weeks ago, as I said, and I believe she's settling in very well. Heather comes to us from Ivy Tech, where she was director of accelerated programs. She has a BA from Hanover in history, and a BS. from IUPUI in secondary education and social sciences, a master's degree from Butler in school counseling, and she's currently working on her PhD in higher education administration from Bellarmine University. So please welcome Lana and Heather. You're going to be working with both of them on different committees and interacting and communications by email. So please make them welcome. And thank you for being here. Lana and Heather, do you have anything that that you want to add or that I misspoke.

Spendl: Oh, no, that was a wonderful introduction. Thank you so much. I'm really excited to be here, and I've just been loving, interacting with our faculty. Thank you.

Reck: Good. My screen is pretty small, so I just want to make sure I can't, I can't tell if I see Heather, but welcome. I don't know if you have anything specific that you want to say.

McDonald: Thank you. Just that I'm happy to be here, and it's already a joy to work for IU.

Reck: Fantastic. Well, we're very happy to have you be here.

Reck: I suspect, which is true, for most of our campuses. Bloomington campus is about waist or neck deep in strategic planning. I don't know if all the campuses are exactly the same, but on the Bloomington campus we have 25 working groups that then funnel up to 3 planning committees, Each planning committee is under each pillar, and then we have an executive committee, so where we are on our campus, which might be different from here is that by the end of this week all the 25 working groups are going to be giving handing off their suggestions and recommendations to the planning committee. Then we'll have one month pretty much to synthesize those things. Colin is in my view screen right now and Colin is one of these people who is on the planning committee for the Student Success Pillar. They'll be synthesizing the working group recommendations to try to draft something that will be then handed up to the Executive Committee. Then the Executive Committee has about two or three weeks on our campus to be able to provide a penultimate draft. On our campus, we have two town halls planned for February 15th and 16th to seek feedback from faculty and staff and students, and trying to have an open dialogue, and then our hope is to have the plan first week of March to President Whitten.

So, during this process we have a lot of great ideas generated. And if you're like any of the other campuses and any other working groups a lot of our faculty are very concerned about good ideas that don't make into the strategic plan not being heard and going away. So I wanted to share with you one of my plans for next year and my glory days of being Past President. I'll be chairing the BFC long range planning committee, and as such I'm kind of hoping to use this vehicle to help communicate good ideas that need to be addressed that didn't make it into the strategic plan to the rest of the campus.

Just a little bit more about what's going on in the Bloomington campus. The BFC Task force on the future of General Education issued a nearly forty-page report on suggestion and suggested improvements to our Gen. End. Curriculum. We're very thankful to that task force. Many of the suggestions actually are overlapping with what the student success Pillar suggestions are working on. So there's a lot of synergy between those two groups. We plan to revisit the genet suggestions after the strategic plan process has been completed in, and see how they overlap

For those of you who are new to UFC this year, you may not know that the UFC constituted last spring the Research Affairs Committee. So this is a new committee. So this nascent committee has been meeting since August, and thankfully we're going to hear a bit more from them today on the Bloomington campus. We also have something called the BFC Task Force on Research for organization. They started in August, and they issued a report. I'd say, probably mid or late November, that's posted on our website. If you have any interest in actually looking at that. I'm very grateful to the most phenomenal chair of that that task force and I'm a little biased because she's in my home department of chemistry. She still did a phenomenal job. And so that actually will be you know, link to what is being discussed today the last thing having to do the research in in it on our campus. The search for the Vice President for research

has commenced. The Search Committee has been charged by President Whitten. My understanding is, last week on our campus we had listening sessions from with the search firm, and they are soliciting nominations for qualified candidates. So I just want to make sure that the campuses recognize any qualified candidates they can actually submit names to and I'll put the email in the chat. That might be easier, but I'll say it verbally. IUVPR@storebecksearch.com. So I think this is going to take a village of people, you know, if you have some good candidates from other institutions that would be good for Vice President Research, please feel free to contact them.

Couple more updates from the Bloomington campus. Since the beginning of the fall semester, BFC leadership has been working with our graduate student professional government (GPSG), to continue to help improve graduate student issues. BFC has reconstituted the student appoint the Academic Affairs Committee SAAAC and hopefully it's going to be fully staffed in the spring, and we'll get them going. Their charge is to anticipate future problems for graduate students, recommend improvements in policies concerning the role of the SAAs on our campus, and then helping implement these changes and improvements. I think you all know that the graduate school's been decentralized back to our regional locations and so on. The Bloomington campus. The graduate search committee is going to be in the process of the being comprised right now, and hopefully, it's going to launch in the spring. That, again is going to be part of what our conversation for today is kind of putting into context with the graduate faculty councils. What that entity is, and what the future of that might look like. So I hope we have a spirited conversation today about that. And then the last thing, and I'm going to tip my hat to Danielle in a moment. We've just recently charged the task force on Faculty and SAA Mediation and Board of Review Processes. It's a mouthful. And Danielle DeSawal is chairing, and I'm very grateful. She is sharing that task force. So I'm going to give a nod to Danielle. Do you want to jump in and just give people an idea of what that you're working on.

DeSawal: Yeah, Absolutely. Thanks, Cate. So good afternoon. Everyone, a couple of things that we're working on that we've actually already completed is we recognize that the SAA Grievance and Mediation and Complaint Process wasn't very transparent and so one of the first things we wanted to do was work on the transparency components. So in short order over the last month, what we've done is taken the existing policies surrounding SAA Mediation and board of review processes, and we've created some flow charts to become transparent about what the process are for students to go through who have a complaint and a grievance. And then what we've also done is based on the policies created two sets of documents. So for the SAA mediation process we've created an external document and an internal document for the Mediation Committee. So the external document is for public display to talk about. What is the process? What does mediation look like in this environment, and then an internal guiding script for the initial meetings with the parties who would be going through mediation. All of this being done with an eye on being consistent, but an eye also on equity. In addition, what we did was take the BFC Board of Review policy, and we did a very similar thing. So we have an external document, and then we also have an internal document for the Board of Review that can use as a script for consistency in handling cases, but also ensuring that we're equitable in the processes.

What we're doing right now is looking to create a website page very similar to that for faculty grievance that we see on the Bloomington Faculty Council Page here in Bloomington, so that the SAAs have the opportunity to go to one spot to kind of see what are my options? What are those options include, and what would be the processes I would go through if I were to

engage in those elements additionally as Cate announced it, it's a mouthful. So what we've also been doing is the exercise of creating the documents allows us to also look at the policy documents themselves, to identify where there might be some gaps or some misunderstandings that could be present. And so we've been making notes about that in order to offer up suggestions for policy revisions in order to update those documents as well. We'll do a similar process with the faculty components, and then our final recommendations will be about resources needed for the campus around mediation kind of centering as well as ombudsman type opportunities that Bloomington might be able to engage in. Did I cover it, Cate?

Reck: You did a beautiful job. Thank you for that that wonderful overview. So right at the tail end, you actually mentioned ombuds team or ombuds people. I'm going to now stop talking, and I'm going to let Phil Goff kind of take off from here. Phil, do you mind actually telling folks about what I think is a wonderful ombuds team that you've had on the IUPUI campus for about four years, and maybe talk for a minute about the success of that, because I kind of have a vision. I think the Bloomington campus would benefit from that. Thanks.

Goff: Sure. Yeah, we moved away from what we used to have which was the faculty grievance advisory panel that the IFC Executive Committee would choose one person and match them with someone who had had a complaint of some sort or another a faculty member. I was on that for years. It's exhausting, and so what we've moved to instead is to have a team of five people who are on board and the person, whoever's having problems can go talk with one of them. But then they take it back to the team and confer and it's advisory when it comes right down to it. It is it doesn't do investigation. It's not investigatory. It doesn't render judgment. Instead, it's informal it's sort of shuttle diplomacy between the parties who are involved. And sometimes mediation actually between the parties, just trying to come to an amicable solution without it going to a board of grievance and overall. I think it's going quite well. We are still fiddling with it on the edges. We'll probably be taking something to IFC in January, where we want to sort of clarify a couple of things within it, just because the members aren't sure sometimes whether they're what they're supposed to do. But overall I think it's gone very well.

Otherwise at Indianapolis. Like Bloomington, we're nearing the end of our strategic planning. In fact, all the 20 different committees have given their initial reports and the Executive Committee meets on Friday to go over those, get feedback and give it back to the committee, so that they can alter things as well, and moving toward the end quickly. The big thing the IFC has been paying attention to, of course, is what's going on with our Purdue colleagues who are moving over to West Lafayette. The IFC took up the question of policy how it might apply here from the very beginning. But the fact is, policy, the very well-drawn out, policies about mergers and closures and realignments, things like that are campus specific for our administrators, the different processes to fall to follow in this case, though this came from the Board of Trustees, and so it overrides a local policy like that. And so we're dealing with something that you know it wasn't of our making, but at the same time we have to do the best we can for our colleagues, who are moving over to Purdue and Purdue is making these personnel decisions so we've done a number of things to try to help with this. I've reached out to the Senate at Purdue, to the President, Vice President and the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. We're really trying to focus on the decisions of the home department. Also the fact that IUPUI isn't involved at all in this and what has happened at IUPUI. Keep in mind that these faculty have been tenured in Indianapolis, but their promotion goes through Purdue. So now they're having to

apply for positions and departments, and they're being judged again, even though they've been tenured at certain levels. And also the fact that there's a no appeals process and finally the issue for lecturers who are seen as HR. They're HR rather than in academic affairs. They're seen as staff with only one-year renewable contracts. We've been working closely with the engineering and technology Senate on this campus. The president of their Senate, Rob Elliott, has been attending the Executive committee to keep line of communication open. And I've spoken several times with President Whitten. In fact, we just spent an hour together, and that was one of the topics of conversation, too, that we keep each other informed, and what's going on with all of this. And then also about 10 days ago, I was before the Board of Trustees and brought up this issue, and they made clear that they didn't know this was going on. I encouraged them to try to use whatever influence they can behind the scenes to try to help our colleagues with this, and then IFC also passed a resolution about sort of processes that even though they can't literally be applied here try to follow the spirit of the application of those policies. So that's you know that's what's going on here. We're trying to make sure our colleagues are in a good place come May, when these decisions are rendered, and that in 18 months this will be a friendly and well-run sort of transition.

Reck: Joe, do you want to jump in?

Wert: Sure, Hi everybody and welcome to our first UFC meeting for the year. Regional campuses have been very busy. We have two regional campuses that are deep into new chancellor searches-- southeast campus and the east campus. We are all, of course, busy with our strategic planning process, and I think, pretty much all of the regional campuses are I think all about the same place, and it sounds like close to where Bloomington and IUPUI are as well. And that we hope to have the things finished up there by March. We are also deep into getting a common calendar approved. We have what I think, is our third proposal, that is being circulated now amongst the regional campuses. And I am confident. pretty confident, anyway, that the third time will be the charm, and this one will get through all of the campuses. So with that I will turn it back over to President Whitten.

AGENDA ITEM THREE:

Whitten: Great, thank you. Thanks to all three of you for those updates, I'll proceed now with giving a report. I was going to start by giving an update on IU2030 planning the strategic planning. But I think that that Cate and Phil and Joe did a great job. So I'm going to just move on that other than wanting to add how delighted I am to see the you know the really active and enthusiastic and ambitious planning that's going on in all of our campuses. So I'm excited to look at the roadmap that you all come up with for each of your campuses as well. Let me transition that, and just share some of the progress that's been made to date on the realignment of the Indianapolis Vision2024 is what we're calling it. So you know we branded this realignment Vision2024, and we actually launched a website that's been up for a while, vision.iupui.edu with our attempts to really present really transparent communication, including offering opportunities for public input into the alignment process as things go on. We early on developed a governance structure for Vision2024, with an executive committee that I chair. We also have a steering committee that's comprised of all the task force co-chairs as well as the members of the Executive Committee, and then, following a very robust nomination process, we actually

launched 10 task forces that represent all the major functional areas, right, relating to actual realigning our campuses. And so, in addition to the 10 task forces we also appointed a dream team of Indianapolis business, nonprofit, and civic leaders, to also provide some insight and some expertise as well to the to the process.

We continue with the early work of working to plan a joint biosciences or biomedical engineering institute that will be a combination of IU and Purdue. You know this is separate from the transition to IUI. This is kind of dreaming bigger about something we can collectively do together to really advance the City and the State. and so this would leverage the health sciences strengths of IU, of course, including the School of Medicine and our entire portfolio of health related programs along, of course, with the engineering strength that Purdue has. And so principals are currently really working hard on it to determine the scope of work, you know, to set up what initial priorities might be, funding needs and other resources required for a launch of this, which would probably be something we will do in phases moving forward as well. So that's that's an earlier stage of planning. We've also already established a data sharing agreement between IU and Purdue, so that we can facilitate the exchange and analysis of information about the transition. We have promoted Vision2024 to various internal and external audiences, and constituent groups and stakeholders attempting to kind of communicate as we move along. Last week we had, I guess, a super meeting, if you will, where representatives from all 10 of the task forces gave an update on their progress and the key issues they've identified so far, and I have to say even though there's so much still to go, it's pretty stunning what they've all accomplished to just what 4 or 5 months into this this 24-month process that we have so far. And then during that time we took advantage of all the brain power in that room, and we had a kind of a strategic feedback session where we asked all the groups to consider a couple of issues, and so we asked them to tell us you know, for example, the 3 things that would make this transition a disaster. The 3 things that would make this transition resounding success, and then to also put on the table you know anything that we've missed or haven't factored in at this point that will affect the outcome, and they had lots of good input for us as we proceed as well.

As hopefully, many of you know at the trustees meeting a week ago, I think? Maybe two this month earlier this month, I should say it was in December, I announced our intention to create a dedicated science and technology corridor in Indianapolis the SciTech corridor which is going to seek to advance STEM education and curriculum, for of course, people all throughout the State of Indiana to really accelerate. IUPUI and the future IU Indianapolis is really established as one of the nation's leading urban public research universities. And so, of course establishment of this corridor, particularly our front door, is a big statement. It does not mean we will not continue all the other wonderful things going on at the University in terms of different schools and degrees that are that in play. This is just an important part of the strategy moving forward for IU Indianapolis. And so you know the goal is that this corridor, which will be the front door to our campus, is going to complement, really the large and actually growing science and technology ecosystem that we're seeing in downtown Indianapolis, which includes 16Tech Innovation District and really the campuses of leading Indiana companies that are in downtown Indianapolis. It also presents an opportunity for continued collaboration between IU and Purdue, because we are, we are quite committed to them, being very successful with the engineering pursuit, both for their students and the scholarship they do as well. So much work still to do, you know, as I said I'm very pleased with the progress made this far, and I'm really grateful to literally the hundreds of faculty and staff members and community members who are engaged in

this important work. So keep watching, because there's a lot there's a lot of good work happening as well.

Let me transition for just a minute and talk about the biennial budget request. This is new for me. I'm used to living in States where you do it on an annual basis. Of course we do it biennially here, which seems so civilized to me as well. So last week I presented our 23 through 25 b annual budget request to the state budget committee and so as a university since it's every two years we spent about 18 of every 24 months working actually on this budget request. Our budget request has already been presented to the Commission for Higher Education in Indiana, and in the coming months, I will also get to present it to the House Ways and Means Committee, and also to the Senate Appropriations Committee as well, and then in April of next year the actual full state budget will be finalized. In May the Commission for Higher Ed in Indy will issue tuition and fee guidance that will be used by the University, and then in June we'll make a recommendation, and our trustees will approve the tuition and fee rights for that coming biennium which, of course, is a long way out. A lot is going to happen between now and then.

Typically state appropriations in Indiana for higher education fall into 3 categories operational funding, special projects and line item funding, and then capital funding. And so let me just speak to each of those very briefly in regard to our budget request. And so I'll start with operational funding, which is largely determined by the outcomes based funding formula that exists in the state. And I think in a few minutes in this meeting, we're actually going to hear a little bit more on the Commission's proposed funding formula by Trevor. I believe he's on the call with us today, so I will leave that for him. You know we do appreciate the work that members of the General Assembly did last year to develop recommendations for a new formula, which is, I think, really sorely needed. And I want to applaud our new commissioner, Chris, Lowery and his team, really for embracing the challenge of developing a more relevant formula. And so when I was meeting with the State Budget Committee last week, you know I shared with them, that now is really the crucial time to fundamentally rethink the role of higher education in the state just as we are taking this on right here at IU. It's also a crucial time that they rethink the outcomes that they think merit funding in higher education as well. For our line item, the second category we're requesting no new line items, and we just asked for an inflationary increase of 2.5 percent for our existing line items, some of these line items, some such as our global Network Operation Center and gigapop. It's a lot of good acronyms. You know, frankly, they have a really significant presence right here in the middle of our science and innovation corridor that we're proposing for the Indianapolis corridor, and they're an important part of our vision of course, to support the region and the State. And then third our capital project request is focused as always, on deferred maintenance for our regional campuses and for renovations to laboratories in Bloomington, to the much-needed renovation of the IU School of Nursing infrastructure of course, and a renovation of portions of the Wells Quad and the School of Public Health facilities on the Bloomington campus, which are just, they're just old if we're honest, and have all of those challenges as well.

We have a winter Commencement ceremony in Bloomington coming up to be held in Simon Skodt Assembly Hall on this Saturday, I guess it's already here. This year, we're going to grant a record number of December degrees. 2,224 people will become college graduates on that day and the members of the December class of 2022 come from 72 of our Indiana counties and they come from all 50 states, and DC and Puerto Rico and from 58 countries around the world. 227 of these students are going to graduate with double majors, and 11 are going to graduate with triple majors. Almost 14%, and I'm particularly pleased with this statistic, 14% of our

graduating class in December are first gen students. Almost 19% are underrepresented students of color, and 21% are international students as well. Tom Shu Row is going to be our student speaker for this graduation. He's graduated from Kelley with a major in finance, and he's done all kinds of things while he's in school. He's been the President of the Indiana Memorial Union Board, and is heavily involved in campus, and he's going to stick around and complete a master's degree in science. I'm sorry a master's degree in finance at the Kelley School through the four plus one combined bachelors and masters program. So it's awesome that he's taking advantage of that. And certainly, I'd like to see more students do that as well. And so, of course it's always a fun day at graduation to get to celebrate with our with our students and their families as well. So let me conclude my report there, and let us move on.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR:

AGENDA ITEM FIVE:

Whitten: I think the next thing in our agenda, our graduate faculty Council updates, and so I think the next few items on the agenda are information items, not action items, if I understand correctly. And so the first are updates on the Graduate Faculty Council, and so joining us today, we have David Daleke, our Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Science and Interim Dean of the IU Bloomington University Graduate School. I think Janice Blum, the Dean of the Graduate School in Indianapolis, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education, as well as I think Bala Arshanapalli, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, from IU Northwest. And then finally, Natalia Rybas, Associate Dean School of Humanities and Social Sciences from IU East, I think those four are up next to provide updates to us, so I will hand it over to you.

Daleke: Thank you very much. I hope you don't mind my colleagues if I jump right in here, I think maybe if I just gave a 2 min summary of how the GFC was created, and how it got to its current structure. And then we can talk about the implications for the division of the graduate school, and in 2005 the graduate school was reorganized, and part of the reorganization was to re-evaluate the structure of the GFC. The GFC is a representative faculty on all IU campuses. It was a large body of about 48 and the decision was to cut it in half to 24, and to make it primarily advisory to the Dean, but also to have set policies for the graduate school. It was restarted in about 2007, went for a few years to have had it's more or less, but it will be about 7, 8 years ago. It really picked up speed, and now it's become what we had envisioned at the time, and that is a really independent body that represents the graduate faculty. They have four committees, that are standing committees for the Graduate Faculty Council. The awards committee which adjudicates University wide and regional and national awards for the graduate school, the Academic Policies Committee Which does what the title said as a [inaudible].

Simpson: David, I think we're having...Am I the only one that's having a little bit of sporadic issues with Dave's audio?

Daleke: That that might be on my end. I think I can switch to computers, but I hope you heard most of that brief summary of the structure of the of the GFC. Because I think we really do want to talk about where the GFC is going moving forward. So I will connect in through another computer that I have next to me here, and hand off to my colleagues in the meantime.

Whitten: thanks.

Blum: So maybe I'll jump in while David's getting reconnected. I'm Janice Blum and I'm the Dean currently in the graduate school at Indianapolis and there are differences certainly across our two major research intensive campuses as well as our regionals. The Graduate Faculty Council does offer a forum to discuss some best practices. The Council has increasingly been leaning towards policy, trying to make policy decisions, but I think there's an acknowledgment, and maybe that's something you want to consider that because there are differences at Indianapolis, from Bloomington and at the regionals, that it's not always easy for that Council to make policy, and we spend a lot of time talking about things that are really that feasible, or maybe relevant on the other campuses. At Indianapolis we have a governing body for our graduate school. It's the Graduate Affairs Committee, and it's been in place for many, many years, and it's well established and has representatives from every school. The current graduate faculty, I believe, has perhaps 11 members from Bloomington, nine from Indianapolis, and then one from each of the regional campuses, and, as David mentioned there's several subcommittees that meet. David and I often sit in on the Academic Policy Committee. There's also an initiativeS committee as you mentioned and they do play a useful role in distributing some university awards. They'll select the distinguished Masters and the distinguished Ph. D. award recipients each year for us. So happy to discuss the Council more, but maybe the our representatives from the Regionals want to offer some comments?

Rybas: Do you want me to continue, I'm gonna tell you I was I'm director of graduate studies at Indiana University East and I've been serving this capacity for 3 years. It's my fourth year, and I've also been a part of a graduate Faculty Council, and I participated in almost all meetings, and also it was a part of the Policy Committee and Awards Committee, and from my perspective the most valuable part of graduate faculty council, for the regional campus is the discussions of policies. And very often the policies because they try to embrace a variety of campuses. They are vague right? And however, I think the discussions are absolutely important, and what we try to do on our campus is to develop an extension of those policies and discuss how they apply, and how they can be implemented at IU East specifically. Sometimes the discussions at GFC may not be particularly relevant or urgent in relationship to our campus, because we may not have particular types of students or particular issues, or they may not have emerged. But I think I appreciate those discussions because they provide insights and what might be available or possible for all programs. I can give you an example on what was important for us. For example, course revalidation or discussions on probation, all various applications of grading policies. That's all I wanted to mention at the moment.

Whitten: Thank you. Is there anyone that would like to jump in with a comment or question regarding this this issue.

Reck: David, it looks like you're actually back on your computer, did you wanna? Unfortunately, the last thing I heard you say before your audio cut out was, there are four committees, and then that was about where it cut for me. And you're muted. Hey, David, you're still muted.

Daleke: How about that? Good! Sorry I'm at Bryan 004 right now, and I'm trying to understand the system and use it at the same time. Yes, I think Janice may have outlined those four committees quite well. I think heard the audio, so I think she explained. I think the only thing in that I heard. I've got this commentary, too. But the only thing I wanted to add is the policies of the Graduate Faculty Council, or a set of the policies for the graduate school, which is the administrative body of the graduate faculty, and those are recorded in the graduate bulletin. So for those interested, the front matter of the Bulletin contains all of those policies. The rest of the Bulletin, of course, is the individual program policies for every program in which there is a graduate school program in the university, and just to be clear, graduate school programs include the PhD, and research based Masters degrees. And so we set policies for the GFC, sets the policies for those programs. But of course, professional programs that confer their own degrees are outside of those policies, although typically almost all of our programs at the graduate level follow policies that were set by the Graduate Faculty Council in some way either exactly or very closely.

Blum: I wanted to make one comment, and I hope this is taken the right way by this group. What one of the challenges for me with the Council is that they want to bring up subjects that really don't focus around policy or innovation, the awards, or our diversity subcommittees. And so there have been frequent meetings where council members want to talk about striking students and supporting the students in Bloomington and I appreciate their perspectives, but I have to keep redirecting us back to this is a System Council, and we do not have oversight, and we don't have at least right now those problems on the other campuses. And so I just want the this group to be aware that there are many issues yet. The other day they brought up the Purdue separation and IUPUI, and wanted to talk about faculty concerns, as Phil mentioned in engineering. And again, the Graduate Faculty Council is really not a council that has any oversight on those problems or concerns. I again appreciate the Bloomington faculty asking about those issues. The committee does some, or the Council sometimes does veer into many areas that seem to fall outside of you know the original focus of graduate and professional student well-being and policies related to academic progression and degree award. So I just feel I should share that because we spend a lot of time on these other issues.

Daleke: And to add to that, the public graduate Faculty Council character of the Constitution is pretty specific about the responsibilities of the of the Council, and as Janice mentioned, I agree with her comments. There is that they oftentimes steer outside of that for a number of reasons, but it also indicates that there is a group within these the Councils and I have met separately with what we call the Bloomington caucus of the GFC to deal specifically with issues that are specific to the Bloomington campus and to take them off of the GFC's main agenda where they maybe should not be because they don't apply to all campuses and have them be dealt with locally. So we have that informal mechanisms, but that's not codified in any kind of a structure.

Blum: Colin, did you have a question for us? See a couple of hands up?

Johnson: I did. I think Lindsey may have had to stand up, hands up, hand up before.

Mayo: Go ahead, Colin.

Johnson: Oh, so I'm wondering, I think and maybe President Whitten can speak to this or David or Janis, or any of you. I think one of the things the UFC, certainly the Executive Committee, is dealing with right now is trying to figure out what the implications for policy making authority are for the separation of the graduate school right? And so, David, you had mentioned, for example, that the corpus of policy that was generated under presumably the graduate faculty council's kind of consultative or legislative authority when the graduate school was a university-wide entity is enshrined in the graduate bulletin, and and right now I think that policy you know was sort of developed with the kind of mindfulness for the need to accommodate the specificities of particular graduate programs on different campuses. I mean that that's always been the kind of the policy making at the University level right, which is, we do the least restrictive stuff at the highest level, and leave it to individual campuses to sort of interpret and implement in a locally kind of responsible fashion. That's all great. But the question now becomes, and so I trust, the kind of spirit of that policy. But the question becomes if the idea of the graduate school separation was, in fact, not only to facilitate, but to some degree to encourage, the development of graduate programs on different campuses in ways that are sort of appropriate to those campuses. What happens when, for example, in order to accomplish something on Bloomington, or soon to be IUI or the regionals a change to that corpus of policy is proposed or needs to be affected, because at that point the jurisdictional questions become relevant. Who is the body that is sort of charged with the responsibility of essentially being able to facilitate the deviation of separate bodies of policy? Is that done administratively, or does it, like every other academic policy on campus, need to be accountable to an elected body of faculty. And I think that's what we're wrestling with in terms of trying to figure out, not necessarily what the structure of it should be. That might be. That's probably well within the purview of the President's decision making. But what are the policy implications, and how is then a university-wide elected body that currently has historically enjoyed, or until recently has enjoyed the ability to make policy for the entire system. Does that continue to be relevant, bearing in mind everything that I've heard from people that kind of, I think legitimacy of everything that I've heard about from people about the importance of ongoing consultation, just as colleagues across campuses. So what is your understanding of the kind of state of that policy and its durability in the longer term, if and when one of those campuses or the regionals decide that they want to start making adjustments to the body of policy that currently governs.

Daleke: I think I mean that's a great question. I think that's the existential question of the GFC right now is in in how to ensure that we don't deviate too far from policies on our individual campuses, that we become very, very different from unrecognizably different, and that Janice and I had this conversation for quite some time and have agreed to continue to cooperate and collaborate in all the ways that we do on each of our two large campuses. But then also I recognize that there may be opportunities for each campus to have different policies, slightly different policies that that are more specific to their to their campus, and the GFC is trying to determine how to make that work. There's lots of options. I think we could all come up with the ideas for how to make it work. But that is the major topic of the GFC agenda right now.

Blum: Yeah, we've always had some differences given, and IUPUI, we had the Purdue programs, and they had to follow the Purdue graduate school and I would frequently raise that. We're now working to move some of this Purdue programs into Indianapolis from our School of Science, which will be a welcome move. But again, in in Indianapolis we have a governing body,

the Graduate Affairs Committee, which then would look to our Faculty Council and certainly, as David said, we're going to try to continue to collaborate and align as much as we can. We have much more of a graduate and professional focus in Indianapolis. So a lot of our policies translate to our professional programs as well as our graduate programs, even if they're not, or we're not part of the University graduate school. Those schools have been wonderful about aligning with us but as, I think, David said, we, we'll try to align, but It's probably going to continue to be where we said each campus has some significant differences.

Rybas: I would like to go with Jan is just that on our campus at IU East, we have a body, graduate affairs council that works to articulate more specifics to the general policies, and for approach is not to contradict existing policies articulated in the credit bulletin so whatever we produce is to add more detail and provide guidance that would happen on our campus.

Blum: Lindsay, Did you want to go on?

Mayo: Yeah, I have a real quick question. Thank you. So previously, President Whitten talked about the operational funding budgetary biennial funding. My question is what this new formula with the State, does that incorporate graduate level funding as well in the system. And if not, is this an ask that's going to be put forth by the University?

Whitten: I'm not sure I totally understand the question. Do you mean the revised formula that's being proposed for the formula funding is that correct? Trevor? Do you want to jump in, or do you want to hold off and wait until you're talking about? The topic, maybe is Trevor on the call with us?

Spendl: President Whitten, I am not seeing him on the call. Unfortunately, I think he is joining us in a little bit, and I know he's sick today, too, so it doesn't look like he's on the call so we could, we could wait on that if you don't mind, let's hold off and let and let Trevor talk about it generally. And then he and then he would be able to answer your question more specifically if it wasn't covered. Are you okay, if we just put that off till Trevor's on with us.

Mayo: That's fine. Thank you.

Blum: Yeah, I will just mention that we are, David and I are meeting this week with the financial chief financial officer's staff and each campus to separate our budgets, and my impression is that each campus will support you know their graduate school, so we'll look to our Chancellor and our chief financial officer and David similarly will look to the Provost and their chief financial officer going forward but there are some things that President Whitten fully supports in the graduate school, and it will definitely be helpful that a discussion on those will continue. David, did you have anything else?

Daleke: No, I think. And Janice, thanks for mentioning that. and we are very close to having the budgetary issues, current budgetary issues settled. It's actually we were entangled, as you might imagine, having been a university-wide or UA level office we did create a number of entanglements, but I think those have been separated actually quite nicely. That'll be the easy change for us, and think going forward, though, is that we'll reevaluate our respective offices and

our schools. To ask, what is this really the structure that we need? And you know, at this moment, and there may be some additional tweaks that we will need, but that that's something that will come with time. I should also point out and I see my Vice President Sciam-Giesecke here is that the regional campuses are relatively independent, and that they record their own graduate degrees. However, we have traditionally in Bloomington assisted them, when necessary, for whatever needs that they have, and we will continue to do that to make sure that there is, that we that we don't essentially cut off our regional campus partners. But they are very independent, and, as I said, do all of their own recording of their own graduate degrees and handling of their own graduate programs.

AGENDA ITEM SIX:

Reck: Natalia I see your hand up.

Rybas: Thanks. I think a possibility for collaboration outside of a GFC for regional campuses is a discussion of various questions, or just sharing of know how and related to collaborative programs, especially in the graduate arena. And I think some of the questions do not always get discussed. For instance, transfer credit or addressing various forms of capstones. We're just discussing possible questions or concerns that we have at the level of collaborative programs.

Whitten: Colin, I see your hand is up. I don't know if it's still up from before, or if you had something else you wanted to say.

Johnson: I just had a follow up question about the applicability of the existing corpus of policy reflected in the Bulletin, and it's really to the [inaudible]. Is it because ultimately this is a UFC questions to, for example, about like the question of what the existing graduate faculty councils purview and authority is in some regard subordinate to what the UFC ultimately decides. The authority of that body is in the same way that every other, you know governing body on every campus. Ultimately, you know, sort of subordinate to policy authority articulated as a level of the UFC. Is it your understanding, for example that the existing body of policy enshrined in the Graduate Handbook that was made and is articulated currently with the assumption that there is a UA level entity right still applies, because I think, even as a superficial matter. And I'm you know I'm a proceduralist. So I'm a big fan of we're going to do this right so that all the T's are crossed and the I's are dotted. So we're not sitting there melting down when something controversial happens, or when some you know, a conflict emerges. You know we've not, for example, even on our individual campuses. made any testers to recognize the existence of that policy as being finding on the campuses themselves. Right now. Once you, it dissolved the administrative entities that was the University Level graduate school. I think implicitly, when you could assume that those policies are still applicable. But it's not it doesn't immediately follow that that is the case. and as it stands right now, we're operating as if that is the case. But I would personally feel more comfortable if individual graduate schools, for example, even if it was a kind of, you know, gesture, but nonetheless recorded gesture said, Yes, we accept the fact that the existing corpus of policies binding on us so that it's officially marked as a point of departure. If and when one of those graduate schools decides that it does actually want to deviate from what is currently articulated at the at the University level. So is it your understanding that when the graduate school was separated into multiple administrative units and

current presumably policy jurisdictions that that existing policy transferred and became applicable to level at the individual campuses.

Whitten: So if you're asking me, okay, thank you.

Johnson: Anybody can speak to it.

Whitten: Yeah, I know I'll start, and then I'll hand it back to the folks that are working on it. I think my assumption would be that's the basis to start. But I think part of what's happening is that our grad Deans are literally working through that right now too and almost need to look at all that policy and see at the University level or the UA level does it even need to be adjusted or changed. Given what's happening now? How relevant it is for how things are going to move forward, and that, of course, needs to ultimately come to a conversation with a larger body. But I would hope our graduate Deans, along with their campus leads, the Provost and the Chancellor and Vice President Sciamme-Giesecke are on task talking about that now as we're in the process of going through the change, but I would invite anyone who's working on it to address that question as well.

Blum: I was gonna say, when we submitted a document to the State requesting the name changes we did indicate in that document that we were not going to make any changes to our practices or policies on at Bloomington or Indianapolis and that we continue to engage with the regionals, and as David mentioned that Bloomington would help the regionals with some issues, if they arise, related to degree awards. And I believe the letter back from CHE that confirmed what we had stated that we would. you know, do our best to stay aligned as we currently are, and continue to follow the same policies and practices.

Daleke: and I think some of the issues you raised Colin, have always been there with the University-wide structure of the graduate school, and that was even before it was a UA level office. So prior to 12 years ago it was an opposite reported to the Provost in Bloomington, but then, when it was raised to a UA level of change became a member of the President's Cabinet. But even before then, in fact, the faculty constitution didn't change through that whole process, and it hasn't changed so I think we have the capability of having flexibility in the policies, as they are applied, and yet still have a common set of policies that we all we all follow to as members of the IU community. But again, these are the discussions that are currently as President Whitten mentioned. But right now I'm going with the Graduate Faculty Council. We sit on that council as ex-officio members, the representatives that are here. and so we are having input with those discussions as well.

Blum: Okay, and I believe Bloomington is the only campus that doesn't have, David has Board of Advisory Associate Deans but he doesn't have an actual Faculty Council on the Bloomington campus, and maybe that's why he has to spend more time with our colleagues on the GFC that represent the Bloomington campus. But yeah, we discuss these issues on the campus, and then some of them will come up to the graduate faculty council level.

Daleke: Janice brings up a good point. We have different structures for the needs that we have, and in Indianapolis, the GAC, the Graduate Affairs Committee does a lot of things, as you heard

from which Janice mentioned earlier. Here on this campus, I rely on the GFC. as Janice pointed out, and also we have the campus curriculum committee, which is both undergrad and graduate, but deals with all particular issues that are graduate. And so we managed with the combination of the GFC and the campus curriculum committee here to do what Janice, [inaudible]. That's it. That's a very crude analogy, by the way, but that works pretty well when you think about the function.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN:

Whitten: Okay, I don't. I don't see any other hands up or people reaching out, so I'll assume that we can thank you guys for your update. And obviously there'll be continuing discussion on this on this important item moving forward as well. let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a report as we referenced on the Commission for Higher Eds funding formula proposal today and with us we've got our EVP for Finance and Administration, Dwayne Pinkney, and I believe our Associate Vice President of State Relations, Trevor is now with us as well, and I want to do a special shout out and thank you to Trevor, who is ill today. but was kind enough to join us to keep this conversation going. So Dwayne and Trevor, I will turn this over to you.

Pinkney: Thank you, President Whiten and thank you members of the Council for inviting us today. The president's absolutely right. Trevor was very, very kind and generous to join us today, and I am going to turn it over to Trevor here very shortly, I would say that Trevor is our resident expert where the performance funding model is concerned. The current model, which we hope soon to call the previous model, certainly has its challenges, as with any funding formula trying to accommodate institutions which are not similarly situated presents a set of challenges. The new formula, goes a long way towards reconciling some of the conflict and or challenge associated with trying to accommodate the needs of institutions that are different. I think that we can give Trevor some of the credit the advocacy that he's been engaged, and the President mentioned earlier, certainly the work that the that commissioner : the Executive Director of the Indiana Commission, Chris Lowry and his team, their willingness to revisit Trevor's advocacy, and others at Indiana University and Purdue University and I think it led to this proposed formula that would serve the interest of Indiana University much, much better, Trevor. I'm going to turn it over you to kind of walk us through some of the highlights of the model, and we'll open for questions.

Foughty: Thanks Dayne, and as it was mentioned, I'm a little ill today. I tested positive for Covid yesterday. I've either got the best timing in the world or the worst timing in the world, because I just got a booster shot on Friday and started becoming symptomatic on Sunday. So yeah, I feel all right. I think that booster may have given a jump start to my immune system. But still have a pretty bad cough, so I'll try and make it through this. I'm gonna go ahead and pull up a Powerpoint. All right. Can everybody see that? So this is our existing funding formula, I'm going to spend a little bit of time just to sort of highlight some of the problems that we've had with this over the past. It's a very complicated and opaque formula. It's hard to predict into the future what we might earn but the way this worked under the old model or the existing model is, you start with your last budget years, and this is for IU for each campus you start with the prior years operating appropriation that becomes your base. But then they apply what's called a reallocation mechanism that reallocation mechanism essentially was most years around 5%. So 5% of your base gets taken away and put into a common pot any new dollars that the State puts

in the higher ed operating also went into that pot. And then, there are several different metrics overall degree completion at-risk student degree completion, which is mostly Pell-eligible students, STEM degree completion, on time degree production, and student persistence. And there's a formula where it determined how that money got divided up, and that was based not just on your own performance, and I'll explain how that worked in a minute, but also your performance relative to every other campus and institution in the state.

So one of the problems that we've had is when you have large campuses, large, high-performing campuses like a Bloomington or a West Lafayette, and to some degree Ball State, because that reallocation mechanism was just a flat percent from everyone's base the large campuses put the most into the pot. You're really trying to win your money back. And then, win new money through this distribution formula, but the way that they measure growth for the purposes of this formula is to look at six years of data. They take the first three years and average them to smooth it out, and then they take the second three and average them. And then they're just looking at a delta in each of these categories, and you get funded on that delta. So it's really just paying for incremental growth. So when you have a Bloomington which has an 80% completion rate, it's hard to show big increments of growth, so you put the most in, and you end up with the least amount of ability to earn some of that money back. And so what we saw over the last couple of budgets is almost by default Bloomington, West Lafayette, and Ball State lost of money. Bloomington lost 2 to 3 million dollars in each budget, and that's real money. Real dollar cuts not inflationary cuts. Some of the other problems with this formula, though, when you're when you're looking at six years of data when you're talking about something like on time degree completion, you have students that actually started 10 years ago before you start to see their completion number show up. So you're actually going back a decade for data that made this formula very slow to respond to the changing reality that we face particularly around the pandemic, and how we've handled that. And then one of the challenges for us as an institution and I think more generally across the state this formula tends to look at every institution the same. So Bloomington gets measured largely the same way that a regional campus does. They both get measured largely the same way that an Ivy Tech does not taking into account differences in mission, differences in student populations, and so on.

And so our challenge as IU has been, well, we've advocated for changes in the past. How do we propose changes that might help this large high performing campus problem for Bloomington, but that doesn't hurt our regional campuses or IUPUI, which have done very well under the last several budgets in this formula. What's happened, though, because of the really good growth that we've seen in some of these metrics at the regional campuses and IUPUI is that they've started to plateau, and their increments are starting to get smaller. Not unlike what we've been experiencing at Bloomington for a while. And so, from our standpoint, this was a good point to ask for more wholesale change to the formula, and other institutions agreed. And so last legislative session in our last budget session, we asked the General Assembly to convene a working group to look at this and to make legislative recommendations for changes to the formula. So that was done last Fall. They came up with a series of recommendations, including removing the reallocation metric, looking at impact to the state beyond just degree completion, you'll notice that most of those are tied to that, and that is important. But that's not the only way that we benefit the state and from my perspective that's not the only sort of activity that we ought to be funded on. and there were some others.

But then when our new commissioner, Chris Lowry, came in earlier this year. He really took those recommendations to heart and has worked on building a new formula. What we're

looking at moving forward is a prospective funding model rather than a retrospective funding model. So, essentially what the Commission is asking the General Assembly for this session is a special line item that is funded with a larger ask than normal from the Commission for prospective funding that doesn't just cover this biennium but could go on into the future. Those prospective appropriations will be contingent upon hitting benchmarks or goals over the course of the biennium and beyond. They will be, some will be similar to all institutions, but importantly, to try and respect mission differentiation, the student population, size, etc. There will be some institutional specific metrics which we're really excited about. I think if we do this right from a policy standpoint, if you set real goals that might be stretch goals. What would happen is, there would be some money unearned, but then that would roll over, and institutions would be eligible to receive that in future years. I think the concern is, if you set goals so low that everyone achieves all of them in each biennium, then you don't have a real performance funding model that encourages striving for bigger growth. But if it's so high that very little is achieved then I don't know that we're doing any institution, and therefore the state any good.

So the way this would work, you would still start with your prior year base. There is no reallocation. and then you would be at each institution and the next slide. I'll show how they determine. This has a certain amount of prospective appropriations that they're eligible for. So in this example we start with a base of 100 units. You would be eligible for 10 in the first year you earn 2 of those 10 units. In the second year you earn 5 of those 10 units, so you'll be paid 102 and 105 respectively, and you would have 3 left over to carry into the next biennium. In that next biennium the money that each campus earns in prospective funding becomes part of their base. So you would start in the second budget with the 107 as the base. Let's say the legislature puts 10 units in for new prospective appropriations plus the 3 carry over. So now, even though the Legislature only put in 10 units, there's still the ability to earn 13. And in this example this campus earns 12 over the course of the 2 years and so on. You'll notice too part of the reason the Commission has proposed this approach with the non-reverting fund, and the carry forward is in the last line, the 2029 budget. They assume that there's a recession, and the State puts in no new money, but because that prospective money is carried forward that still allows institutions the ability to increase their appropriation.

One of the concerns that was raised in getting rid of reallocation, though, was reallocation in some sense has been meant to be a right sizing mechanism, so that if a campus sees a sharp drop in enrollment there, the thinking is that their appropriation should drop and those that grow should see an increase. That was the that was always the theory. But we've seen a lot of disincentives, as I mentioned with the large perform high performing campus issue to that. And so the way they've set this up is that if you look at your base appropriation. So in this example the first university has 450, the second 350, the third, 200. That's a 1,000 total units. Your proportion of that 45, 35 and 20 is how we determine what prospective appropriation you're eligible for so if there's 100 units in total that the legislature funds, then the first institution will get 45, the second 35, and the third 20. Where the quote unquote right-sizing mechanism comes in then is in the amount you earn, because that's added to your base. Those that do better at earning those prospective funds will see their proportion grow. So in this example, the third, though it's the smallest, shows the largest increase their new proportion for the next budget would be 21 instead of 20, while the other two would go down slightly.

So theory is always fun. But here's how this plays out in the commission's current request. And I'll note that typically the Commission wants 8 to 10% of operating funding for higher ed to be performance funding. Ideally half of that would come from reallocation in the

past, and half of that would come from new money from the State. That has never happened. What's happened is the Commission will propose 10% with 5 from the State, and 5 from reallocation. The State will put in one to two percent excuse me but not adjust the reallocation amount. So we're still putting it in 5% in the State is putting it in one to 2%. For this new model what they're asking for this time is 6% new money in the first year and 8% new money in the second year of the budget. Because it's a transition year and we've all been working under the offices of the old formula they would still put out that 6% one of it would go towards the traditional model, 2% would be base adjustment, which does two things: one, it helps smooth out the effects of moving from a prospective, I'm sorry from retrospective to a prospective model, but it also serves as a sort of inflationary adjustment for universities at this time of high inflation. And then 3% would be the prospective funds that we're each eligible for, and the second year they're asking for 8, and that breaks down 1, 3, and 4. So what we see is these first 2 columns, one legacy and 2% base adjustment. That's essentially if the Legislature funds this and adopts this formula that would be guaranteed money. So Bloomington would be guaranteed almost 6 million dollars where they've lost 2 to 3 million in the last 2 or 3 budgets. Our regional campus is importantly and IUPUI the amount of increases that each one gets is roughly equal to the average increase that they've seen under the last 3 budgets. So our campuses are all essentially held harmless there. But then, with this prospect of funding everyone has the chance to earn more than they have in the past. So we see Bloomington has the potential for a 12 million dollar increase and on down the list. I'll point out to the School of Medicine has always been held out of the formula, because, and the School of Dentistry. That's what SOMD stands for, because they're producing different types of degrees. They are held out, and whatever new state money the state puts in they get an increase equal to that. Similarly, IU Fort Wayne since we established that has been held out of the formula. And that's because they did not have 6 years of data because we set up new programs. We are now at the point where we have 6 years of data, but we've realized again for completion, you need 10 years of data. So, they're being held out again and as we work through IUPUI and the transition there because IUPUI manages Fort Wayne, that'd be a question we need to address longer term how we want to continue to handle that. So I'm gonna stop there and see if there are any questions. I know it just covered a lot.

Whitten: We did. We had a question before you jumped on and joined us. Looking through, let's see. Remind myself who asked the question. It was specifically about graduate funding, which I hope you can understand. Now it does it doesn't work that way. It's more just a collection of a gross dollar amount that comes into each campus that is specifically used and retained by that campus. But, I'm sorry. Whoever asked that question, can you jump back? And was it you, Lindsey? I think it was you wasn't it?

Mayo: So what strikes me is that this is all driven for undergraduate funding as opposed to graduate level funding as well, which advanced degrees should count toward the equation at some point, or at least should be put forth in the funding model, because that's a vital part of this university and its rankings, and I'm curious why that's not put in the system or not.

Foughty: So I'm going to answer this in two ways. One in the existing formula, graduate degrees are counted in the total group degree completion, and I think there will still be a way to do that in the new model. As we set the metrics. And I'll talk a minute. I should have talked a

little bit about how those metrics are being set. That's the one part that isn't completed at this point. But the other way, I'll answer it is while it is in there now graduate degrees are funded at a much lower rate than undergraduate degrees and part of that, and part of the reason that the focus has been so much on completion is for the last 12 to 15 years the state has been so focused on Lumina's big goal of having 60% it was college degree attainment. It's shifted over time to post-secondary credential attainment that that's where they put all their funding. you know. 10, 12 to 15 years in we're still around 50, 48 to 50% we haven't moved the needle all that much. It's pretty clear we're not going to get 60% by 2025 which was always Lumina's goal. But, as I said, there are other ways we impact the state. So we're hoping as we set these goals I think there's a good chance that for Bloomington and IUPUI there will be research metrics right? And those could work a couple of different ways. One you might look at NSF and NIH funding awards, which are sort of a gold standard, and if you hit a certain amount the state will pay X% to match that it sort of serves as another form of ICR but from the state, or you align it to specific state goals. So we know the state is interested in microelectronics industry. So maybe they fund a bigger percent for research awards that we get that further R&D in the microelectronics. For our regional campuses, you know, those metrics may look at where we have shortage areas. So if there's a nursing shortage or a teaching shortage, the more nurses or teachers that they might produce that might be a metric for the regional campuses that makes sense there, that doesn't make the same sort of sense for a Bloomington, or maybe even an IUPUI.

This is one of the reasons, though, why we wanted to get to a model that recognizes some of that mission differentiation. I think the graduate school degree absolutely matters in that. I think we'll have a chance to have that conversation about how that gets applied, if it gets applied the same in every campus, or even if it does apply at every campus we've got the room to have those sort of conversations now.

Mayo: Thank you.

Foughty: The Commission just reached out about a week and a half ago to start setting up meetings to have conversations about what those metrics look like for this first time. It sounds like we're going to have goals for Bloomington, for IUPUI. and then the regionals will all be on the same. I had wanted to, maybe look at each regional campus on its own. But understand that this is their first time going through this and in future years we may be able to break out the regional campuses to look at their service areas and where they most contribute.

Whitten: I would just say it as a comment. thank you, Trevor, for the great presentations to show us the potential change in the funding for me model. But it hasn't been approved yet. So we don't we don't there's no guarantee that that additional funding is going to come to us yet.

Foughty: That's right, and and even if they approve the the framework of the formula. We don't know the Legislature is going to fund it at the amount that the Commission is recommending. We don't know that they're going to adapt the same. I'll say transition schedule where it's 1%, 2%, 3%. They may decide they want a slower transition. So more money gets put into the legacy model, and there's less available for the prospective. So still a lot up in the air. But moving, moving in the right direction at least.

Goff: Okay.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT:

Reck: Thank you, Trevor. Thank you so much. It we get a lot of questions about what this landscape looks like. So, even though it hasn't been necessarily approved, that was really helpful, I think, for a lot of us to understand what the dynamics looks like. I think I'm still going to ask a follow up question about metrics in general. Is it obvious how I mean what composition of people are actually setting those metrics. So it you alluded to the fact that they were you were going to have a meeting with them about what the metrics might look like. But did you get a good feeling? But who's actually setting the metrics, and how those kind of look! And then how often would you revisit what those metrics need to be is that the yearly basis? Did you understand that?

Foughty: That is, I think there are some questions that are still up in the air there. What I'm trying to get clarity from the Commission on right now is obviously we want some fiscal folks at the table, because this is a budgeting exercise but we probably need some academic people. We probably need some research folks if we're going to talk about research metrics. We may want different people, or different roles from IUPUI than we do from Bloomington, we may want different from the regional. So I'm trying to get clarity from them on that, so that we don't have to bring, you know, half the university to these meetings but still but we can still be effective. I would also like to see, continued legislative input into the formula; prior to the working group they did last fall the Legislature has never really had much of a say over how the funds get distributed. It's all done by this formula that's done by the Commission. Like, I said, it's not very opaque, even when we know what our data, or what our data is and what our increases are we typically don't see all the other institutions data until November before the budget year. We've already presented our request to the Commission in September. Our Board of Trustees approved it in October, so we've kind of done that blind in the past. So, you know, to the extent this new process can be a little more transparent and have some legislative input. I don't know that I would want to do it every 2 years, adjust them unless we really needed to. I think if we want to do big things some of these need to be, you know, 3, 4, 5, 6 year goals that we're working towards. Not just 2 years, and then we're sort of subject to the whims of who won the last election so still a lot up in the air there.

Reck: Thank you.

Whitten: I don't see any other hands up regarding this issue. Trevor and Dwayne, Were you guys gonna to? Did you have any other comments prepared that you wanted to speak in regard to funding, formula, or budget, if not, we'll transition to a second topic.

Foughty: Nope, I've got nothing else on that.

Morgan: Hi, thanks. I had yet another question about metrics, and I know that there are a lot of things that we don't know at the moment. But I was just wondering if you anticipate that, whether the new metrics will include elements that we've been focused on for years now, like progress towards degree, completion and on time completion. Will there be elements of that? Do you do foresee that, or are we going in a completely different direction?

Foughty: There will still be elements of that. There's a lot of talk right now in state policy conversations about the leaky workforce pipeline, right? And so sort of the way that we're looking at that in terms of higher ed, and where I think the funding will go for these metrics is in three buckets. One, it's the college going rate sort of phenomenon, right. Two is completion and three is economic impact to the State. I think that that second category for sure, though the completion that's where we're going to see some of the more traditional metrics that maybe apply across all institutions. You may see some in there like, I said, if it's specific degree types based on needs in a region whether that's nursing, teaching what have you, which also, I think, lines well with our strategic planning process that's under way. You know, there but it's really in the economic side, and maybe the college going side where we can get a little creative based on each campus.

Morgan: Thank you. Great. Thank you.

Whitten: thank you. I also, have in my notes that there have been a request to ask you to speak to it, and I recognize that there's probably not much you can say, because we don't really know anything yet. But, the case in front of the Supreme Court regarding changes to a potential changes to affirmative action. What it could mean for recruitment acceptance, etc. So Trevor and Dwayne. And if you have anything you'd want to add to that, there was a request for that.

Foughty: Yeah, just real briefly. so there are two cases, one against Harvard, one against UNC, both filed by the by the same plaintiff, which is an organization that has tried to overturn affirmative action for several years. They've lost multiple times in the Supreme Court before, but now, with the new makeup of the Supreme Court there's some thought that that they may be able to win. At this point there's nothing in federal law that prohibits affirmative action, or what's called race conscious admissions procedures. There are state laws, though, that prohibit that. So some states, if you're a university in one of those States you can't. And the thinking is that the Supreme Court ruling may bar that federally in some way. Theoretically US Congress could pass a law, though depending on how that ruling reason, how it's tailored, and we don't know what legislation might look like until we actually see the ruling, but they could pass legislation that does allow it, but still be consistent with the court's opinion. There's also some thought that the Department of Education, at least under the Biden administration, may look at making Title IX funding contingent upon efforts to expand diversity in student bodies, so they wouldn't have to mention affirmative action or race conscious admission policies. But it's not clear that that sort of executive action would hold up in court. So until we see a ruling later in 2023 I think it's tough to say exactly how all this is going to play out, and what the other dominoes are that are going to fall. I think there's already some conversations and some units about how IU should prepare to change. But again until we see those rulings, it it's tough to say how we might need to change.

Whitten: Thank you. Okay. Well, it looks like we're gonna let you get back in bed, Trevor. Thank you so much for joining us today. We appreciate it and Dwayne to you as well.

Foughty: I'll point out real quick I've had Covid once before, and I tested positive the day before I met with the Bloomington Faculty Council. So I'm going to be very skeptical in the future, no offense, when I get invited to speak to a Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM NINE:

Whitten: Well, thank goodness for Zoom, right? Awesome. All right, thanks, gentlemen. We appreciate it. We're going to move to the next item on our agenda today, which is updates from the UFC's Research Affairs Committee. So we have Sally Letsinger from Bloomington and Deborah Marr from IU South Bend and Tom Stucky, I think, from IUPUI so Sally, Deb, and Tom, I will turn it over to you.

Marr: Thank you. So good afternoon. We are providing a report from the UFC Research Affairs Committee. We are composed of faculty from nearly all of the campuses. and what we will be doing today is talking a little bit about what we've been discussing this fall. So our committee is new. we have 3 main responsibilities. We advise the Vice President for Research and the University Faculty Council on research matters. We collaborate on plans for strengthening research infrastructure, and we develop university-wide policies and procedures that improve the University environment. The issues that we have been discussing this fall include, it's a long list, a centralization of Research Administration, particularly at IU, Bloomington and IUPUI, the capacity model proposal for the regional campuses. If you are not familiar with this, this proposes that faculty that have been deemed unproductive in research will have their time reassigned to teaching responsibilities. Initially, the research productivity was measured by publications and jury exhibitions, but this has been changed since then. It's been modified on some of the campuses, but not all of the campuses and the timeframe considered is still included in the past. We've been discussing research, infrastructure issues on all of the campuses, the importance of research certifications, and accreditation in terms of being able to do research and also attract and retain faculty. And then also research funding transparency.

And so one core point that we will repeat several times today is that a world-class university research enterprise is best achieved through strategic thinking and planning with input from all of the campuses. We are a complex organization, and so we really need that information from people on the ground to see how new procedures and policies will affect them. We've organized information into thinking about strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. I will start with strengths. One is that we have a multi-campus structure, and each campus has a unique mission in terms of serving the region. So from IU Northwest, a leader in urban issues and social issues, community Health and Science partnerships to IU southeast at the other end of the state, that's had decades long of building relationships with industry professionals in the Louisville market. We have diverse approaches to the research from world-class arts and creativity to the science side of things. And that means we have a really impressive array of human research capital. And so some of the core points, then, is that we cannot be homogeneous in mission, and it seems like we've hit on that point in several other presentations today, but each campus has a long history of defining their research activities and mission that support the unique needs of each region, and faculty have built their careers in the context of those standards. and therefore, the research contributions of each campus need to be evaluated in those campus-specific standards. The last point is that each campus plays a critical role in their local economy. Regional campuses in particular, are providing access to higher education with

30 to 39% of the student body being first-generation students and 60 to 70% of the students at the regional campuses stay and work in those regions. And so, finally, the research experiences for all undergraduates and graduate students on all of the campuses is really critical to meeting IU's mission in terms of preparing them for the next generation of a wide variety of careers, and this requires robust in-person educational opportunities available for students on all campuses. I'm going to turn it over to Sally to talk about weaknesses.

Letsinger: Thanks, Deb. I will be playing the role of Eeyore in today's presentation. So a few of the weaknesses that we've identified offset the strengths are minimal faculty engagement in some of the recent proposals, and as someone who's participated in faculty governance in the last five years I've observed a striking reduction in faculty engagement in true shared governance. To shut out this resource squanders the breadth of faculty experience across the university system in terms of implementation of initiatives that have been coming down, for example, the capacity model, it sometimes appears to have had limited planning, or at least limited information provided. We've received examples of opaque top-down decisions pretty regularly in the last year, and it might not come as a surprise that faculty are a subset of the population who specialize in data, driven decision, making information, gathering and meticulous budget preparation. So it's also not a surprise that faculty might react with discomfort at the lack of supporting information for these decisions. So when we ask for transparency, we're asking for this information, this supporting information, and I suspect that the Administration could expect more buy-in by meeting faculty in their overly informed comfort zone. And finally, research productivity metrics undervalue research impact, and for the at least a year those of us representing faculty across the university system have been provided with so many examples of non-traditional research impacts that range from more prepared undergraduates ready to enter their workforce to students prepared for graduate school to faculty performances, prestigious fellowships, and community engagement. And I'm sure the Administration has heard the same examples. So again, our collective strength is contained in the vibrancy of our diversity and breadth and policies need to be innovative enough to capture and optimize that vibrancy. You're turn Deb.

Marr: So for opportunities we would like to really leverage that faculty talent through true shared governance, getting the input from all of the campuses. In addition, recognizing the role that regional campuses have in high quality undergraduate research experiences. This is critical to Indiana workforce development. and, for example, on Friday there was the IU Undergraduate Research Conference. The top prize was awarded to a student at IU Southeast. The top four finalists were from four different campuses. Every campus is contributing to this mission. There are undergraduate research journals on all of the campuses. and IU South Bend the last five years we've had the LSAMP program, which is the Lewis Stokes Alliances for Minorities program. This is a National Science Foundation funded program that provides intensive summer research opportunities and career mentoring for students who traditionally don't consider science careers or drop out of science early. And also the research innovation center at IU Southeast has provided student entrepreneurs experiences needed to start their careers.

If the only measure of research productivity is publications, then that can negatively impact these mentoring programs. There's an analogy that doing research with people new to doing research, such as undergraduates is somewhere to baking the cake with a four-year-old and

if you haven't done this, it can be wonderfully creative and chaotic. But just like the reason why you do, it is because cooking skills are a lifelong, fundamental, important skill that every individual needs. Similarly, that experiential learning research opportunities helps prepare those students for career opportunities that they would not otherwise have. And so just like baking a cake with a professional baker would be much more efficient but there are important reasons to do it. So, in order to develop a world-class research environment. I think we need to attend to infrastructure needs and faculty retention issues and so forth. But we also have a huge opportunity to integrate the research enterprise from undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral and faculty across all the campuses. and so we see this as one way forward in terms of really leveraging research.

Letsinger: It's me again. So it's hard to imagine growing a research enterprise by cutting budgets and some examples of threats resulting from cuts or reductions that have come to our attention, include infrastructure resiliency, changes in the ICR And RCM allocations, and loss of voluntary certifications and accreditation is critical to research programs. These are examples of where lack of financial commitment and flexibility can threaten research programs. And just as an aside a lot of the discussions that I've been part of with the Research Consolidation have basically stated that there is no research infrastructure on the regional campuses. And so I'd like to kind of correct that perception. For example, flooding caused the IU South Bend Biology Department and labs to be unusable for three years while repairs were made. The IU Bloomington Vertebrate animal program has had difficulty coordinating with capital planning projects to avoid disrupting animal care and research as well as providing appropriate backup generators and HVAC to receive animal welfare standard practices. And it's concerning the number of times in the last year that administrators have provided statements concerning voluntary certifications and accreditation so critical to specific programs in areas of study stating that they're optional and violations or loss of the certifications are not of concern. The voices and experiences of researchers on each campus are the experts in what world-class research looks like in their programs and we urge reliance on these experts to achieve those world-class objectives. And then moving down difficulty in faculty, recruiting and retention during times of widespread organizational change. Again, given the subset of the population that faculty are there is a high priority for building and maintaining research, productivity in the IU system and planning should recognize the need for stability and thoughtful roll outs of new policies and procedures. I think sometimes faculty are more jumpy than those stock market people that used to shiver when anything happens. So then I come back, and again, just to reinforce the capacity model does not recognize a reward faculty for work in all areas critical to the IU mission. And again, we want to re recognize that every campus in the IU system has separate and regionally, nationally, and or internationally important missions.

Stucky: So we think that they're actually at this point in the in the life of IU as a as a multi-campus entity, that this is a real opportunity. It's an inflection point, perhaps, where we get to really rethink a lot of the ways that we separately, and I've been involved in now two different campuses here at IUPUI and then I was formerly at IPFW a number of years ago. There is an opportunity, I think, for us to leverage this as you know, wonderfully complex system that is Indiana University, and do it in a way that is beneficial, not only for the current students, but also for the State of Indiana. So we would recommend that again this sort of reiterates some of the

points that have been made. Clarity and communication in terms of when the decisions are being made in, and involving faculty deeply in that. We have a tremendous if you think about the human capital across all of the campuses of Indiana University it's hard to imagine a group of folks that that would have more collective capacity to develop a really really innovative but also integrated research activities. Envision a situation where the undergraduate student on the Kokomo campus works with a graduate student a master's level student on the IUPUI campus as part of a team that is directed out of Bloomington, for example. That's just one of the ways that that we think we can do this.

I think, from the standpoint of the incentivizing positive behavior, we would recommend that that the capacity model be reconsidered, at least in some of the specifics. And one of the ways to incentivize research, productivity is to develop the infrastructure for that, and we don't see that as being necessarily needing to be recreated on each of the campuses. For example, if we had a centralized, you know, grant writing support situation for all the campuses. That would be a wonderful opportunity, then, for somebody say from Kokomo or South Bend, or wherever it would be potentially take advantage of that. So we think there are economies of scale within a multi-campus system. Again, there are some specific infrastructure needs that, you know, and it we don't want to be perceived as just having our hands out here. But there are elements of frankly, the research infrastructure that if we want to build a world-class university moving forward and we think we have, you know, so much of the pieces in place for that they're frankly just, are going to necessarily be needs to invest in some of those things. And again reducing the barriers to like true innovative cross-campus collaboration. We think now a particularly post pandemic, that there are many opportunities to really just yeah, almost create zero barriers there. you know, again, I was a part of the IU undergraduate research conference, and it was fantastic, some of the really innovative work that's being done across all the different campuses. So we'll close with this: we understand that it's absolutely critical that we be good stewards of the money that is invested in Indiana University, but we also think that at some point it becomes very difficult to achieve the strategic goals that we are looking at across the multiple campuses without some investment. So we look forward to trying to work together to identify ways to be lean, but also be efficient, and really grow the research enterprise.

AGENDA ITEM TEN:

Marr: I'll stop sharing this screen and we're open to questions.

Stucky: Mic drop. Very good. Okay. So I guess we don't have any questions that's fantastic.

Whitten: Well, let me thank you all for that thoughtful report. I think you bring up a lot of important ideas, and I couldn't agree more with you on many of those issues. And just as a reminder, I think Cate brought it up in her initial comments. You know we are doing national search for a new Vice President of Research just to make clear the search committee is actually comprised of people from all represented areas of the University as well, and I know they've met because I charged them, and you know now we're in the phase quietly where anybody and everybody's been being recruited. So as that rolls out, please participate, particularly as we have finalists on campus and provide your thoughts and inputs as well, because obviously they're going to play a very important role in the future with much of what you discussed today. So thank you for that.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN:

Whitten: Okay, I'm going to move on to our next item, which is a motion to amend ACA-33, the code of academic ethics. The motion comes from a standing committee. So it doesn't require a second so I just want to put it out there for everyone to note that this is an action I am, and presumably we'll be voting on it at the end of the discussion if you all get to the point where you're at that point. Alex Tanford is the chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee, and he is joining us today. So I'm going to invite Alex to deliver the report and the motion to amend. And then, Alex, if you want to manage any conversation or discussion regarding this topic, I would appreciate that as well.

Tanford: Thank you; and if there turn out to be proposals, motions to amend any sections, because I'll have to delegate those back to you, President Whitten, because I'm not authorized to call for a vote on those. But hopefully it will go smoothly, and there won't be any. Anyway, for those of you who are new to the UFC. The Policy Review Committee is a standing committee charged with reviewing existing academic policies and bringing to this body any of those that appear to us to need updating. There is actually further. We who love power, season and nerdy bureaucracy like I did. The University has a policy on policies. That policy on policies requires that all policies be reviewed every 5 years. Faculty are notoriously lacking in paying any attention to this, and in fact, as we've been slogging through all the academic policies enacted over the years by the UFC to do the revision and updating many of them go back 20 to 40 years and have never been actually substantively viewed. Taken through, you know, Campus Faculty Councils, Campus Faculty Affairs Committee talked to the various campus academic affairs administrators who have to deal with and implement these things. So that is the process that we have been going through. We have six faculty members, two from Bloomington, two from Indianapolis, and two from the regional campuses, and we have an ever-rotating number of ex officio administrators. One's Rachel Applegate has been indispensable, and Bill McKinney for the Regionals. And then depending on the topic we're working on. We will bring in the people from the recorder's office or the student transfer office, or whatever other unit of the University has to implement what we do.

So today we're bringing a motion to amend ACA-33. The horribly misnamed code of academic ethics, which was never a code and never had anything to do with ethics. And it dates back in its substance to the 1970s. Indeed, there were provisions in it that cite a 1976 AAUP report on how these things work. In doing so we are guided by the following principles: Number one: avoid having the same thing expressed in multiple policies. Too much chance there of inconsistency that one will be updated and the other won't. So that we have basically deleted in our proposal of deleting from ACA-33 sections that have been superseded by the Indiana University principles of ethical conduct approved by the trustees. UA-17 conflicts of interest. UA-3 sexual misconduct, policies on research, misconduct, academic freedom, grading obligations to the extent that those they were some provisions governing those that were in the ACA-33. We have just taken out and where necessary for context put in links and cross-references.

Second thing, we wanted to move policies text to the appropriate policy. So for example, ACA-33, was 75% about faculty, and then included some odd sections on student misconduct

and an occasional reference to SAAs. We are proposing at the end of this that the sections related to SAAs be moved out of the faculty misconduct policy and put into ACA-16, the student academic appointee policy, and the section on student misconduct be moved out of this and put into where it's always resided. These code I'll never get the title right, code of student responsibilities and conduct, and I've left something out on rights, responsibilities, and conduct which, working with the University Policy office, will be named STU-00 for those policy wonks who want to know what things are called. Third, we want to avoid purely hortatory language. It's vague, it doesn't tell anything, and it gives, it does not give deans, administrators or faculty any sense of to what extent are we obligated to do this? What would constitute a violation of this policy? So we took out language that said in essence that we're all obligated to love and respect one another. Okay.

Fourth, there is an actual IU policy template developed over the years that we are encouraged to use. So we move some things into policy, template form, which means separating policy from procedures and putting in a section on the reasons of the policy and its scope. Fifth and most important of this, I think we reported the update in all policy to reflect actual kind practices. For the last nine months they've been consulting widely with campus faculty affairs, committees with campus faculty councils with campus academic affairs administrators and just looking at it. And so things are added to this. such as including in the in section on what the academic responsibilities are for instructors, thinking about how that plays out to people with online classes, remote work, adding the faculty's obligation to follow health and safety and Covid safety guidelines. They just there was a lot of things that weren't in there. They were consistent with the existing policy but is not needed to be addressed. All of those deletions, gaps, changes. Those are explained line by line, in excruciating detail in the forty-page attached report which we sent to you in advance, and I know your eyes all glazed over when you looked at it. If you want to know what we did, line by line there, that's where it is. And in that case I want to say that as we have been updating policies that are old, and has often turned out that six months later it becomes apparent we overlook something or misjudge something. so that it it's not it's really important to the policy updated. But you know Christmas time when you're bored--go back through that thing and see if there's any, if there are things about the new policy things that turn out that you really wonder about feel free to continue to get in touch with me. and we can talk through them.

The final policy was consolidate, don't micromanage and avoid redundancy. So in the existing policy the same thing was said in in various ways, five or six times, we have put those all together and say them once. And then things like the old policy, it said at things like a list of prohibited conduct. Don't set fires on campus. don't assault anybody with violence. Don't steal University property, don't steal anybody else's property. We just say don't commit any criminal laws, so that's trying to get because you can't list them all. So that's the other thing we did. Now we try and doing this not to make any substantive changes, because that's not really our policies charge substantive changes. We try to find out to the Faculty Affairs Committee. In this case they refused them and gave them back to us, because they have a full plate of other things to do. So I just flag this in the report there are three substantive changes that we discuss that are making one which generated actually quite a lot of discussion. The old policy required an instructor to report all instances of student dishonesty to the campus student affairs office. We change this to give the instructor some discretion to handle minor dishonesty and plagiarism issues within the class as a teaching moment for students who may not have come to college with the background to understand plagiarism. That was a substitute change, and it was. I would say,

it was opposed by the campus student affairs officials who thought that who wanted a record of all this stuff?

Secondly, in response to a number of complaints and issues by faculty over the years we included a new section on work life balance. It's pretty vague, but basically it discourages the regular scheduling of classes and faculty meetings at inconvenient times, like evenings and weekends, unless that's part of a program in the unit that's been talked about by the faculty. We recognize that campuses have evening programs. They have weekend programs. They have things where you know they may need to schedule things at inconvenient times, because there is no other time to do it. We're just saying that those things can't be done sort of arbitrarily. and they need faculty involvement. And finally, there never was a clear provision about how complaints of faculty misconduct would be investigated. We simply borrowed the model that was discussed and approved with respect to sexual misconduct and research misconduct. Which is get out there. You can file a complaint. It gets investigated there's an administrator that the chair that decides whether or not, there's initially whether or not there's some need to impose a sanction. But and then the faculty member can take that so they don't liken it to a Faculty Board of Review. Some we included a provision that a campus has the option to require, that to define a set of types of faculty misconduct that need to have a faculty committee or some kind of faculty involvement prior to the initial finding of responsibility and sanction. I know a number of campuses already have campus misconduct committees that are supposed to do those things, at least in serious cases. All right.

That's why I sent this out in advance and asked if anybody had any questions to send them to me to help. you know, organize discussion. I got two related questions that's all I got, and both of them said it wondered whether or not we needed a more specific definition of what it meant to be regularly on campus at the early on. We had basically in response to student input including one of the faculty obligations, is to be regularly on campus, and the question is whether or not we needed a more clear definition of that. We felt no. No single definition can cover all the various programs in all units on campuses because they're all different in terms of the expectations of what it means. What if you know, if you have online classes, if you're running a, you know, a field research project or a clinical program. or you're using a lot of adjuncts that only come in at night. Combined with the University's Aca, 83, recently acquired by the Academic Leadership Council. Defining remote work during an age of Covid, and things like that. The answer is for that one which will come up very quickly is that we thought no there there was no need, as Colin Johnson so eloquently said earlier in general, we want to minimize the amount of direction, the running of things like that from the University level, because those really have to be defined by the units. so that that we didn't include one.

If this will work. as you all know that on people's screens. Now. somebody okay, thanks, Tom. Somebody's so nice. It's always hard to ask that question to 60 people, because nobody answers. Okay, what I propose to do is just to sort of go quickly through this section by section, and if anybody has questions, comments, or concerns, I'm not going to take the time to read them all. Oh. it'll help. you know. Sort of focus the issue. So I guess the first is the question of the scope, the policy. Yeah. Again, whether there are any concerns about that. Basically just it includes cross-references to other policies, just cut and paste it out of the existing policy. I know, I said, I don't like horrifying language, but we decided some hortatory language needed to be in there, so that's carried over the term of appointment. Got some generated some discussion and what it ended up with was, there was a policy on this that was in an old policy that got rescinded. It's explaining somewhere in the report. I think the salary policy, or something that defined the

academic year and the terms as generally beginning, as it says here, seven days prior to the first day of class, and, it always said, ended at commencement. On the day of commencement we changed the grading policy. The grading policy used to say grades had to be due no later than commencement. when students had a chance to see the grades and discuss them when he changed the grading policy. We care everybody like an extra two days to get their grades in at minimum, which means some grades won't get turned in until two days after commencement. So I have to run this through all the various administrators. We extend it, if we put this term in that terms, and two days after Commencement, and with everything else, there is policy buried away, and everywhere, it says a unit. An agreement with an individual faculty member can almost always vary from these things by the written terms of an individual appointment. Any questions about the term of appointment. That's the language shall be regularly on campus during the term of the appointment that generated the question. The responsibilities were twofold. Well, really three.

The first was general responsibilities of academic appointees. These were all pretty, but just brought in from the existing policy. except this is things where if you look at one, a the kind of thing we did. The old policy set out various ethical principles that academics were supposed to be you are familiar with. We just go. We just linked it to the principles of method. We just link it to the principles of ethical conduct. Say, with familiar with the code of student rights. Responsibilities in conduct show the link academic freedom. No conflict of interest condenses it down, say no conflicts of interest. See the policy. So those are the basic set of responsibilities. And then one that also drew some keeping abreast of knowledge and develops in their disciplines of that, in the original policy only applied to research to people with research responsibilities. we've dropped that limitation because it seems to be a teacher has to keep up with changes in the discipline as well as the general responsibility. So that was a slight change over the wording of the previous policy. Any questions, comments, concerns about the section on general responsibilities. Three is a particular one that is we think, implicit was implicit, but not explicit in the existing ACA-33. Yeah. Treat students and staff with respected courtesy no threatening, humiliating, intimidating. bullying and things like that. At least at Bloomington, there is work being done on a and I think this is going to then be university-wide similar to the sexual misconduct policy on a on a serious, anti-bullying policy sort of it'll be broader than this, but we just wanted, but there was no mention in ACA-33 about how you treat staff. So that is a slight wording change that makes it a little more specific than it was.

Reck: Alex. Can I just jump in here for a moment? So we are going to charge a task force that's gonna in one of their charges be writing and drafting a bullying policy. So I was just talking to Jennifer Kincaid about that yesterday, actually. And so we're into a you know, a seal team size task force and we were trying to figure out whether we start that on being at the Bloomington campus and then bring it to UFC; we're still in discussions about that. But that's definitely top of the list of things to talk about in the spring.

Tanford: Good them for you know, put students in postdocs names on your publications, that already exists existed in the other policy. that is, in our research, misconduct policy. The instructional responsibility is sections five and then six. Oh. again, those were the expanded. Some of them we added some updated, some comments, but those are basically in the existing policy. Oh. now, where we treaded a kind of a fine line is like in A. We spent a fair amount of time talking about how to define the student great, and this is going on simultaneously with

revisions to the student code of student rights and responsibilities. and I sit ex officio on that so we can try and coordinate. But the idea is that you have to guarantee students the right to openly discuss things. and but at the same time doesn't mean that in the middle of the physics class. When a student wants to talk about whether or not the last election was stolen, that you need to allow that as a sort of open discussion of ideas. Kick the wording around, and we came up with opinion, you know, openly discuss ideas and opinions germane to the class topic and consistent with the class format. Oh. we think that's about as close as we can get. And all this stuff was in there. Look at G. Here is another one of those where we think it's accurate and reflects current practices, and we vetted it a while--makeup classes is just place some obligation on faculty who are scheduling makeup class that you have to do it in ways that all students can attend or get the information there. So that was basically its structural comments. He will get up to six a minute. Any questions comments, concerns about general and instructional responsibilities.

Reck: Alex. I'm. Happy to jump in on our campus. A lot of faculty have an, it's kind of up the air, what quote adequate office hours are and so I mean that right? And then the other issue is hosting office hours, as in I will be in this location on these this day and time versus just email me, because those are two totally different things for students. If you have the barrier to emailing a faculty member who has a power dynamic feels very strange to some students. and so at some point it would be. I'm not addressed saying it here, but just in general, you know, just saying the words adequate office hours, I think, is very vague and then actually posted and kept. You know what I mean. So to me there's vagary, and in J.

Tanford: That there is. It's like, be regularly on campus. We thought that that was going to have to be something that was going to be defined. If a more specific definition would have to be on a campus and the unit. Because, what about people who teach entirely online classes? They just we. We got some push back on this because it originally said language very similar to what you suggested. We got some pushback, particularly from regional campuses, saying that there were their expectations. The student body is more fluid as to whether or not you get a campus where most of the students commute and go home, and the faculty commute and go home, and that for some students online office hours may be more convenient than physical office hours. So that that's why we talked about office hours at times convenient for students. sure, and and have a procedure for contacting the faculty outside of office hours. And then, yeah, I agree with you. I don't know. We didn't think, like being regularly on campus, that we could have one definition that fit all situations on all campuses. Nothing precludes the campus policy or Campus Faculty Council from taking this policy and giving it more teeth.

Reck: Sure, thank you.

Tanford: This is the one I talked about. I mentioned earlier about whether all instances a student misconduct have to be reported to the campus Student Affairs office. They want it. and they, and just because they want to keep track of these things. and because they fear the serial first time offender. We found no particular evidence that that that really was that that was a practical concern that there, in fact, were students who claimed ignorance of the plagiarism rule in course after course. and kept getting away with it because the student. The Student Affairs Office didn't know that they had a history. We found much more. and these are trade-offs. But

we found that that it went the other way that more faculty had instances of what they thought, particularly at the freshman level of inadvertent plagiarism. Just completely did not know that you can't just cite Wikipedia, just things that they thought were, that the academic freedom, the judgment of the instructor as to how best to deal with that situation. we decided ultimately should be left in the hands of the instructors. So this was kind of the compromise that any significant dishonesty needs to be reported. And this is again that the definition problem significant does not have a definition. It's up. We didn't see any way to define that, to apply to all campuses in all situations consistent with the instructors general notion of academic freedom to run the class and figure out best how to instruct the students any questions about that.

Then 7 is a slight expansion. There always was a section on the responsibilities for librarians. Again, this was an update, the concept of the librarian. as in the dusty archive with books on the shelves preserving it just it's not [inaudible]. It's information resources. Now we have all sorts of people with responsibilities, not just for collections of books, but of other kinds of collections. The Bathers Museum, whatever it's now called, information resources generally. So we expanded the this general responsibility to collect, preserve, make, available, disseminate information resources beyond just the librarian. Any questions concerns about that one? Good. Here's the work life balance. We started off by just sort of saying number one. and then we immediately people immediately jumped all over us, saying, Wait a minute. We have, we run a night program. We have faculty that go out to locations off campus as part of their academic duties. So we went to adding two and three, two being essentially okay. Every unit is going to have to do some in some inconvenient scheduling, or we can't run the program, fine. Spread it out. All appointees should accept to the extent that they are able to do so. A fair share of them, and you shouldn't just. I know that it came up sometime in my own unit, which was the the faculty without children. I had to teach at from 4:30 to 7 at night. Well, I understand the reason why, but just because you don't have children doesn't mean you don't have other obligations late afternoon. and so the idea was to put in something that says. Spread out the inconvenience to the overall faculty. And of course, since we are talking about faculty responsibilities, faculty through is, there are faculty members results for accepting their turn to teach at an inconvenient time, for example. Oh. and then in number three, saying, okay, if you're going to make a bunch of people teach at night. It at least has to go through the faculty governance organization of the unit, so that there's faculty approval of the kinds of programs that are inconvenient, and you can easily see you got it. You know the Med school. It's got to keep its clinics open. It's got to have people working at night in you know the school of nursing, and that, you know, just all these things have are going to have to be able to schedule people at in community times have faculty, input any questions comments about the end result on D on academic scheduling. Colin. I see your head.

Johnson: Yeah. Well, I just wanted to point out. I'm sure this came up in the context of your discussions. But as in principle, I absolutely, I think this is a good move. I think that it lays out important principles as a matter of practice, and you know I'm sure everyone in this is well aware of this. Units don't actually have a lot of control over those things, because the registrar's office is the sort of practically the entity on individual campuses, and you know, that has to figure out how to basically schedule rooms in not enough space. And so I would just say I wouldn't suggest changing it. I think it's a statement of general principle. It's fine, and I think the qualifications that you've committed to the record here regarding the origin of this is enough to sort of clarify its intent. But I would just say, I think probably if there aren't like faculty advisory

groups attached to you know, the registrar's office on every campus. If there aren't structures in place for that kind of accountability currently, there may need to be because ultimately the registrar's office is, you know, an entity that kind of operates in the zone of administration. And at the end of the day, if they come back and say, we just don't have enough rooms. We're gonna have to, you know, schedule all this stuff to go until 9:30, or 10 o'clock at night in order to accommodate everything. Most units are not going to be in a position either in theory or in practice, to push back against that. So, I would just say, I think this is a place where implementation needs to be looked at, very carefully to honor the spirit of the change.

Tanford: I agree with you completely. But again, it's an area where implementation has to be yeah. campus level and the unit level. Some units like the loss of the professional schools often have much greater control over their own facilities and classrooms than I believe in the college arts and sciences, so that. And so maybe they're those discussions would have to go on at the unit level. And since in the grading policy we've had dialogues with the registrars, I can assure you that they can be sometimes quite difficult people to deal with. They and I understand it that is like, you know, a three-dimensional excel spreadsheet to try and get this stuff in, but I agree I would urge, the various campuses have that dialogue with the registrar and with their chair, with their department chairs. I mean it just because the registrar says, okay, your department has to teach a class at 6:30 at night. Maybe the unit could rotate, which class is scheduled there. I don't know, but I agree. but the campus level, I think again, is like every place where this policy is kind of vague. There's an implementation issue that goes to the campus. Anything else on scheduling issues work, life balance all right, consensual relations. Oh, I didn't mention, I guess I can mention at the end. Never mind consensual relations with students those of you who have been on the Faculty Council for a couple of years may remember that in 2019, I believe a task force was appointed to generate to update our existing policy on consensual relations with students that issued a report which was approved by the Faculty Council in 2021. That report among other things delegated to our committee the question of whether this should be a free-standing policy or incorporated.

We thought it fit nicely within ACA-33, and on the general principle that we have, which is consolidating policies, so that all relate things are in the one place someone would look for them. We thought, if a faculty member is wondering what you know about the rules of Misconduct put them in here, and it seemed it seemed to fit we otherwise we made three changes to the task force report other than a couple of grammatical or typographical error corrections. Now one was to remove the same sentence that appeared twice, only put that in once, and the other one was at the end of the consensual relationships policy was a section was a sentence that said. A violation of this policy will be considered a violation of UA-03 sexual misconduct. We took that out because we can't, we don't have the ability to amend you UA-03, which is not an ACA policy. and it seemed to be misleading. It's not a violation of a consensual relation to be in a consensual relationship. Policy is not misconduct, as that is defined by UA-03. So that is the one place where something that was approved by it was recommended by the task force and approved by the UFC. We took out, under our general authority, to revise existing policies, to prevent conflict with other university policies Other than that. Everything is the lying which is here is unchanged. Any questions about the corporation of the task force report on consensual relations?

Reck: No, but I'm gonna jump in and just kind of give you a time check reality. You have half an hour, and we still have to vote at the end. So I'm just giving you that.

Tanford: We're wrapping this up Alright, then personal misconduct policy two parts, three parts really what constitutes misconduct? How complaints are made investigated. and what sent what to do about sanctions? The existing ACA-33 contained no personal misconduct policy. It simply said, faculty members shall abide by the same rules of misconduct as students. Well. as that means that I can't drink beer if I'm under 21 in the basement of a fraternity, so there were a lot of things about the student policy that did not apply to faculty. We took the student policy, moved it out and took all of its provisions. and rewrote them in a sort of simplified form, to apply to faculty. and then we ran it by the various, you know, campus, academic affairs, offices, the Vice Provost and Vice Chancellors for academic affairs about whether our final result was pretty much consistent with what they considered faculty misconduct. And again, some of it is a little bit vague. but that's the section two on what cause? It is an act of personal misconduct. Now this has nothing to do with what constitutes an act of sexual misconduct or research, misconduct or professional misconduct. whatever that might be. We didn't take on. They're floating around some of this campus policies is the notion of professional misconduct that is usually linked to the dismissal. Involuntary dismissal policies. We didn't go there because it simply was beyond the scope of ACA-33. Take that up. So we just did. We just took it and define basic misconduct. you know. So people up don't violate other policies. Don't interfere with the Academic Mission. Don't have a fire. I mean they're not run around campus with a gun, the encouraging physical violence, bowling, threatening, humiliating again that will. When there is a bullying policy. this can add a link to that which would give it more detail. encouraging retaliation unauthorized, you know, letting unauthorized people They're not opening it. Science lab and letting in PETA to kill you to let the animals free. Don't let people are using your, you know, giving maybe your swipe card sort of it's like this is straight out of the student provision.

Then the one thing we took some time at. There's an old policy IT-21 which a couple of years ago referred to it and they are doing, they are constantly having to revise all of their policies because of changes in the IT world. This one on the use of mass emails has fallen way down to the bottom of their pile. They still get to it. It's somebody's lifetime, but maybe not ours. So then again, it was a very outdated policy which said we could not send faculty, could not send emails to people without, unless they had a pre-existing relationship with that person well overnight. There goes our ability to send book prospectuses to the Yale University Press. It clearly was not something that was viable. So that we understand the use of university emails for political purposes that's covered by GR-1. So we link to that. But in other terms, we just know university email is for yeah, communication related to the overall mission of the University. Whether or not you have a pre-existing relationship with this person, we understand the no spam rule, and pointed out that if you know, if you frankly, if you use your university email address for your personal email, so your family can contact you. That's not a violation. So that's one place where we did do some thinking and to try to update a policy dealing with it with email this that basically says, okay, faculty can do this. We are not addressing anything more broadly than that about email that is up to it. But it says it's not misconduct any questions about that on email, all right. And there we go.

Oh, for some reason. and we had some comments about use of alcohol/drugs and we got the comment, hardly from some people who tend to take student groups to on field trips, or mostly student groups going to Europe going overseas. saying, Well, what if we go? We all go

out to a tavern, you know, and have some bottles of wine. That's the answer I don't know. Deal with it. It's not a problem. So we talk about, we tried as best we could to say an intoxicated condition that in class is obviously the most serious part, or the university function or activity. And then you have a unit that has formalized events with students. with older students, or that take students out to restaurants and things like that. They can write their own policy any questions about drugs and alcohol. Good. all right.

Procedure section is again three parts. What is one is a change in number one. But the old policy said it. Anyone may initiate a complaint. We change that to any member of the University community because of the prevalence now, the internet trolls, who are a whole bunch of people, both from the progressive left and from the far right, that want to constantly be filing complaints against faculty members who, they believe, are too liberal or too conservative, or whatever it is. We didn't want to open up the procedure to that kind of initiating of a complaint. Anyone who has a complaint like that can still go to the person's chair, or dean and complain. But the formal triggering of the process would have to then come from the chair, or the Dean, or another member of the University community. It couldn't you couldn't trigger the process simply by a person from Oklahoma saying, I read an article by one of your professors, and I'm objecting to it. Then we basically have a process where a complaint goes to generally it either did the Dean or the chair, or it's on some of the regional campuses, it's likely to go straight to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. because of the way that they are structured. Good. They at first have the opportunity to try to resolve these things informally. Number two, number three. If they don't then you have an investigation process similar to the ones used in other misconduct situations. And at that investigation process. if you remember then we talked over the last year or so about the use of an anonymous, so comments by students in course, evaluations in some other contexts. So that language about when we can use, when complaints can be anonymous creeps in there, which is that at some point you can't get too far in the process with an anonymous complaint. Faculty member has to know who is making the complaint, or they can't respond to it. So that gets there in B. And then you got just gives the the dean and the chair, the ability to investigate it then make a determination whether the person did it, and ought to be sanctioned. That's kind of just the ordinary investigation process.

Now we are aware that some campuses have policies that that delegate this function to some kind of faculty misconduct committee. We talked to those people who had been on those committees. [inaudible] Everybody fundamentally dislikes that process. First place, it's not actually followed. If the chair is gonna pull you into their office and say don't do that again, they are not first going to take that through a faculty misconduct committee. But pull you into the office and say, don't do that again is a form of sanction. A reprimand is a sanction imposed by the administration, so it's technically false within this kind of policy. Secondly, we heard that nobody brings anything to these committees. They don't have much to do in general, and they can't find faculty willing to serve on them if they have a broad mission. So we have a, we do say here later on that, particularly with severe sanctions, and we try to for this reason we try to divide levels of sanctions into simple common sanctions and severe sanctions. and encourage campuses if they want to have their sort of faculty misconduct the faculty committee involved at the level of severe sanctions. but not ordinary sanctions like when I first started teaching, the dean called me in and said, you know your teaching evaluations are terrible, and we're getting complaints for the students. I really think you should go to (forgotten what the office was called in those days). The strategic teaching initiative, whatever it was at the campus. Go, go, talk to people. We have an office that helps young professors get better in their teaching. Go talk to them there are all

that you know. Reprimand referral to university resources. That kind of action a chair takes in response to a complaint from someone offered suggestions to try to smooth things out and make things get better. That we tried to put it this concept of a common sanction.

And then what we tend to think of is sanctions, severe sanctions. The suspension of the privilege is taking away a class up to and including termination. Oh. Call those severe sanctions, try and define when they are appropriate. and in that's the one where you give the campus the opportunity to get their own. This conduct committees involved if they can get anyone to serve on them. And then, of course, there at the end yeah, all of this can go to a faculty board of review. You don't like the dean, says you need to go get there, go get sensitivity training, and you go, No, I'm going to continue to yell at my students. Yeah. you know, they said. Okay. Then you can't teach a freshman year course or get younger freshman at some point, even if that is sort of you know that that decision could be taken to a Faculty Board of Review. Yeah. standard appeal questions, comments about this section on personal misconduct. Colin.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE:

Johnson: so some of this I know. You mentioned that there are other domains of policy compliance that you know, are covered by other policies. I get that, and one of the complicated realms of distinction, I think, is between personal misconduct and professional misconduct, which can sometimes cross paths but and we may have to address that separately as a clarification issue in the longer term. But, I the question I have, and I just like your response for the purposes of this historical record by inserting these procedures. which make very clear that it is, in fact, the responsibility of the chief academic officer of the unit to oversee this process. The implication of that is that there are a whole bunch of people in administrative positions and on all the campuses, and that the UA level, who have various responsibilities to make sure that various things are complied with. You know all sorts of other things. But this seems to enshrine as a matter of practical principle, that if, in fact, there are concerns about faculty, conduct, right, and especially kind of formalized complaints. That those need to be in every case routed through the chief academic officer of the unit and that all of those people should not be, for example, interacting directly with individual faculty members in order to pursue their own. you know, in order to sort of meet their own responsibilities to address possible issues of policy violation is, am I correct in sort of reading that again?

Tanford: Yeah. The that is again one of those sections of that's a bit vague. Does it? Go to put things in sort of ordinary terms to the chair, to the Dean, to the Executive Dean. to the associate Vice Chancellor for economic affairs to the Vice Chancellor herself. I think that that the answer to that again is going to vary across campuses and units to decide how best to do that. some of it is with I don't know what they did. The Dean of a large unit. I doubt once particularly to have to have all these things rounded across their desk. So we conclude a definition that those could be deleted can be, can be designated somewhere as they can be delegated. And I also think there's nothing wrong with a but an individual campus being more specific about the route through this process.

Johnson: If I could ask a follow up question, which is the preamble to this section, specifies the constitution of the faculty is very clear about the fact that faculty have the prerogative to oversee faculty conduct right broadly understood. So all of the people that you've just named are within the kind of chain of command and authority in the fact in the kind of academic ranks. What I'm

concerned about are the kind of broad range of, I think, of excellent colleagues who are working very hard to do their job, who are essentially in staff positions, including highly appointed staff positions who have professional responsibility, but who may or may not understand that if part of their responsibilities involve implementation, interpretation of existing policy, that this per the this person. That's fine, that's fine for that. But it needs to be routed through the chief academic officer of the unit, so that they are involved in sort of figuring out how to resolve that through the implementation of procedure that abides by the line of kind of process that's been developed and approved under the sign of shared governance and faculty oversight. Does that make sense? That does make sense? And you're right in part? It is trying to.

Tanford: We had a lot of concern expressed, oddly enough, mostly by administrators about the so. The absence of an accumulated body of knowledge, the ideas that some sense that similar things ought to be treated similarly as a part of sort of everything being routed through a certain pathway he is designed to. so that there are people who know what happened in similar cases, I guess. I'm Still not sure. I'm answering your question.

Johnson: And so I gather I'm reading your answer to say yes, that the implication of this is, if you have an issue with the faculty member that falls under the purview of this policy generally regardless of where you are, pursue it. But do not contact individual faculty members directly say, I am X whatever for this, and I have the authority to censure you because it's supposed to go through the chief academic officer.

Tanford: That, yes, that is correct. But within the chief academic affairs officer could for example, in the College of Arts and Sciences could with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee delegate these to department chairs or an executive. But yes, you're right. It is designed to so that somebody knows what's going on, and you don't want sort of various department chairs and things just doing the stuff on their own.

Whitten: So, Alex. I'm going to just show that we're down to the final moments before I'm done. If there are no other questions or motions for amendment or anything.

Tanford: I'm done, and turn it back over to you to call for vote.

Whitten: All right. I'm gonna take that as no one else seeking to ask a question. I don't see any hands up, so I will turn us to a vote. We need to vote on this amendment. So all those in favor of amending ACA-33, please type yea into the chat I guess that's the process we're using here. So we'll take a moment or two and let everyone do so.

Tanford: and I would request the Secretary or Lana or whoever is going to record the vote that the minutes actually reflect the numbers of the votes because some of this policy takes away autonomy from the individual campuses, and under our constitution that requires like, I've forgotten, a 2/3s vote or 3/4s. It requires a concurrence by a super majority of the UFC, not a mere majority.

Whitten: Let's give another 10 seconds for those to type in yea, and then we'll transition and give people the opportunity to vote. And so any other yeas please vote yea now into the chat. Okay, anyone who wants to vote no, please do so by typing nay into the chat at this point. Can we get an account, Lana?

Spendl: It's looking to me roughly about 29 yays and no nays. But, Alex. I will, we will have a record of the chat, so I'll go through more carefully but it looks it looks as if it has passed.

Whitten: Thank you, thanks, thanks for Alex for your thoughtful and detailed presentation, and for all the members on the committee who did all the hard work. I know how laborious that is, and so thank you for that. At this point. I think we've gone through everything that was brought up for agenda today. Do I have a motion to adjourn motion? Second.

Reck: Thank you.

Whitten: Thank you all so much. I wish you the best and most relaxing holidays. Thank you for all you do for our students and for your colleagues. This meeting is adjourned.

Reck: Thank you very much. Bye, Everybody Happy holidays

Simpson: to you, too.